Journal of Informatics Education and Research
ISSN: 1526-4726
Vol 5 Issue 4 (2025)

Digital Transformation in Higher Education: Evaluating the Impact of AI-Enabled Learning Systems

Dr. Vijay Dhole,

Principal, R.B.Mundada College of Arts, Commerce & Science, Pune.

Dr. Sanjay Dharmadhikari,

Director, Institute of Business Management and Rural Development, Ahilyanagar

Dr. Ganesh Antre,

Institute of Business Management and Rural Development, Ahilyanagar

Abstract

The rapid integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into the educational framework has catalyzed a paradigm shift in global higher education. This research paper evaluates this transformation within the specific context of Pune City, Maharashtra, focusing on the period from 2000 to 2022. The study investigates the dichotomy between the theoretical promise of AI for personalized learning and the practical realities of implementation, specifically assessing faculty readiness and the prevalence of Technostress. Using a quantitative methodology, the research analyzes data from 347 faculty members across diverse Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Pune. The study employs the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) and Technostress frameworks. Statistical analysis reveals a significant positive correlation between Performance Expectancy and Behavioral Intention, indicating that faculty recognize the utility of AI. However, the study also confirms high levels of Technostress, driven by "techno-invasion" and "techno-complexity." The findings suggest that while motivation to adopt AI exists, it is hampered by infrastructural gaps and psychological strain. The report concludes with strategic implications for administrators to balance technological acquisition with human capital development.

Keywords: Digital Transformation, Artificial Intelligence, Higher Education, Pune, Technostress, UTAUT, Faculty Perception.

Introduction

The narrative of higher education in India has shifted dramatically over the last two decades, transitioning from traditional pedagogical methods to a highly digitized ecosystem. This shift is not merely a change in the medium of instruction but represents a fundamental restructuring of the academic workplace. Pune City, often celebrated as the "Oxford of the East," stands at the forefront of this transformation in Maharashtra. Home to a unique convergence of legacy educational institutions and a thriving IT sector, Pune offers a compelling case study to examine the friction and synergy between education and technology. The period from 2000 to 2022 encapsulates this journey, tracing the evolution from basic ICT usage to the deployment of sophisticated AI-enabled learning systems.

The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 has codified this digital vision, explicitly mandating the integration of "disruptive technologies" like Artificial Intelligence into educational management and pedagogy. However, policy documents often present an idealized view of transformation. The ground reality for faculty members in Pune is far more complex. The COVID-19 pandemic acted as a massive stress test, forcing a "digital migration" that required educators to master Learning Management Systems (LMS), automated grading tools, and predictive analytics dashboards overnight. This sudden shift exposed the fragility of the existing infrastructure and the lack of preparedness among the teaching staff.

This research paper aims to critically evaluate this impact. "AI-enabled learning systems" are defined here as a suite of technologies that use algorithmic intelligence to support educational processes, including intelligent tutoring systems, automated assessment tools, and administrative chatbots. While these tools promise to democratize access and personalize learning, they also introduce the risk of "Technostress"—a modern psychological malady where individuals feel unable to cope with the demands of new technologies. By focusing on the faculty perspective, this report seeks to answer whether the digital transformation in Pune is empowering educators or merely overwhelming them. It argues that for digital transformation to be successful, it must be human-centered, prioritizing the well-being and capability building of the faculty who are its primary agents.

Literature Review

Raman and Don (2013) provided foundational work on the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) within educational settings, specifically examining pre-service teachers' acceptance of Learning Management Systems (LMS). Their research highlighted that while "Performance Expectancy" (the belief that technology will help in job performance) is a strong driver of behavioral intention, "Facilitating Conditions" (technical support and infrastructure) are often the deciding factor for actual usage. This is particularly relevant to the Indian context, where infrastructural disparity is high. They argued that without robust institutional support, even the most enthusiastic faculty members eventually disengage from new technologies. Their findings emphasized that the mere introduction of software like Moodle is insufficient; it must be accompanied by a supportive ecosystem that reduces the effort required to use it.

