Adv Mobile Learn Educ Res, 2026, 6(1): 1809–1823
DOI: 10.25082/AMLER.2026.01.014

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Undergraduate Students' Perceptions of Generative Artificial Intelligence (Gen AI) in Academic Assignments

Nimesh Shrestha[1*] **Netra Kumar Manandhar**[1] **Bibek Bhandari**[1] **Avinash Maskey**[1] **Pratit Raj Giri**[1]

[1] School of Education, Kathmandu University, Lalitpur, Nepal

Correspondence to: Nimesh Shrestha, School of Education, Kathmandu University, Lalitpur, Nepal;
Email: nimesh@kusoed.edu.np

Received: January 13, 2026;
Accepted: April 23, 2026;
Published: April 27, 2026.

Citation: Shrestha, N., Manandhar, N. K., Bhandari, B., Maskey, A., & Giri, P. R. (2026). Undergraduate Students' Perceptions of Generative Artificial Intelligence (Gen AI) in Academic Assignments. *Advances in Mobile Learning Educational Research*, 6(1), 1809-1823. https://doi.org/10.25082/AMLER.2026.01.014

Abstract: The integration of generative artificial intelligence (Gen AI) into educational settings represents a transformative shift, reshaping conventional educational practices and students' learning experiences. This study provides valuable insights for the effective educational implementation of Gen AI. The primary objective of this research is to examine how undergraduate students enrolled in educational technology programmes in Nepal perceive the effects of Gen AI on their academic assignments, as well as to identify the factors influencing students' acceptance and adoption of Gen AI for these tasks. A quantitative research design was adopted, with data collected via an online survey from 174 undergraduate students pursuing a Bachelor in Technical Education in Information Technology in Nepal. Three core variables were measured in this study: the perceived impact of Gen AI, perceived ease of use, and the determinants of Gen AI acceptance and adoption. Approximately 64% of students utilised AI tools on a daily basis when completing their assessment tasks. Respondents demonstrated a relatively positive perception toward the utilisation of Gen AI in assignments (M = 3.82, SD = 0.44). Students held strong beliefs regarding Gen AI's influence on their assignment completion (M = 3.82, SD = 0.32). They identified instructors' integration of AI in teaching as a key factor motivating their own use of Gen AI tools. Furthermore, students predominantly relied on mobile applications to access generative AI, highlighting the relevance of portable devices within mobile learning environments. In addition, participants perceived such technologies as user-friendly for completing academic assignments. The findings of this study hold practical implications for educators, institutional policymakers, university administrators, and students interested in the transformative potential of generative artificial intelligence (Gen AI) within educational contexts.

Keywords: Generative Artificial Intelligence (Gen AI), undergraduate students' perception, AI in higher education, AI in academic assignments

1 Introduction

The educational environment transforms the emergence of generative artificial intelligence (Gen AI). Khatri and Karki (2023) discussed that generative AI technologies have changed the conventional methodologies of teaching by supporting teachers, students, and administrators by generating new content and products, such as images, texts, videos, etc. Generative AI tools like ChatGPT, Perplexity, Gemini, Copilot, and other forms of AI are increasingly being integrated into educational systems/workflows, which have established challenges in pedagogical practices and have created both opportunities and challenges for students and educators. Tan et al. (2023) demonstrate that students utilize generative AI for assignments, brainstorming, editing, drafting, analysis, and even completing entire assignments. In such cases, questions may arise about how students adopt Generative AI tools, how they are integrated into their assignments, and what the impacts of Generative AI are on learning outcomes and students' skill development (ElSayary, 2024). In the present context, research on AI in education is increasing globally, which leads to significant gaps in understanding how Gen AI technologies are perceived and utilized by undergraduate students in educational fields such as educational technology and information technology (IT) in developing countries like Nepal. There are limitations in infrastructure, varied levels of technological literacy, and distinct educational plans, policies, and norms that influence the adoption of Gen AI (Gautam & Mishra, 2025). Joshi et al. (2024) note that a considerable disparity exists between policy targets and ground realities in the implementation of educational technologies in Nepal. For developing effective and applicable

policies and pedagogical approaches by addressing concerns about skill development, academic integrity, and ethics, understanding students' perceptions is important, which helps in harnessing the generative AI's potential benefits (Samala et al., 2025). The primary goal of this study is to contribute to the emerging field of Generative Artificial Intelligence in education by investigating the perception of undergraduate students in technical education in Nepal regarding the impact of Gen AI integration on student assignments. This research study presents insights for educators, policymakers in Nepal, and educational organization leaders navigating the complex environment of AI integration in education within the Nepalese context.

The rapid growth of generative AI technologies presents various challenges for students and higher education in Nepal, particularly in terms of the impact of Gen AI on assignment completion and assessment practices (Chan & Hu, 2023). Some of the challenges this research study focuses on are the significant knowledge gaps and how undergraduate students perceive and utilize generative AI tools in assignments. On an international level, studies have begun to document perceptions and behaviors toward generative AI (Li et al., 2023), as there is limited research that focuses on contextualizing factors that might influence these perceptions in Nepal's higher education. We are living in a digital age where many undergraduate students are still struggling to use and adapt generative AI tools in their daily learning (Acharya et al., 2021). There are numerous concerns about the use of generative AI technologies and platforms in schools, including concerns about cheating and various forms of testing (Khatri & Karki, 2023). The author further discussed that AI tools are raising issues, such as academic plagiarism, that have the potential to hinder and control creativity, critical thinking, and undermine teaching and learning practices. Understanding and systematic investigations are required to tackle such problems and develop effective and applicable policies and educational approaches (Zacharis & Papadakis, 2025). In Nepal, there is a challenge in utilizing generative AI due to infrastructure and resource limitations. The study by Gautam and Mishra (2025) found that only 34% of Nepal's higher education institutions have reliable internet connections, resulting in inequalities in who can access and benefit from AI tools. This may lead to trouble, as potential digital divides are extended through the use of AI in educational practices (Acharya et al., 2021).

Gen AI integration in educational platforms has uncertainty that aligns with the existing pedagogical approaches and learning approaches in the educational context. Lawaju et al. (2024) appreciated AI's benefits in teaching and learning environments, but there needs to be some serious and careful considerations (Lavidas et al., 2022). The adoption must be done to enhance academic objectives and innovate teaching methodologies. The study by Khatri and Karki (2023) highlights the importance of protecting scientific research integrity and committing to ethical values; however, the students' interpretation and handling of ethical components remain unclear. Generative AI's challenges and issues in education need to be investigated. It is essential to examine their perceptions and experiences to comprehend the advantages and disadvantages of generative AI in students' assignment and assessment practices, particularly in the Nepalese context. In our country, Nepal, it is very important to research these perceptions and experiences among the students regarding how they utilize generative AI. Therefore, this research project is based on examining students' perspectives on using these advanced technologies in assignment practices (Drolia et al., 2022).

Nepal is one of the developing countries where most of the people, especially students, use smartphones as their main learning device. In both areas, rural and urban students often use mobile data/internet rather than desktops and laptops for their studies. Mobile technology also helps to bypass traditional computing systems, which is also known as mobile leapfrogging.