Jena (2015) conducted a seminal empirical study on the impact of "Technostress" on job satisfaction among Indian academicians. Using a sample from various universities, Jena’s research identified specific stressors such as "Techno-overload," where technology forces individuals to work faster and longer, and "Techno-invasion," where work invades personal life. His findings suggested that these stressors have a significant negative correlation with job satisfaction, implying that the digital upgrade of Indian universities was coming at a high psychological cost to the faculty. The study was instrumental in proving that the "always-on" culture promoted by ICT tools was detrimental to the well-being of educators, leading to burnout and reduced commitment to the institution.

Zawacki-Richter et al. (2019) performed a systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education, analyzing publications from 2007 to 2018. Their comprehensive analysis revealed a critical gap in the literature: the vast majority of AI in Education (AIEd) research focused on student outcomes, profiling, and adaptive learning algorithms, while the perspective of the educator was largely marginalized. They argued that this oversight is dangerous, as it treats teachers as passive users or mere facilitators of the machine's logic rather than active partners in the educational process. They called for a more ethical and critical approach to AIEd that considers the role of the teacher and the pedagogical implications of algorithmic decision-making.

Kumar and Nanda (2019) explored the integration of social media tools in higher education institutions as a framework for continuous engagement. While their study highlighted the benefits of platforms like Facebook and WhatsApp for student-teacher interaction and collaborative learning, they also uncovered the darker side of this connectivity. They found that the use of informal social media for formal educational purposes contributed significantly to "Techno-invasion," where professional obligations bleed into personal time. Faculty members reported feeling pressured to be available 24/7 to respond to student queries, blurring the lines between work and life and contributing to a sense of fatigue.

Chen et al. (2020) provided a comprehensive review of Artificial Intelligence in Education, categorized by application types such as learner-facing, teacher-facing, and system-facing tools. Their review noted that while learner-facing tools like intelligent tutoring systems are popular and well-researched, teacher-facing tools such as automated grading systems often face resistance due to a lack of transparency and trust. They emphasized the "black box" problem, where educators do not understand how an AI system arrives at a grade or a recommendation. They argued that for AI to be accepted in the classroom, the nature of these algorithms needs to be demystified for educators to build trust in the technology.

Chatterjee and Bhattacharjee (2020) conducted a quantitative analysis on the adoption of AI in higher education in India using structural equation modeling. Their findings reinforced the UTAUT model in the Indian context, showing that "Performance Expectancy" was the strongest predictor of behavioral intention. However, a significant finding was the role of "Perceived Risk." They noted that faculty are wary of the potential negative consequences of AI, such as job displacement, loss of autonomy, or data privacy breaches. Their study suggested that policy-makers need to address these risk perceptions through clear regulations and ethical guidelines to accelerate the acceptance of AI in Indian universities.

Mishra et al. (2020) documented the immediate impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on online teaching and learning in Indian higher education. Their study provided a snapshot of the "emergency remote teaching" phase, highlighting that while digital platforms ensured continuity, they also exposed severe gaps in digital literacy and infrastructure. Faculty members in regions like Maharashtra reported high levels of anxiety due to the sudden demand to master complex digital tools without adequate training. The study concluded that the transition was less of a pedagogical innovation and more of a crisis management response, often lacking the interactive and engagement elements of true online learning.

Bozkurt and Sharma (2020) offered a global perspective on the "emergency remote teaching" phenomenon, which is highly relevant to the Indian context. They argued that what occurred in 2020 should not be conflated with well-designed online learning or digital transformation. They described it as a temporary shift of instructional delivery to an alternate delivery mode due to crisis circumstances. They cautioned that the stress and negative experiences associated with this chaotic period could lead to long-term resistance against digital tools among faculty if not managed carefully, distinguishing between "emergency remote teaching" and planned "online education."

Pokhrel and Chhetri (2021) reviewed the literature on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on teaching and learning, with a specific focus on the digital divide. Their review highlighted that students and faculty in resource-constrained colleges faced significantly higher hurdles compared to their counterparts in elite institutions. They argued that the digital transformation has exacerbated existing inequalities, creating a two-tier education system. They emphasized that any policy on digital transformation, including the adoption of AI, must address these equity issues to prevent the marginalization of students and faculty in rural or under-funded institutions.

Gopal et al. (2021) investigated the impact of online classes on student satisfaction and performance during the pandemic in India. While their primary focus was on students, their findings regarding "Quality of Instructor" have direct implications for faculty. The study found that student satisfaction was heavily dependent on the instructor's ability to facilitate online learning effectively. This places immense pressure on faculty to not only be content experts but also technical troubleshooters and digital pedagogues. The study implies that without proper training for faculty, student satisfaction drops, creating a stressful feedback loop for educators.

Upadhyaya and Vrinda (2021) investigated the impact of technostress on academic productivity among university students and faculty in India. Their study found a paradoxical relationship: while technology is meant to enhance productivity, the stress associated with learning and maintaining these technologies often leads to a dip in performance. They termed this the "productivity paradox." They found that factors like techno-complexity and techno-overload were significant predictors of reduced productivity. This is a crucial concept for understanding the faculty experience in Pune, where the pressure to adopt new tools often outpaces the capacity to master them.

Bisen et al. (2021) focused on machine learning approaches for improvising modern learning systems. Their technical review highlighted the capabilities of current AI systems to predict student performance, identify at-risk learners, and personalize content. However, they noted that the practical implementation of these systems in Indian classrooms is often hindered by a lack of clean, digitized data and the requisite technical infrastructure. They argued that for AI to be effective, institutions first need to invest in data management systems and digital record-keeping, moving beyond basic digitization to true digital transformation.

Haleem et al. (2022) conducted a comprehensive review of the role of digital technologies in education. They posited that AI and machine learning have the potential to revolutionize education by providing personalized learning experiences and automating administrative tasks. However, they also warned that the "human element" remains irreplaceable. They argued that technology should be viewed as an augmentation of the teacher's role rather than a replacement. They suggested that the most effective use of AI is to handle routine tasks, freeing up faculty time for high-value activities like mentorship and research, provided the transition is managed well.

Bhutoria (2022) presented a systematic review comparing personalized education and AI in the US, China, and India using a Human-In-The-Loop model. Her analysis revealed that while India has high policy ambition regarding AI in education, as seen in the NEP 2020, it lags behind in "AI readiness" at the institutional level compared to its global peers. She identified a lack of data infrastructure and a shortage of skilled personnel as primary bottlenecks. She argued that India needs to focus on building "AI literacy" among its educators to bridge the gap between policy vision and ground reality.

Singh and Hiran (2022) examined the impact of AI on teaching and learning in higher education technology. Their review concluded that while AI offers immense potential for efficiency, such as automated grading and smart content, it also raises ethical concerns regarding data privacy and algorithmic bias. They argued that the rapid adoption of these tools often overlooks the ethical implications. They suggested that faculty need to be educated not just on how to use these tools, but on the ethical implications of their use, ensuring that AI is used to enhance equity rather than reinforce bias.

Schiff (2022) discussed the role of education and ethics in national AI policy strategies, distinguishing between "AI for Education" and "Education for AI." He argued that most policies, including those in developing nations, focus too heavily on the deployment of tools (AI for Education) and not enough on the ethical and literacy aspects (Education for AI). He suggested that a sustainable digital transformation requires a faculty workforce that is AI-literate and capable of critically evaluating the tools they use. He warned that a tech-first approach that ignores the sociological dimensions of education is likely to fail.

Chaudhry and Kazim (2022) provided a high-level academic and industry note on AI in Education. They emphasized that the future of AIEd lies in "Human-in-the-loop" systems, where AI supports human decision-making rather than automating it entirely. This perspective is vital for alleviating faculty fears regarding job replacement. They argued that the narrative needs to shift from "AI vs. Teacher" to "AI + Teacher." They highlighted that the successful integration of AI requires a collaborative approach where developers work closely with educators to create tools that solve actual pedagogical problems rather than perceived ones.

Objectives

1. To analyze the relationship between Faculty Performance Expectancy of AI tools and their Behavioral Intention to adopt these systems in the classroom.
2. To assess the prevailing level of Technostress among higher education faculty members in Pune and determine if it significantly exceeds a neutral threshold.

Hypotheses

H1: There is a significant positive correlation between Faculty Performance Expectancy and their Behavioral Intention to adopt AI-enabled learning systems.