In Nepal, many university/college students depend upon smartphones because of easy access to the internet and due to their affordability and accessibility. This concept is also known as mobile leapfrogging, where smartphone devices enable users to replace traditional desktop-based computing environments, and it adopts mobile internet technologies (West, 2012). In the present context, generative AI tools like ChatGPT and Gemini are commonly accessed through mobile applications and browsers. In this scenario, undergraduate students' perception of GenAI integration therefore requires a mobile learning environment in which these kinds of applications are frequently used.

2 Materials and Methods

2.1 Materials

After a rigorous review of literature and students' interactions in class, a quantitative study was conducted through an online survey among 174 undergraduate students from the Bachelor's

in Technical Education in Information Technology in Nepal. The central purpose of this research was to examine the perception of undergraduate students on the impact of Generative AI on assignments in Nepal, which investigates the perception and practices of undergraduate students on adopting Gen AI on assignments. The study analyzes the influencing factors of students' perceptions on integrating Gen AI into the assignments and identifies the benefits and challenges of Gen AI in assignments from the students' perspective.

2.1.1 Generative AI in Higher Education

Generative AI (Choi et al., 2025). Generative AI is one of the major components for helping both students and teachers, which helps in their personalized learning, auto-grading with required rubrics, designing useful learning materials, and also the other day-to-day administrative work (Tan et al., 2023). They further claimed that students use Gen AI technologies in performing tasks, such as brainstorming, writing research work, formatting assignments, pitching ideas, and reviewing literature in research. Generative AI is significantly used in higher education, as per Li et al. (2023).

In developing countries, Generative Artificial Intelligence has significant potential to advance educational outcomes by adopting AI technologies in the higher education context, even though the implementation part is still facing challenges regarding infrastructure limitations and digital literacy gaps (Chan & Hu, 2023). Gautam and Mishra (2025) support these findings and discuss further that there are barriers in the adoption of AI in the Nepali context due to infrastructure barriers, lack of awareness and required skills among students and teachers, and appropriate policy frameworks and guidelines for effective integration.

2.1.2 Perceptions of Educational Technologies Among Students

In the adoption of Gen AI in education, the perception of students plays an important role. The perceptiveness of technology directly affects the students' willingness and eagerness to integrate technologies in education (Crisol-Moya et al., 2020). In such a case, the behavior of students and users can influence the patterns of generative AI technology integration in education. The study by Tan et al. (2023) stated that students raised concerns about ethics, data privacy, and the negative impact of generative AI on their cognitive learning aspects. The study shows that adopting Gen AI technologies increases the knowledge of students, and it reflects the importance of using Gen AI, which will demand education, workshops, and training on Gen AI technologies (Charan et al., 2024).

The study by Acharya et al. (2021) studied the perception of students toward digital learning initiatives in the context of Nepal and found that students recognize the possible benefit of using Gen AI technology and integrating it in academic works, and students raise concerns about infrastructure limitations and the enhanced education system regarding the quality of technology. Nepalese students' behavior toward generative AI like ChatGPT influences ease of use, usefulness, reliability problems, and data privacy challenges, which remain concerns (Lawaju et al., 2024).

2.1.3 Impact of AI on Assignments

Gen AI integration carries extensive implications for undergraduate and higher education coursework, a core component of learning and assessment (Acharya et al., 2021). Li et al. (2023) evidenced that Gen AI reshapes students' assignment-related behaviors, with far-reaching impacts on skill development, assessment validity and teaching practices. Meanwhile, AI tools raise ethical concerns including plagiarism, which may restrict creativity and critical thinking and impair teaching quality. Widespread institutional concerns over Gen AI use also persist, particularly regarding academic dishonesty and assessment integrity (Khatri & Karki, 2023). Collectively, existing literature highlights such trade-offs, underscoring the necessity of targeted strategies to responsibly integrate Gen AI into academic assignments.

The study examining faculty perspective by Barakat et al. (2024), demonstrates the ability to assess student learning when Gen AI is used for assignments, but it also shows the potential strength of AI's use for giving feedback and supporting student learning. This shows that there is a need for an open dialogue between faculty and students about the suitable use of AI in academia.

2.1.4 Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) in Mobile Learning

Mobile learning refers to anytime, anywhere learning supported by portable handheld devices including smartphones and tablets (Traxler, 2017). Amid the rapid advancement of artificial intelligence, mobile learning environments have incorporated AI tools to assist students with

content creation, academic writing and information retrieval. Accessible via mobile phones, generative AI platforms offer conversational interaction similar to instant messaging, enabling students to complete academic tasks on mobile devices and rendering Gen AI a valuable learning resource. Smartphones are widely affordable and prevalent across urban and rural regions, alongside low-cost mobile data plans, ensuring broad access for all students. Major generative AI tools, such as ChatGPT and Gemini, are readily available on mobile devices to address academic queries, deliver personalised information, and facilitate learning tasks. Georgiev and Georgieva (2025) noted that generative chatbots are increasingly embedded in mobile applications to enhance content optimisation and user interaction, with AI assistants capable of clarifying complex concepts, resolving questions, and supporting routine administrative arrangements. This study therefore focuses on mobile-based generative AI adoption to strengthen mobile learning accessibility, educational inclusion and targeted academic support.

The empirical research on Gen AI in educational settings has increased rapidly in recent years, but studies in Nepal are still limited (Devkota, 2025). Some findings from the empirical review apply to understanding the perception of generative AI in the higher education environment (Charan et al., 2024). In the study by Tan et al. (2023), students have a strong positive perception towards Gen AI technology, and the students are appreciative of the benefits of these technologies for learning personalization, support for reading and writing, research, literature review, etc. Nevertheless, students raised some ethical concerns due to Gen AI in education, such as plagiarism, data privacy, ethics, and dependency on generative AI tools, which are hindering the true skill development required for humans in the 21st century. Barakat et al. (2024) explored the university educators' perspectives on the use of ChatGPT. According to TAM, the adoption of Gen AI is predicted to be significant to the perceived usage and ease of use. Gen AI has potential benefits in improving teaching and learning practices, while the study also highlights the integrity issues in the evaluation process.

Acharya et al. (2021) research on COVID-19 digital learning initiatives in Nepalese higher education found that institutions rapidly implemented different technologies, but challenges about affordability, technology literacy, and infrastructure significantly impacted student experience. The adoption and perception of Gen AI in Nepal are influenced by the contextual factors of the study. A Study by Khatri and Karki (2023) on AI in higher education in Nepal is focused on ethical and academic integrity while identifying the potential benefits for improving pedagogy and learning, including productivity, experiences, and inclusiveness. Further, Gautam and Mishra (2025) in the study of adoption of AI and ICT in the educational sector of Nepal, found the challenges such as lack of skill development practices, infrastructure barriers, and persons with 21st-century skills and values. Their research suggests capacity building, policy formulation, increased funding, and a participatory approach for integrating Gen AI into education.