H2: The level of Technostress perceived by faculty members is significantly higher than the neutral test value (Test Value = 3 on a 5-point scale).

Research Methodology

The present study utilizes a descriptive, quantitative research methodology to evaluate the impact of AI-enabled learning systems on faculty members. The geographical scope is confined to Pune City, Maharashtra, a major educational hub in India. The population for the study consists of full-time faculty members (Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors) employed in UGC-recognized universities and affiliated colleges. Faculty members were selected as the sole class of respondents because they are the primary executioners of digital pedagogy. Their acceptance or resistance is the single most critical variable in the success of any educational technology initiative; if the faculty are not on board, the technology remains underutilized regardless of its sophistication.

A sample of 347 respondents was selected using a stratified random sampling technique. The population was first stratified based on the type of institution (Private Universities, Deemed Universities, and Affiliated Colleges) to ensure a representative mix of resource-rich and resource-constrained environments. This stratification was essential to capture the diverse organizational realities of Pune's educational landscape. Within these strata, respondents were selected randomly. The respondents were contacted primarily through digital means, leveraging official institutional email directories and professional academic networks such as LinkedIn and faculty WhatsApp groups. This digital contact method was chosen due to the lingering hybrid work models in early 2022 and to ensure a broad geographic reach across the city without the logistical constraints of physical site visits.

The data collection instrument was a structured questionnaire designed on Google Forms. It utilized a 5-point Likert scale (1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree) to measure constructs adapted from the UTAUT model (Performance

Journal of Informatics Education and Research
ISSN: 1526-4726
Vol 5 Issue 4 (2025)

Expectancy, Behavioral Intention) and the Technostress Creators Inventory (Overload, Invasion, Complexity). The data collected was analyzed using SPSS, employing frequency distribution for demographic profiling and item-wise analysis, Pearson's Correlation for testing relationships, and One-Sample t-tests for comparing means against a neutral baseline.

Data Analysis

Table 1: Demographic Profile - Gender

Particulars	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Male	188	54.18%	54.18%
Female	159	45.82%	100.00%
Total	**347**	**100.00%**	

Table 1 illustrates the gender distribution of the 347 respondents. The data shows a fairly balanced representation, with males constituting 54.18% (188 respondents) and females comprising 45.82% (159 respondents). This balance is crucial for the study as it ensures that the findings regarding Technostress and AI adoption are not skewed by gender-specific perceptions, which has been a variable of interest in previous studies. The cumulative percentage reaches 100% with the inclusion of the female category, confirming that there are no missing values in this demographic variable.

Table 2: Demographic Profile - Age Group

Particulars	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
25-35 Years	112	32.28%	32.28%
36-45 Years	145	41.79%	74.06%
46-55 Years	68	19.60%	93.66%
Above 55 Years	22	6.34%	100.00%
Total	**347**	**100.00%**	

Table 2 presents the age distribution of the faculty members. The largest group falls within the 36-45 years category, accounting for 41.79% of the sample, followed by the 25-35 years group at 32.28%. This indicates that the majority of the respondents (over 74%) are in the early-to-mid stages of their careers. This demographic is particularly significant for the study because this cohort is generally expected to be more tech-savvy than their older counterparts, yet they also face the highest pressure for research output and administrative compliance. The smaller representation of the 'Above 55' category (6.34%) reflects the retirement patterns in academia.

Table 3: Demographic Profile - Academic Designation

Particulars	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Assistant Professor	195	56.20%	56.20%
Associate Professor	102	29.39%	85.59%
Professor	50	14.41%	100.00%
Total	**347**	**100.00%**	

Table 3 details the academic designation of the respondents. The data reveals that the largest segment, comprising 56.20% (195 respondents), consists of Assistant Professors. This is consistent with the pyramidal structure of academic institutions where entry-level and mid-level faculty form the base. Associate Professors make up 29.39%, while Professors constitute 14.41%. This distribution ensures that the study captures the perspectives of the primary workforce who are most likely to be tasked with implementing new digital tools in the classroom and for administrative duties.

Table 4: "AI tools improve the quality of my teaching." (Performance Expectancy)

Particulars	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Disagree	12	3.46%	3.46%
Disagree	24	6.92%	10.37%
Neutral	45	12.97%	23.34%
Agree	189	54.47%	77.81%
Strongly Agree	77	22.19%	100.00%
Total	**347**	**100.00%**	

Table 4 analyzes the faculty's perception of the pedagogical value of AI tools. A significant majority, combining "Agree" (54.47%) and "Strongly Agree" (22.19%), indicates that 76.66% of respondents perceive AI tools as capable of improving the quality of their teaching. Only a small fraction (approx. 10%) expressed disagreement. This high positive response suggests that the fundamental value proposition of AI—that it aids in professional tasks—is well-accepted by the faculty in Pune. This aligns with the Performance Expectancy construct of the UTAUT model, suggesting that utility is a strong driver.

Table 5: "AI helps me automate grading and administrative tasks." (Performance Expectancy)

Particulars	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Disagree	15	4.32%	4.32%
Disagree	30	8.65%	12.97%
Neutral	52	14.99%	27.95%
Agree	150	43.23%	71.18%
Strongly Agree	100	28.82%	100.00%
Total	**347**	**100.00%**	

Table 5 focuses on the administrative utility of AI. Here, 72.05% of respondents (Agree + Strongly Agree) believe that AI tools help automate grading and administrative tasks. The "Strongly Agree" category is notably high at 28.82%, higher than for teaching quality. This indicates that the most immediate and appreciated value of AI for Pune's faculty is its ability to reduce the burden of administrative work and grading, which are often cited as major pain points in the Indian higher education system.

Table 6: "Using AI increases my productivity." (Performance Expectancy)

Particulars	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Disagree	10	2.88%	2.88%
Disagree	35	10.09%	12.97%
Neutral	68	19.60%	32.56%
Agree	165	47.55%	80.12%
Strongly Agree	69	19.88%	100.00%
Total	**347**	**100.00%**	

Table 6 assesses the overall impact on productivity. While the majority (67.43%) still agree that AI increases productivity, there is a higher percentage of "Neutral" responses (19.60%) compared to the previous tables. This might suggest that while some faculty are using advanced AI tools effectively, a significant portion may be experiencing the "productivity paradox" mentioned in the literature, where the learning curve temporarily hampers efficiency, leaving them undecided about its net productivity benefit.

Table 7: "My interaction with AI tools is clear and understandable." (Effort Expectancy)

Particulars	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Disagree	38	10.95%	10.95%
Disagree	92	26.51%	37.46%
Neutral	105	30.26%	67.72%
Agree	82	23.63%	91.35%
Strongly Agree	30	8.65%	100.00%
Total	**347**	**100.00%**	

Table 7 reveals significant issues with usability. Only 32.28% of respondents agree or strongly agree that their interaction with AI is clear. A significant portion (30.26%) is neutral, and over 37% disagree. This "usability gap" highlights that while faculty value the output of AI (Performance Expectancy), they struggle with the input process (Effort Expectancy). This suggests that the user interfaces of current academic AI tools are not intuitive enough for the average faculty member.

Table 8: "I find it easy to become skillful at using AI tools." (Effort Expectancy)

Particulars	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Disagree	45	12.97%	12.97%
Disagree	89	25.65%	38.62%
Neutral	95	27.38%	66.00%
Agree	88	25.36%	91.36%
Strongly Agree	30	8.65%	100.00%
Total	**347**	**100.00%**	

Table 8 corroborates the findings of Table 7. Only about 34% feel it is easy to become skillful at using these tools. The high disagreement (38.62%) suggests a steep learning curve. This points to a lack of intuitive design in the tools being procured by these institutions or a lack of adequate training to bridge the skill gap. Faculty feel that acquiring the necessary skills requires more effort than they can easily afford.

Table 9: "I have the necessary resources (hardware/software) to use AI." (Facilitating Conditions)

Particulars	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Disagree	25	7.20%	7.20%
Disagree	60	17.29%	24.50%
Neutral	55	15.85%	40.35%
Agree	140	40.35%	80.69%
Strongly Agree	67	19.31%	100.00%
Total	**347**	**100.00%**	

Table 9 shows a moderate level of satisfaction with physical resources, with roughly 60% agreeing they have the necessary hardware and software. This is likely a result of infrastructure upgrades during the pandemic. However, nearly 25% still disagree, pointing to persistent pockets of digital inequality within the city's colleges. It suggests that while some institutions are well-equipped, others still lack the basic digital infrastructure required for AI adoption.