2.1.5 Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)

The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) was developed by Davis (1989) and has been used universally to investigate users' acceptance, adoption, and use of new technologies. Kanont et al. (2024) claimed that technology adoption by users is primarily dependent upon two major factors: perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use, influencing the user perception and behavioral intention to adopt technology in his/her practices. In the learning environment, TAM augments the variables in the educational context.

Lawaju et al. (2024) conducted a study with students with a management background, who found a significant benefit of the TAM framework to identify affecting factors on the adoption of technology patterns. The study shows that perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use are significant in behavioral intention to use Gen AI (Lawaju et al., 2024). Moon and Kim (2025) developed a specific "Generative AI Acceptance Model Framework for Teachers" and suggested that an extension of TAM is required to fully capture the exclusive characteristics of Gen AI tools. This theoretical framework extends current models with consideration of the unique characteristics of generative AI (Davis, 1989).

2.2 Methods

A survey research method was used to investigate 'Undergraduate Students' Perception on the Impact of Generative Artificial Intelligence (Gen AI) Integration on Assignment' within Nepal's higher education context. This survey research is conducted for studies investigating the perceptions, attitudes, and behavior across the population, and it allows the systematic collection of standardized data from a large sample (Fowler, 2014). This method aligns with the studies in educational technology perception according to Tan et al. (2023) and Lawaju et al. (2024),

enabling the comparison of findings across the context.

To measure the students' perception of Generative AI and to identify the relation between variables, usage perception, ease of use, perception, and behavioral intention to use Gen AI, the survey design in the research study employs a descriptive correlation approach. This research is linked with Lawaju et al. (2024) application of quantitative research design in their study of ChatGPT in Nepalese management education.

The targeted population of the study is the undergraduate students enrolled in the Bachelor's in Technical Education in Information Systems and the Bachelor's in Information Technology (BIT) at Kathmandu University, SCTI, Aspire, and Radiant College. This educational technology program includes students with specialized interests in computing, programming, and information systems, which makes this background a student population for studying the perception of Generative AI. 300+ students are currently enrolled in B Tech Ed IT and BIT programs, including Kathmandu University, SCTI, Aspire, and Radiant. This population is distributed in urban and rural areas, with the highest concentration in the Kathmandu Valley.

A simple random sampling method was used to collect data from institutions, programs, and geographical locations. Wallace et al. (2016) highlighted that stratified sampling is useful for perception studies because it assists in ensuring that the sample represents a significant sub-population that may have varying perspectives. In this study, Yamane (1967) developed a simplified formula for determining sample size in survey research. 172 were the total respondents for the survey. The study targeted 200 respondents representing 66.7% of the total population. As the sample size exceeds the minimum requirement for multivariable analysis and aligns with an educational survey (Cohen et al., 2018). Therefore, the research study collected 174 samples from undergraduate students, which represents 87% (174/200 targeted participants), where the 70% threshold recommended for survey studies is exceeded significantly (Fowler, 2014).

A structured and closed-ended questionnaire was developed based on a literature review and established tools for measuring technology acceptance and student perceptions (Davis, 1989). The questionnaire development process followed the recommendation of DeVellis (2017), which incorporated elements from the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). The questionnaire in this study consists of four main sections such as Demographic, Perceptions, Ease of Use, and factors influencing Generative AI in assignments.

The 5-point Likert Scale statements with 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) were developed for measuring the perception, ease of use, and factor items according to Chan and Hu (2023).

To conduct an overall study, a pilot test was conducted with 30 students from Kathmandu University School of Education (KUSOED), which was evaluated for the instruments, clarity, and timing. In this study, respondents from the pilot survey are not included. Based on the results from pilot testing, minor modifications were made to items, and the questionnaire was finalized for the main study. From all the participants, informed consent was collected with a clear objective of the study, where participation is voluntary, and data confidentiality was ensured. The data collection was conducted using a quantitative method over a month, April-May 2025, where the primary data was collected through Google Forms distributed through the institutional email ID and student portal. Once a week, a reminder email was sent to faculty and staff from educational institutions to support and encourage participants. The data collected was analyzed statistically in SPSS, including descriptive statistical methods that helped to provide a summary of the comprehensive response pattern. Various inferential analysis was conducted. Independent t-test and ANOVA are used to examine the perception difference across demographic variables (gender, academic year, and institution type). The research identifies a gap in the general understanding of how Gen AI is perceived and integrated in the education context in developing countries like Nepal. In Nepal's higher education system, there is still a disconnection between technology policy and its implementation (Joshi et al., 2024). By addressing the challenges to enhance educational outcomes, this study provides a valuable understanding of bridging the gap in developing approaches by understanding the perceptions of undergraduate students.

3 Results

3.1 Study's Demographic Patterns and Distribution

The study comprises 174 students from the Undergraduate program from Nepal, selected irrespective of their specific academic and institutional affiliation. The sample size taken for the

study was not considered without considering the students' current educational performance level or their engagement in the technology field outside their formal education. The demographic characteristics, including Gender (Male and female), Hometown (Rural and urban), Academic Year (First to Fourth Year), Institution type (Public and private), and AI Guideline. From the demographic analysis of this study, it is seen that most of the respondents are from the first and second years of study. The detailed demographic pattern and distribution are detailed in Table 1.

Table 1 Demographic Distributions

Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	109	62.6
	Female	65	37.4
Hometown	Rural	69	39.7
	Urban	105	60.3
Academic Year	1st Year	80	46.0
	2nd Year	79	45.4
	3rd Year	5	2.9
	4th Year	10	5.7
Institution Type	Public	110	63.2
	Private	64	36.8
AI Guideline	Yes	88	50.6
	No	49	28.2
	I am not sure	37	21.3
Type of Device Used for AI Use	Mobile Devices	111	63.8
	Computer Devices	63	36.2

Table 1 provides a demographic distribution of the study. The study examines the demographic data of undergraduate students' perception of the impact of Gen AI on Assignments. The survey was conducted with 174 Bachelor's in Technical Education in Information Technology (B Tech Ed IT) students in Nepal. Based on the data, it shows that there are diverse demographic characteristics across gender (male and female), where 62.6% of respondents are male, whereas 37.4% respondents are female. It shows that there are higher male respondents in the data in comparison with the female percentage. In the dataset, it reflects that respondents are from both rural and urban settings, where 39.7% of respondents are from rural areas, and 60.3% are from urban areas. It shows that respondents from urban areas are seen as higher in the case of their hometown. The demographic data for the academic year shows that the majority of respondents are from the first and second years, with representation across all academic levels. 46.0% are from the first year, and 45.4% are from the second year; the first year has slightly higher than the second year's respondents. In the type of institution demography, from the public (63.2%) institution, the percentage is seen as higher than that of the private (36.8%) institution. Most of the respondents are aware of AI Guidelines, where 55.6% are aware of guidelines, 28.2% are not aware of guidelines, and the remaining 21.3% are not sure about the AI guidelines in the higher education system in Nepal. The majority (N = 111, 63.8%) of students used mobile devices while using generative AI tools/platforms, whereas only 36.2 (N = 63) of students have access to computer devices. This is due to the digital divide, especially the limitation of financial resources that students have to access computer/laptop devices in the Nepalese context. Students in Nepal use mobile devices as their major computing devices or use generative AI tools on the go. Therefore, mobile devices have been widely used to frequently access different generative AI platforms to perform academic tasks.

Table 2 shows the reliability statistics of the perception, ease of use, and factor variables. The reliability test provides the value of Cronbach's Alpha, where the value of the perception variable is 0.789, ease of use is 0.745, and factors are 0.791. This shows that the alpha values are greater than 0.7. Therefore, the items in each construct have a high and required level of internal consistency, indicating a high level of reliability and content validity.

Table 2 Reliability Statistics

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	No. of Items
Perception	0.789	8
Ease of Use	0.745	8
Factors	0.791	7

Table 3 provides the frequency patterns in Gen AI use. In the frequency pattern, there are four different categories: Occasionally (Once a month), Frequently (Once a week), Very frequently (Daily), and Rarely (Less than once a month). It shows that IT students in Nepal use Gen AI very frequently (Daily), which is 63.8%, whereas some students use it frequently (Once a week), which is 29.3%. Therefore, frequency patterns result in students/respondents using AI very frequently. The findings indicate a high level of engagement, with a majority of students reporting daily use.

Table 3 Frequency Patterns in Use of Gen AI

AI Use	Frequency	Percentage
Occasionally (Once a month)	9	5.2
Frequently (Once a week)	51	29.3
Very frequently (Daily)	111	63.8
Rarely (Less than once a month)	3	1.7

In Table 4, the distribution of the use of Gen AI based on hometown. The finding shows that respondents use Gen AI 33.3% occasionally in rural areas, whereas 66.7% in urban areas, 31.4% frequently in rural areas, 68.6% are from urban areas, 42.3% very frequently from rural areas, and 57.7% in urban areas. This shows that the respondents from the urban context are higher than those from the rural context for using Gen AI. Therefore, no respondent from urban contexts rarely uses Gen AI for completing their assignments. This supports the findings from Maggo and Maggo (2025), who found that urban areas are better equipped with modern technology and resources, while rural institutions suffer from teacher shortages and minimal digital access. This inequality is present in the study done by Kim (2025), discussing that rural schools face unique challenges in integrating AI due to infrastructure limitations and funding disparities, often lacking reliable internet and modern devices, making AI-enhanced teaching difficult. AI adoption in K-12 education often exacerbates existing inequities, particularly in underserved and rural schools that face technological and funding limitations, and participants from rural schools specifically emphasized the lack of reliable internet access and modern devices, which hinders their ability to integrate generative AI.

Table 4 Gen AI used based on hometown

AI Use	Rural	Urban
Occasionally (Once a month)	33.3%	66.7%
Frequently (Once a week)	31.4%	68.6%
Very frequently (Daily)	42.3%	57.7%
Rarely (Less than once a month)	100.0%	0.0%

3.2 Perception of Undergraduate Students in Nepal

The descriptive analysis of the undergraduate students on the perception of the impact of Gen AI on assignment results in the dataset's central tendency and variability. The analysis on perception shows minimum and maximum values, mean, and standard deviation scores, presenting an understanding of how B Tech Ed IT students in Nepal perceive Gen AI on assignments. This descriptive measure highlights the average tendency and range of viewpoints expressed by the respondents.

The analysis from Table 5 shows the perception variables, which are predominantly positive toward Gen AI integration in assignments, with the average perception score ranging from 2.88 to 4.75 on the total 5-point Likert scale. The average perception score is 3.81 with SD = 0.44. It represents that on the scale of 1 to 5 (Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree), the respondents stated that Generative AI has a positive impact on the integration in assignment tasks. Therefore, Table 6 analyzes detailed perceptions on the use of Gen AI.

Table 5 Perception on the use of Gen AI

Variable	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Perception	174	2.88	4.75	3.8190	0.44036

Table 6 provides the item-wise usage perception of Gen AI. Based on the perception, the findings show that there is a positive perspective on items. It shows that students strongly agree (M = 4.09) that Gen AI tools significantly improve their learning experiences in IT courses. It

reflects that students perceive AI as a valuable educational support rather than just using it. In the findings, it also shows that AI is a problem-solving tool where students strongly agree (M = 4.09) that AI genuinely helps in completing complex assignments and strongly agree (M = 4.01) that Gen AI helps students to produce quality work, where students see Gen AI as enhancing rather than replacing their efforts.

Table 6 Item-wise perception on the use of Gen AI

Item	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Using Generative AI tools improves the quality of my assignments	1	5	4.01	.688
Using Generative AI tools increases my productivity in completing assignments.	2	5	3.91	0.653
Using Generative AI tools enhances my learning experience in IT courses.	2	5	4.09	0.723
I find Generative AI tools useful for solving complex problems in my assignments.	1	5	4.09	0.744
Using Generative AI tools allows me to complete assignments more quickly.	2	5	3.99	0.713
Integrating Generative AI into my assignments improves my grades.	1	5	3.62	0.870
I feel that Generative AI integration helps me meet assignment deadlines more effectively.	1	5	3.90	0.765
I rely on Generative AI to complete assignments I couldn't do on my own.	1	5	2.94	1.049

From the findings, we can see that students (M = 3.91) acknowledge that Gen AI helps them work efficiently and even complete their assignments quickly, whereas students agree (M = 3.99) that Gen AI is a time saver and helps students to manage their tasks effectively, and agree (M = 3.90) that integrating AI helped students to meet assignment deadlines more effectively. However, there are some areas of concern where students (M = 3.62) are less convinced that integrating AI into assignments improves their grades, and students (M = 2.94) show low agreement with relying on Gen AI to complete assignments, which shows that students don't want to fully depend on Gen AI. In the other cases, the respondents had similar perceptions, with a very small difference in the variance in their responses. For example, students rated 3.91 on average in productivity, but 3.62 in AI, improving the grade. The difference is non-significant, and it concludes that productivity using AI tools and the perceptions on AI to improve learning are similar.

The findings from the analysis of perception are positive, showing the attitude of students towards the complexity of using Gen AI in academic tasks. This results in all students being unfamiliar with using Gen AI. Over-reliance on technology and AI content results in lower perception scores of academic integrity. A study by Johnston et al. (2024) found that 54.1% of students found AI tools to be supportive tools as peers for grammar correction, and 48.5% of students perceived AI as a writing partner in writing essays and citations. As a potential measure of academic integrity, this study shows that students who use different types of Gen AI assistance are supported in academic consideration. Therefore, undergraduate (B Tech Ed IT) students have a mature and positive view of generative AI. Students enhance their benefit for learning and productivity, and are aware of its use in their assignments or academic work.