Table 10: "I intend to use AI tools in my future classes." (Behavioral Intention)

Particulars	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Disagree	8	2.31%	2.31%
Disagree	18	5.19%	7.49%

Neutral	40	11.53%	19.02%
Agree	175	50.43%	69.45%
Strongly Agree	106	30.55%	100.00%
Total	**347**	**100.00%**	

Table 10 measures the core dependent variable: Behavioral Intention. An overwhelming 80.98% of respondents express an intention to use AI in the future. The "Strongly Agree" count (106) is the highest in this category. This confirms that despite challenges with usability and resources, the faculty's mindset is future-oriented. They accept that AI is the way forward and are mentally prepared to integrate it into their professional practice.

Table 11: "I plan to use AI frequently for student assessment." (Behavioral Intention)

Particulars	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Disagree	22	6.34%	6.34%
Disagree	48	13.83%	20.17%
Neutral	65	18.73%	38.90%
Agree	140	40.35%	79.25%
Strongly Agree	72	20.75%	100.00%
Total	**347**	**100.00%**	

When asked specifically about using AI for assessment frequency, the intention remains positive (61.1%) but is lower than the general intention to use. The rise in "Neutral" (18.73%) and "Disagree" (13.83%) responses likely reflects a hesitation regarding the reliability of AI in evaluating subjective student work or concerns about institutional policies regarding automated grading. It highlights a specific area of resistance where trust needs to be built.

Table 12: "I feel forced to work faster due to technology." (Technostress - Overload)

Particulars	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Disagree	15	4.32%	4.32%
Disagree	35	10.09%	14.41%
Neutral	50	14.41%	28.82%
Agree	135	38.90%	67.72%
Strongly Agree	112	32.28%	100.00%
Total	**347**	**100.00%**	

Table 12 begins the Technostress analysis. A striking 71.18% of faculty feel "Techno-Overload"—the sensation that technology forces them to work faster and process more information than they can handle comfortably. Only about 14% disagree. This indicates that AI and digital tools are currently acting as stressors rather than facilitators for a large majority, increasing the pace of work to an uncomfortable level.

Table 13: "I worry about constant connectivity/work invasion." (Technostress - Invasion)

Particulars	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Disagree	11	3.17%	3.17%
Disagree	19	5.48%	8.65%
Neutral	40	11.53%	20.17%
Agree	120	34.58%	54.76%
Strongly Agree	157	45.24%	100.00%
Total	**347**	**100.00%**	

This table reveals the most acute stressor: "Techno-Invasion." Nearly 80% of respondents feel that technology has blurred the boundaries between work and home. The "Strongly Agree" category is at its peak here (45.24%). This reflects the post-pandemic reality where WhatsApp groups, emails, and LMS notifications keep faculty tethered to their jobs 24/7, causing significant psychological strain.

Table 14: "I feel intimidated by the complexity of new AI tools." (Technostress - Complexity)

Particulars	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Disagree	24	6.92%	6.92%
Disagree	61	17.58%	24.50%
Neutral	85	24.50%	48.99%
Agree	125	36.02%	85.01%
Strongly Agree	52	14.99%	100.00%
Total	**347**	**100.00%**	

Table 14 addresses "Techno-Complexity." Approximately 51% of faculty feel intimidated by the complexity of the tools. The high "Neutral" count (24.50%) suggests a hesitancy to admit incompetence or perhaps a mixed experience. However, the fact that over half the workforce finds the tools complex points to a failure in User Interface (UI) design or, more likely, a lack of adequate training programs.

Table 15: "I fear AI might replace my job in the future." (Technostress - Insecurity)

Particulars	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Disagree	44	12.68%	12.68%
Disagree	66	19.02%	31.70%
Neutral	80	23.05%	54.76%
Agree	95	27.38%	82.13%
Strongly Agree	62	17.87%	100.00%
Total	**347**	**100.00%**	

Interestingly, Table 15 shows that "Techno-Insecurity" (fear of job loss) is lower than other stressors. Only about 45% agree they fear replacement, while nearly 32% actively disagree. This suggests that faculty are generally confident in the unique human value they bring to education (mentorship, empathy) and do not see AI as an existential threat, but rather as a source of hassle and overload.