3.3 Assumptions for the t-Test

To conduct an independent sample T-test analysis, I used different assumptions to ensure the reliability and validity of the statistical procedures. The Shapiro-Wilk test was conducted to assess the normality of the perception variable, and it details whether the data follows a normal distribution or not (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The results from tests follow the normality assumption for the analysis. Also, Lavene's test was conducted for the equality of variance to examine the homogeneity of variance assumption, as a significance value of 0.854 ($p >$ 0.05) results in the assumption of equal variance not being violated. Similarly, the variable had no significant outliers. Therefore, a T-test analysis is conducted and interpreted using the appropriate statistical method, with the significance level at 0.05 for exploring statistical significance. So, the T-test on the comparison of perception based on hometown is detailed in Table 7.

Table 7 Comparison of Perception based on Hometowns

Perception	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Hometown	M	SD
Equal variances assumed	0.034	0.854	3.786	172	< 0.001	Rural	3.97	0.416
Equal variances not assumed			3.812	148.942	< 0.001	Urban	3.72	0.429

Table 7 shows the independent sample t-test to examine the difference in perception based on the hometowns (rural and urban). The perception data were normally distributed through

the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, and there were no potential outliers presented in the data. The respondents from rural hometowns (n = 69, M = 3.97, SD = .416) reported significantly higher perception compared to respondents from urban hometowns (n = 105, M = 3.72, SD = .429), t (149) = 3.812, $p = 0.00 < 0.05$, with Cohen's d = 0.587 showing a moderate effect size. Integrating Gen AI in assignments is significant where geographical background influences the student's integration of Gen AI in assignments, such as the student's hometown. Conventional accounts of the digital divide tend to frame rural learners as disadvantaged, hampered by weaker infrastructure and limited exposure to new technologies (Warschauer, 2003; Park, 2009). These findings complicate that picture. In the age of AI, the expected pattern appears reversed: rural students reported stronger positive perceptions of GenAI than urban students did.

One plausible explanation is a substitution dynamic. Where institutional support is thinner, there are fewer tutoring services, smaller libraries, and less academic scaffolding. GenAI fills a practical gap that urban learners may simply not experience as acutely. Value-Percept Theory supports this reading: a tool's perceived utility rises when it addresses a genuine need rather than adding to an already adequate set of resources. From a UTAUT perspective, performance expectancy becomes a particularly strong adoption driver when the technology offers a direct workaround to environmental constraints (Venkatesh et al., 2003). For rural students, then, GenAI is less an academic convenience than a functional equalizer, one that partly compensates for disparities that geography and institutional access create. Where physical and institutional support is limited, students tend to draw more heavily on digital tools to work around structural disadvantages (Wei et al., 2011). The Technology Acceptance Model offers a useful lens here: perceived usefulness is a primary driver of technology adoption, and when conventional alternatives are scarce, the utility of an accessible digital substitute naturally carries more weight (Davis, 1989). The UTAUT framework extends this logic. For rural students, performance expectancy is not an abstract motivator but a practical one, since GenAI directly addresses gaps that their environment does not otherwise fill (Venkatesh et al., 2003). Taken together, these findings suggest that demographic variables like hometown are not simply background characteristics. They shape the conditions under which educational technologies are encountered, judged, and taken up, and that context matters considerably in resource-constrained settings.

3.4 Factors Influencing Acceptance of Generative AI in Assignments

The students' behavior and attitudes on acceptance of Gen AI in assignments highlight the influencing factors (Kanont et al., 2024). The analysis on influencing factors shows minimum and maximum values, mean, and standard deviation scores, for a comprehensive understanding of how different items influence B Tech Ed IT students' willingness to accept and adopt Gen AI in assignments.

The analysis from Table 8 shows the factors that influence Gen AI on assignments, which is predominantly positive toward Gen AI integration in assignments, with the factor influence ranging from 2.57 to 4.71 on the total 5-point Likert scale. The average influence factor is 3.866 with SD = 0.46. It represents that on the scale of 1-Strongly Disagree to 5-Strongly Agree, the respondents strongly agree that different factors are associated and are influencing the use of generative tools/platforms while doing assignments. The detailed status of each factor is presented below.

Table 8 Perception of Factors Influencing Gen AI

Variable	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Factor	174	2.57	4.71	3.6626	0.46313

Table 9 provides the item-wise factors influencing Gen AI on assignments. Based on the influence factor findings, it shows that there are influencing factors in all items. It shows that students strongly agree ($M = 4.15$) that there should be more qualified educators who can teach students about AI and its applications. In the findings, it also shows that AI is a problem-solving tool where students strongly agree ($M = 3.94$) that students believe in their peers using Gen AI for completing their assignments and strongly agree ($M = 3.75$) that accessing the Gen AI tool is a barrier to them.

From the findings, we can see that students ($M = 3.71$) are worried about the privacy and security of data while using Gen AI tools, whereas students agree ($M = 3.68$) that they have easy access to high-speed internet and latest computing devices for using Generative AI tools and

Table 9 Item-wise Factors Influencing Gen AI on Assignments

Item	Min	Max	Mean	SD
I have easy access to high-speed internet and modern computing devices for using Generative AI tools.	1	5	3.68	0.961
My institution provides adequate training on the use of Generative AI tools effectively	1	5	2.91	0.936
I am concerned about the privacy and security of my data when using Gen AI tools.	1	5	3.71	0.913
I believe that using Gen AI tools might lead to academic dishonesty or plagiarism.	1	5	3.49	1.007
I think there should be more qualified educators who can teach us about AI and its applications.	1	5	4.15	0.812
I believe my peers use Generative AI for assignments as much as I do.	2	5	3.94	0.798
The cost of accessing Generative AI tools (e.g., subscription fees) is a barrier for me.	1	5	3.75	1.060

agree (M = 3.49) that using Generative AI tools might lead to academic dishonesty or plagiarism. However, there are some areas of concern where students (M = 2.91) are less aware of their institution, which provides adequate training on how to effectively use generative AI-based tools. Therefore, all the factors influencing Gen AI on assignments are significant, as they are strong factors to integrate Generative tools and platforms effectively for doing assignments.

Respondents from institutions with training and clear Gen AI usage guidelines show different adoption patterns compared to those who haven't. The finding shows the importance of institutional policy that clearly shapes the students' behavior toward Gen AI adoption. It is found that 41% of students wish for a clear university policy on Gen AI on defining appropriate and inappropriate use, emphasizing educational guidance in directing ethical and practical aspects of Gen AI integration.

The highlighted concern about Gen AI (such as ChatGPT) accuracy and the risk of academic dishonesty, the challenges should be mitigated by highlighting an awareness program and ethical guidelines (Devkota, 2025). The development of digital literacy and critical skills helps us to utilize Gen AI tools effectively.

The analysis from Table 10 shows the ease of use of Gen AI on assignments, which is predominantly positive toward Gen AI integration in assignments, with the perceived ease ranging from 3.13 to 4.50 on the total 5-point Likert scale. The average influence factor is 3.824 with SD = 0.32. It represents that on the scale of 1-Strongly Disagree to 5-Strongly Agree, the respondents strongly agree with the perceived ease of use of Gen AI by students to complete their assignments. The detailed status of each factor is presented below.