Table 16: Hypothesis 1 Testing - Pearson Correlation Analysis

Variables	Correlation Coefficient (r)	p-value (Sig.)	N	Decision
Performance Expectancy vs. Behavioral Intention	0.682	.000	347	**Reject Null Hypothesis**

The Pearson Correlation analysis yields an r value of 0.682, indicating a strong positive correlation. The p-value is .000, which is less than the standard alpha of 0.05. This statistically confirms Hypothesis 1. It means that as faculty perception of the usefulness of AI increases, their intention to use it also increases significantly. It validates the rational choice model: faculty are pragmatic adopters who will use tools that clearly demonstrate value.

Table 17: Hypothesis 2 Testing - One Sample T-Test

Variable	Test Value	Mean	t-value	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Technostress Score	3.00	3.72	18.45	346	.000	0.72

The One Sample T-Test compares the aggregate Technostress score against a neutral value of 3. The observed mean is 3.72. The t-value of 18.45 with a significance of .000 indicates that this difference is not due to chance. We reject the Null Hypothesis. The data provides conclusive statistical evidence that faculty members in Pune are experiencing elevated levels of Technostress that are significantly above the neutral or "comfortable" threshold.

Findings

The rigorous analysis of data from 347 faculty members in Pune yields a set of findings that paint a nuanced picture of the digital transformation landscape as of 2022. These findings move beyond simple adoption statistics to explore the behavioral and psychological undercurrents of the transition.

The first major finding is the existence of a "Technology-Readiness Paradox." On one side, there is a robust acknowledgement of the utility of AI-enabled systems. The high Performance Expectancy scores (Mean = 3.80) coupled with the strong correlation to Behavioral Intention ($r = 0.682$) confirm that the "will" to modernize exists. Faculty explicitly recognize that AI-enabled systems can address chronic systemic issues, such as the heavy burden of grading in large classes and the need for early identification of at-risk students. They are not ideologically opposed to AI. However, this optimism is paradoxically matched by low Effort Expectancy and high Complexity scores. This suggests that the bottleneck is not attitude, but aptitude and tool design. The digital transformation is stalling not because faculty don't want it, but because the tools are physically and mentally taxing to use without adequate support.

The second critical finding is the identification of Technostress as a silent epidemic within the academic community. The research provides statistically significant evidence ($t = 18.45$, $p <.000$) that Technostress is a pervasive issue. The stress is not generic; it has specific drivers. The highest stressor, "Techno-Invasion," points to a breakdown in professional boundaries, likely exacerbated by the "always-on" culture of the pandemic years. Furthermore, the feeling of "Techno-overload"—working faster than one can cope—is acute. This suggests that AI tools, instead of functioning as labor-saving devices, are currently acting as labor-intensifying devices for many faculty members. They are having to manage the traditional demands of teaching and research while simultaneously wrestling with complex new digital workflows.

Conclusion

The investigation into the impact of AI-enabled learning systems on higher education in Pune reveals a system in a state of turbulent transition. By 2022, the "digital transformation" in this region can be best described as "Hardware-Rich but Support-Poor." The study concludes that the primary barrier to the effective integration of AI is not faculty resistance or Luddism—myths that are often perpetuated in administrative circles. On the contrary, faculty members act as willing partners who clearly see the transformative potential of AI to enhance teaching quality and operational efficiency. The positive correlation between Performance Expectancy and Behavioral Intention serves as empirical proof of this progressive mindset. However, this willingness is being eroded by a hostile implementation environment. The significant prevalence of Technostress confirms that the rapid, often forced adoption of digital tools has exacted a heavy psychological toll.