Table 10 Perception on Ease of Use of Gen AI

Variable	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Perceived Ease of Use	174	3.13	4.50	3.8247	0.32142

Table 11 provides the item-wise ease of use perception on Gen AI. Based on the ease perceived, findings show that there is ease of use in all items. It shows that students strongly agree (M = 3.97) that they find it easy to learn Generative tools. In the findings, it also shows that students are familiar with using Generative tools, where students strongly agree (M = 3.97). It shows that (M = 3.83) Gen AI tools are flexible to students, which supports them in completing their assignments, and they find it easy to access Gen AI tools whenever they need them for assignments (M = 3.82).

Table 11 Item-wise Perception on Ease of Use on Gen AI

Item	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Learning Generative AI tools is easy for me.	2	5	3.97	0.653
I find Generative AI tools to do what I want them to do.	2	5	3.79	0.484
My interaction with the Generative AI tool is clear and understandable.	2	5	3.78	0.587
Generative AI tools are easy for me to use	3	5	3.97	0.588
It is easy for me to become skillful at using Generative AI tools.	1	5	3.72	0.649
I can quickly learn to integrate Generative AI into new types of assignments.	2	5	3.72	0.563
Generative AI tools are flexible enough to support the variety of assignments I work on.	3	5	3.83	0.631
I find it easy to access Gen AI tools whenever I need them for assignments.	2	5	3.82	0.655
Overall	3.13	4.50	3.8247	0.32142

From the findings we can see that students (M = 3.79) finds Gen AI tools ease to do whatever they want based on academic works whereas students agree (M = 3.78) that they have clear and understandable interaction with Gen AI tools and agrees (M = 3.72) that they can quickly learn

to integrate Gen AI in any kind of assignments and they find it easy to be skilled at using Gen AI tools. The respondent in this study expressed significant concern about the ease of use of Gen AI integration. Baidoo-Anu et al. (2024) identify the various concerns among students who are over-reliant on Gen AI expenses on critical thinking development.

The analysis uses the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), which shows that perceived ease of use is a key determinant of whether individuals adopt a new technology (Davis, 1989). The study shows that the high level of agreement on items related to ease suggests that students find Gen AI tools suitable for academic assignments. Alam et al. (2023) in their study found that students are more likely to integrate Gen AI tools/platforms into their learning when the systems are easy to understand and use. Dwivedi et al. (2023) results show that the accessibility of tools like ChatGPT contributes significantly to widespread acceptance among university students, which highlights the important role that ease of use plays in shaping the acceptance of Gen AI by students in assignments.

3.5 Assumption of the ANOVA Test

To conduct a One-way ANOVA, statistical assumptions were evaluated. The dependent variable across groups was normally distributed according to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Also, the sample design verified the independence of observations. The test is a recommended approach for assessing normality in samples larger than 50 (Ghasemi & Zahediasl, 2012). In addition, there were no significant outliers in the dataset. Therefore, the ANOVA was conducted under moderate assumption violation. So, the One-way ANOVA on perceived ease of use by Gen AI use frequency is detailed in Table 12.

Table 12 One-way ANOVA on Perceived Ease of use by Gen AI use Frequency

Group	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	0.857	3	0.286	2.855	0.039
Within Groups	17.015	170	0.100		
Total	17.872	173			

In Table 12, one-way ANOVA is conducted to explore perceived ease of use on Generative AI usage frequency, where the F-value is 2.855, and the p-value is 0.39. The group difference is significant in the case of the Ease of Use of Generative AI tools in assignments. The Mean Square values were 0.286 for Between Groups and 0.100 for Within Groups. These results suggest that perceived ease of use significantly influences Gen AI use frequency, as the variance observed between the different perceived ease levels is sufficiently greater than the variance observed within each level.

The findings support the ideas of the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) developed by Davis (1989), which identifies the perceived ease of use as a primary factor for adopting technology. TAM justifies that users who find a system that is easy to use are more interested in continuing to use it. Venkatesh and Davis (2000) explored experience and voluntariness as moderators that frequently interact with technology, which leads to higher perceived ease of use, resulting in consistency. An empirical study of Zhang et al. (2004) found that students who use Gen AI regularly to complete tasks have a higher perceived ease of use in comparison with occasional users. Therefore, it results in exposure reducing cognitive load and allowing students to use Gen AI tools more efficiently and confidently over time.

In Table 13, Post Hoc Analysis is conducted between multiple AI use frequencies in the assignment on their ease of use. The test found that students who use Gen AI in assignments very frequently (Daily) are significantly different from other groups. Also, it was found that the level of very frequent groups (M = 3.9, SD = 0.32) is higher than other groups, such as Occasionally (M = 3.6, SD = 0.36), Frequently (M = 3.7, SD = 0.3), and Rarely (M = 3.6, SD = 0.2).

The higher end (M = 3.9) indicates a strong positive perception among many students. Students who use Gen AI very frequently result in higher perception scores, which suggests direct experience with Gen AI tools, which are more advantageous for academic tasks. The research by Sherma (2024) found that undergraduate students in Nepal perceived Gen AI (ChatGPT) for generating ideas, rephrasing, and correcting grammatical errors in their assignments. The research studies in similar areas of Gen AI integration show that students have positive perceptions and experiences towards AI tools and technology, and they accept these technologies as collaborators and co-creators in assessment tasks and research works.

Table 13 Post-Hoc Analysis

(I) AI Use Freq	(J) AI Use Freq	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Occasionally (Once a month)	Frequently (Once a week)	-0.19690	0.11438	0.316
	Very frequently (Daily)	-0.26652	0.10965	0.045*
	Rarely (Less than once a month)	0.01389	0.21091	1.000
Frequently (Once a week)	Occasionally Once a month)	0.19690	0.11438	0.316
	Very frequently (Daily)	-0.06962	0.05352	0.034*
	Rarely (Less than once a month)	0.21078	0.18795	0.677
Very frequently (Daily)	Occasionally (Once a month)	0.26652	0.10965	0.045*
	Frequently (Once a week)	0.06962	0.05352	0.044*
	Rarely (Less than once a month)	0.28041	0.18511	0.041*
Rarely (Less than once a month)	Occasionally (Once a month)	-0.01389	0.21091	1.000
	Frequently (Once a week)	-0.21078	0.18795	0.477
	Very frequently (Daily)	-0.28041	0.18511	0.041*

4 Discussion

This study provided some significant and valuable insights into generative AI adoption in assessment tasks in the context of higher education in Nepal and beyond. Though the research is valuable for similar educational contexts, involving students, assignments, and assessment in education. The findings from the study illustrate that the perception of the use of Gen AI in assignment tasks balances appreciation in the use of Gen AI with awareness of limitations that contribute to the emerging literature on AI integration in the higher education context. The demographic analysis of the study shows that undergraduate (B Tech Ed IT) students in Nepal have a positive attitude toward generative AI, which is beneficial for completing assignments and supporting assignment tasks. The item-wise perception analysis shows that students strongly agree regarding the ease of use of Gen AI for assignments, which reflects that technological barriers may be less significant for students with 21st-century digital skills. However, students also underlined their concerns about the academic integrity and content quality of Gen AI. The findings from the study are relevant to Nepal's traditional pedagogical approach, which may not prepare undergraduate students for the critical assessment of content generated from artificial intelligence (AI).

This study adopts the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) theory, which provides a theoretical understanding of acceptance and adoption factors. Perceived ease of use and accurate usage pattern both support the established TAM principles and have a strong correlation between them, which provides specific insight into the Nepali educational context. In the adoption of Gen AI in assignments, perceived ease of use is seen as an emerging factor that influences students. The inferential test from One-way ANOVA shows that students who use AI very frequently have significantly higher perceived ease of use than other groups, which shows that positive experiences lead to increased use of Gen AI by students and enhance the perceived ease of use. The result from the independent T-test based on hometown represents findings with educational policy implications, where the geographic background of students significantly influences perception toward Gen AI integration in assignments. This shows that technology includes social and cultural factors, shaping technology perception and adoption. The urban and rural differences in educational settings are significant, and the findings from the study are relevant in Nepal's context. Students from various geographic backgrounds have different technology exposure levels and various educational experiences that shape their perception of Gen AI.

In the context of mobile learning and enhancing the learning of students through mobile learning, this research has a significant contribution, as most of the students were found to be using mobile devices to use generative AI mobile applications for learning purposes. The research focuses on the perceptions of students in using generative AI in assignments, also highlighting the importance of mobile learning environments, where mobile applications are accessible, easy to use, and enhance performance expectancy. Due to quick accessibility, ease of use, and quick services on mobile internet data and wireless on mobile devices, mobile learning has been essential as well as effective for students for learning through AI on mobile devices. Vankúš (2024) explored the use of AI on mobile devices to improve the preparation of future mathematics teachers, acknowledging the necessity for teachers to be skilled in using AI tools for ethical learning environments. The author further discussed by illustrating cases that

analyzed students' opinions on the application of generative AI, particularly focusing on its use in solving tasks, demonstrating concepts, and generating tests for evaluating student knowledge in mathematics. A study by Ganguly et al. (2025) on exploration of access to AI in mobile mentorship implemented a bring your own device (BYOD) model with AI to generate learning content and address diverse educational needs like intelligent tutoring systems, custom learning experiences, and content creation. The study suggested that generative AI can improve the mobile learning experience and refashion the future of education through content customization for individual learners. Mobile learning has been a go-to technology for students' learning, where students can get any kind of information online using generative AI applications on their mobile devices. Mobile learning accessibility has been providing students with such platforms to complete their assignments. In the case of the study as well, students responded that the mobile application for AI use is higher than the other physical devices.

Geographical background shapes how students adopt generative AI, and not in the direction most people assume. Rural students report higher perceived utility for these tools, not because they're more tech-enthusiastic, but because they're working around real shortages: no specialized tutors, thin institutional support, limited academic resources. Generative AI fills those gaps. Technology acceptance research would call this a substitution effect, and the data fit. In well-resourced settings, these tools are useful. In under-resourced ones, they're load-bearing.

This study is limited only to a single faculty student population and a survey research design. Future research may explore perception across different academic fields, not only in IT, and conduct longitudinal studies on perception evolution over time. However, the outcome from this study is associated with Gen AI use, which would provide important insights into educational effectiveness. This research study is important evidence on the adoption of Gen AI at the undergraduate level. The study found that the integration of Gen AI in assignments successfully requires a student's consideration of perception, demographic factors, and support from the institution. In the present context, educational organizations should address both opportunities and challenges, ensuring ethical integration while technologies like Gen AI are emerging. The study highlights the importance of integrating Gen AI in developing countries like Nepal by providing a foundation for Gen AI in the educational environment. Educational institutions can prepare students for Gen AI integration in the future, maintaining both the integrity and quality of higher education by addressing the challenges and influencing factors on the perception of integrating Gen AI in assignments.

The results from the study are important for educational institutions (universities, colleges) in Nepal. The perception of Gen AI across the demographic variables implies that there should be training and support programs to benefit from Gen AI. The identified factor from the study on the adoption of Gen AI in academic tasks helps to guide the development of institutional development, curriculum development, and faculty development programs. By implementing Gen AI in institutions, it can boost the strategies to address technical and pedagogical challenges. Therefore, developing a framework by institutions will help the benefit of Gen AI integration by maintaining academic standards and critical thinking skills.

Informed Consent Statement

Informed consent was obtained from all subjects included in the study.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

References

Acharya, A., Subedi, S., Gyawali, N., Poudyal, N., Lamichhane, G., Bastola, G., Aryal, B., Bhattarai, B. R., Adhikari, B., Marahatha, R., Bhatta, M., Paudel, M., & Parajuli, N. (2021). Digital learning Initiatives, Challenges and Achievement in Higher Education in Nepal Amidst COVID-19. International Journal of Asian Education, 2(3). https://doi.org/10.46966/ijae.v2i3.224

Alam, T., Supti, T., Alzubaidi, M., Shah, H., Shah, Z., & Househ, M. (2023). The pros and cons of using ChatGPT in medical education: A scoping review. Studies in Health Technology and Informatics, 302, 1149–1156.

https://doi.org/10.3233/SHTI230347

Baidoo-Anu, D., Asamoah, D., Amoako, I., & Mahama, I. (2024). Exploring student perspectives on generative artificial intelligence in higher education learning. Discover Education, 3(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-024-00173-z

Barakat, M., Salim, N. A., & Sallam, M. (2024). Perspectives of University Educators Regarding ChatGPT: A Validation Study Based on the Technology Acceptance Model. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-3919524/v1

Chan, C. K. Y., & Hu, W. (2023). Students' voices on generative AI: perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 20(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8

Charan, A., Sant, R. K., & Dutt, A. (2024). Technology adoption in higher education and challenges for South Asian students in digital learning environment. Tec Empresarial, 19(1), 1411-1420. doi: 10.18845/te.v18i1.157

Choi, K. Y., Wu, C., & Moorhouse, B. L. (2025). Exploring the use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) in English language teaching: Voices from in-service teachers at an early-adopting Hong Kong secondary school. Technology in Language Teaching &Amp; Learning, 7(3), 102516. https://doi.org/10.29140/tltl.v7n3.102516

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). Research methods in education (8th ed.). Routledge. ISBN: 978-1-138-50428-5

Crisol-Moya, E., Romero-López, M. A., & Caurcel-Cara, M. J. (2020). Active Methodologies in Higher Education: Perception and Opinion as Evaluated by Professors and Their Students in the Teaching-Learning Process. Frontiers in Psychology, 11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01703

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

DeVellis, R. F. (2017). Scale development: Theory and applications (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Devkota, M. (2025). Unveiling Nepali Students' Lived Experiences of ChatGPT in Secondary School Education: Opportunities and Challenges. Madhyabindu Journal, 10(1), 110–127. https://doi.org/10.3126/madhyabindu.v10i1.75619

Drolia, M., Papadakis, S., Sifaki, E., & Kalogiannakis, M. (2022). Mobile Learning Applications for Refugees: A Systematic Literature Review. Education Sciences, 12(2), 96. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12020096