The findings of this report carry urgent implications for stakeholders shaping the future of higher education in India. For University Administrators, the strategy of "buy it and they will use it" must be abandoned. Budgets must be restructured to allocate funds for "Faculty Development Programs" that focus not just on technical skills but on "AI Pedagogy." Furthermore, "Digital Wellness" policies must be institutionalized to combat Techno-Invasion, establishing clear "right to disconnect" guidelines. For Policymakers, the metrics for success need to evolve beyond infrastructure penetration to include "Faculty Well-being" indices. Accreditation bodies like NAAC should consider including "Technological Support Structures" as a criterion for institutional grading.

This study, while exhaustive, opens several avenues for further inquiry. Future research should expand to include the student perspective to provide a mirrored view of the ecosystem. Additionally, longitudinal studies tracking the same cohort of faculty over the next five years would be invaluable to determine if Technostress decreases as "digital fluency" increases, or if it evolves into new forms of psychological strain. Qualitative deep-dives into specific disciplines could also reveal why certain faculties (e.g., Arts vs. Engineering) might experience these stressors differently.

References

1. Bhutoria, A. (2022). Personalized education and artificial intelligence in United States, China, and India: A systematic review using a human-in-the-loop model. Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 3, 100068. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100068
2. Bisen, I. E., Arslan, E. A., Yildirim, K., & Yildirim, Y. (2021). Artificial intelligence and machine learning in higher education. In Z. Gulzar & A. Leema (Eds.), Machine Learning Approaches for Improvising Modern Learning Systems (pp. 1-17). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-5009-0.ch001
3. Bozkurt, A., & Sharma, R. C. (2020). Emergency remote teaching in a time of global crisis due to CoronaVirus pandemic. Asian Journal of Distance Education, 15(1), i-vi. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3778083
4. Chatterjee, S., & Bhattacharjee, K. K. (2020). Adoption of artificial intelligence in higher education: A quantitative analysis using structural equation modelling. Education and Information Technologies, 25, 3443-3463. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-020-10159-7
5. Chaudhry, M. A., & Kazim, E. (2022). Artificial Intelligence in Education (AIEd): A high-level academic and industry note 2021. AI and Ethics, 2, 157-165. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-021-00074-z
6. Chen, L., Chen, P., & Lin, Z. (2020). Artificial intelligence in education: A review. IEEE Access, 8, 75264-75278. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2988510
7. Gopal, R., Singh, V., & Aggarwal, A. (2021). Impact of online classes on the satisfaction and performance of students during the pandemic period of COVID 19. Education and Information Technologies, 26, 6923-6947. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10523-1
8. Haleem, A., Javaid, M., Qadri, M. A., & Suman, R. (2022). Understanding the role of digital technologies in education: A review. Sustainable Operations and Computers, 3, 275-285. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.susoc.2022.05.004
9. Jena, R. K. (2015). Impact of technostress on job satisfaction: An empirical study among Indian academician. The International Technology Management Review, 5(3), 117-124. https://doi.org/10.2991/itmr.2015.5.3.1
10. Kumar, V., & Nanda, P. (2019). Social media in higher education: A framework for continuous engagement. International Journal of Information and Communication Technology Education, 15(1), 109-120. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJICTE.2019010107
11. Mishra, L., Gupta, T., & Shree, A. (2020). Online teaching-learning in higher education during lockdown period of COVID-19 pandemic. The International Journal of Educational Research Open, 1, 100012. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2020.100012
12. Pokhrel, S., & Chhetri, R. (2021). A literature review on impact of COVID-19 pandemic on teaching and learning. Higher Education for the Future, 8(1), 133-141. https://doi.org/10.1177/2347631120983481
13. Raman, A., & Don, Y. (2013). Preservice teachers' acceptance of learning management software: An application of the UTAUT2 model. International Education Studies, 6(7), 157-164. https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v6n7p157
14. Schiff, D. S. (2022). Education for AI, not AI for education: The role of education and ethics in national AI policy strategies. International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 32, 527-563. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-021-00270-2
15. Singh, S. V., & Hiran, K. K. (2022). The impact of AI on teaching and learning in higher education technology. Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice, 22(13). https://doi.org/10.33423/jhetp.v22i13.5514
16. Upadhyaya, P., & Vrinda. (2021). Impact of technostress on academic productivity of university students. Education and Information Technologies, 26, 1647-1664. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-020-10319-9
17. Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education – where are the educators? International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 16, 39. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0