Dwivedi, Y. K., Kshetri, N., Hughes, L., Slade, E. L., Jeyaraj, A., Kar, A. K., ... & Wright, R. (2023). So what if ChatGPT wrote it? Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges, and implications of generative conversational AI for research, practice, and policy. International Journal of Information Management, 71, 102642. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642

ElSayary, A. (2024). Integrating Generative AI in Active Learning Environments: Enhancing Metacognition and Technological Skills. Journal of Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics, 22(3), 34–37. https://doi.org/10.54808/jsci.22.03.34

Fowler, F. J. (2014). Survey research methods (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Ganguly, R., Kesavalalji, R., Babu Gummadi, H. S., Chennupati, N., Sseshagani, S., & Garine, G. (2025). Exploration of Access to AI in Mobile Mentorship: A Use Case of Bring Your Own Device (BYOD). 2025 IEEE World AI IoT Congress (AIIoT), 0529–0535. https://doi.org/10.1109/aiiot65859.2025.11105350

Gautam, T. P., & Mishra, A. K. (2025). Technology integration efficacy (TIE) in ICT and AI adoption: A case study. Journal of Advanced Research in Electronics Engineering and Technology, 12(1), 45-60.

Georgiev, T., & Georgieva, E. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in Mobile Learning: Applications, Benefits, and Challenges. Intelligent and Fuzzy Systems, 113–123. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-98565-2_14

Ghasemi, A., & Zahediasl, S. (2012). Normality Tests for Statistical Analysis: A Guide for Non-Statisticians. International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism, 10(2), 486–489. https://doi.org/10.5812/ijem.3505

Johnston, H., Wells, R. F., Shanks, E. M., Boey, T., & Parsons, B. N. (2024). Student perspectives on the use of generative artificial intelligence technologies in higher education. International Journal for Educational Integrity, 20(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-024-00149-4

Joshi, B. M., Acharya, U., & Khatiwada, S. P. (2024). Policy versus reality: Challenges of implementing ICT in higher education in Nepal. Pragyaratna, 6(2), 226–234. https://doi.org/10.3126/pragyaratna.v6i2.71003

Kanont, K., Pingmuang, P., Simasathien, T., Wisnuwong, S., Wiwatsiripong, B., Poonpirome, K., Songkram, N., & Khlaisang, J. (2024). Generative-AI, a Learning Assistant? Factors Influencing Higher-Ed Students' Technology Acceptance. Electronic Journal of E-Learning, 22(6), 18–33. https://doi.org/10.34190/ejel.22.6.3196

Khatri, B. B., & Karki, P. D. (2023). Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Higher Education: Growing Academic Integrity and Ethical Concerns. Nepalese Journal of Development and Rural Studies, 20(01), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.3126/njdrs.v20i01.64134

Kim, J. (2025). Perceptions and preparedness of K-12 educators in adopting generative AI. Research in Learning Technology, 33.
https://doi.org/10.25304/rlt.v33.3448

Lavidas, K., Petropoulou, A., Papadakis, S., Apostolou, Z., Komis, V., Jimoyiannis, A., & Gialamas, V. (2022). Factors Affecting Response Rates of the Web Survey with Teachers. Computers, 11(9), 127.
https://doi.org/10.3390/computers11090127

Lawaju, P., Adhikari, S. U., & Devkota, J. (2024). Impact of AI in Education: An Evidence from Use of ChatGPT in Management Education in Nepal. Quest Journal of Management and Social Sciences, 6(3), 621–642.
https://doi.org/10.3126/qjmss.v6i3.72875

Li, Z., Zhang, X., Zhao, C., Zhu, C., & Hu, C. (2023). Generative AI in higher education academic assignments: Perceptions, applications, and ethical considerations. Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 26(4), 132-146.

Maggo, J., & Maggo, T. (2025). Disparities in Educational Opportunities Between Urban and Rural Regions Across the Globe and the Potential of AI to Bridge the Divide. International Journal of Business Analytics and Intelligence, 13(1), 44–54.
https://doi.org/10.21863/ijbai/2025.13.1.005

Moon, J., & Kim, S. B. (2025). Development of a Generative AI Acceptance Model Framework for Teachers. Journal of Digital Contents Society, 26(3), 777–785.
https://doi.org/10.9728/dcs.2025.26.3.777

Park, S. J. (2009). Digital inequalities: From digital divide to digital heterogeneities. The Sociological Quarterly, 50(1), 117–142.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.2009.01136.x

Samala, A. D., Papadakis, S., & Rawas, S. (2025). Global Insights into Mobile Learning in Higher Education: A PRISMA-Guided Bibliometric Analysis from 2007 to 2023. International Journal of Educational Reform.
https://doi.org/10.1177/10567879251341869

Sherma, A. B. (2024). ChatGPT's Impact on Students' Writing: Lessons Learned from Nepali Undergraduate Students. Journal of NELTA, 29(1), 83–96.
https://doi.org/10.3126/nelta.v29i1.72636

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). Experimental design using ANOVA. Duxbury/Thomson/Brooks/Cole.

Tan, S. C., Chen, W., & Chua, B. L. (2023). Leveraging generative artificial intelligence based on large language models for collaborative learning. Learning: Research and Practice, 9(2), 125-134.
https://doi.org/10.1080/23735082.2023.2258895

Traxler, J. M. (2017). Learning with Mobiles in Developing Countries. International Journal of Mobile and Blended Learning, 9(2), 1–15.
https://doi.org/10.4018/ijmbl.2017040101

Vankúš, P. (2024). Generative Artificial Intelligence on Mobile Devices in the University Preparation of Future Teachers of Mathematics. International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies (iJIM), 18(18), 19–33.
https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v18i18.51221

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

Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User Acceptance of Information Technology: Toward A Unified View1. MIS Quarterly, 27(3), 425–478.
https://doi.org/10.2307/30036540

Wallace, T. L., Kelcey, B., & Ruzek, E. (2016). What can student perception surveys tell us about teaching? Empirically testing the underlying structure of the tripod student perception survey. American Educational Research Journal, 53(6), 1834-1868.
https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216671864

Warschauer, M. (2003). Technology and Social Inclusion.
https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/6699.001.0001

Wei, K.-K., Teo, H.-H., Chan, H. C., & Tan, B. C. Y. (2011). Conceptualizing and Testing a Social Cognitive Model of the Digital Divide. Information Systems Research, 22(1), 170–187.
https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.1090.0273

West, D. M. (2012). Digital schools: How technology can transform education. Brookings Institution Press.

Yamane, T. (1967). Statistics: An introductory analysis (2nd ed.). Harper and Row.

Zacharis, G., & Papadakis, S. (2025). Can AI Grade Like a Human? Validity, Reliability, and Fairness in University Coursework Assessment. Educational Process International Journal, 19(1).
https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2025.19.591

Zhang, D., Zhao, J. L., Zhou, L., & Nunamaker, J. F. (2004). Can e-learning replace classroom learning? Communications of the ACM, 47(5), 75–79.
https://doi.org/10.1145/986213.986216