Serbian Journal of Management 21 (2) (2026) 321 - 333

www.sjm06.com

Serbian Journal of Management

USES OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN STUDENTS OF POSTGRADUATE DEGREES IN ADMINISTRATION

Edgar Oliver Cardoso Espinosa

Instituto Politécnico Nacional, 471 Manuel Carpio Street, Plutarco Elías Calles, Mexico City, México

(Received 15 August 2025; accepted 02 April 2026)

Abstract

The objective of this research is to determine the uses of Artificial Intelligence among students of postgraduate programs in administration in their academic training. The research approach employed was quantitative with an explanatory scope using the survey technique. The study participants were students enrolled in a master's program in administration. The instrument designed and administered was a questionnaire based on a five-point Likert scale. The organization and analysis of data were performed using descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation) and inferential statistics (parametric *t* and *F* tests). The main results indicate that students identify the benefits of AI; they use AI tools; they recognize that AI requires a regulatory framework for its use in academic training; it is necessary to include training in the use of AI tools in postgraduate programs and that AI has a positive impact on academic training; AI positions the organization's human capital; and a regulatory framework for the use of AI is necessary in each organization. No significant differences were found regarding gender (t = 1.876, p = 0.211); there are significant differences by age (F=5.897, p= 0.000, η^2= 0.16); by semester (F = 6.234, p = 0.000, η^2= 0.08) and work experience (F = 3.508, p = 0.000, η^2= 0.01). The main conclusion of the study is to consider the formulation of an institutional regulatory framework for the use of AI at the postgraduate level and that AI does not replace face-to-face classes.

Keywords: students, benefits, academic training, Artificial Intelligence, postgraduate programs, uses

1. INTRODUCTION

The postgraduate level is a key component of national and international educational policies and strategies. Postgraduate education contributes significantly to the generation of high-quality human capital and researchers, which promotes economic development and the scientific and technological advancement of countries (Zhu et al., 2025).

In this sense, the main purpose of

* *Corresponding author: eoce@hotmail.com*

DOI: 10.5937/sjm21-60868

postgraduate training practices is to achieve a comprehensive understanding of knowledge, which according to Mowbray (2015) must comply with the following principles: a) use of competencies as the central axis of training; b) supportive pedagogical relationships (tutoring and accompaniment); c) professional development of the student (empathy, attitude, aptitude and behaviors); d) interactions between academics and students; e) humanistic foundations in training; f) training of critical citizens of information to build future scenarios for the improvement of humanity and, g) training of scientists in the various areas of knowledge that transform and project changes in society.

The primary objective of the postgraduate educational path is for students to reach maximum academic, personal, and knowledge-based achievement, as well as to develop into individuals who are competent in their personal and social work. Thus, postgraduate studies contribute to the development of citizens who collaborate comprehensively in their communities (Méndez et al., 2021).

Specifically, the training of administrators at the postgraduate level remains relevant in the 21st century due to the evolution of organizations, which require human talent capable of comprehensively understanding their internal and external behavior, as well as a set of skills to intervene strategically and make reasoned decisions with the support of technological tools (Hernández, 2018). Graduates from a postgraduate degree in administration possess a set of competencies oriented toward planning, direction, development, and control with effectiveness and efficiency in order to implement management processes based on decision-making that help position them in the market segment in which they participate in a highly technological environment (Onete et al., 2014).

According to Aroca (2025), human capital faces significant challenges that require the development of contemporary skills to adapt to new organizational demands. Human capital must master the tools and technological platforms based on Artificial Intelligence that enable task automation and improved efficiency, as well as informed decision-making based on data.

Based on the above, the objective of the research is to determine the uses of Artificial Intelligence in the academic training of postgraduate students in administration.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

One of the technological changes with the greatest impact and that is positioning itself in society, in the world of work, in communication and education is Artificial Intelligence (AI), which is a field of computer science and engineering that simulates and imitates the intelligent behavior of a human being through the application of theories, models and applications to improve decision-making (Naqvi, 2020; Zemel et al., 2013).

AI has become an emerging field that has consolidated its presence in the industrial and service sectors, as well as in the educational sector and even government agencies (Zhan & Lu, 2021), which is why it has also consolidated itself in the workplace, academic and individual spheres (Talati, 2024).

For the education sector, AI tools have generated challenges for their incorporation into the academic training of students at any level because they are useful tools for

acquiring knowledge and successfully completing school tasks (Terwiesch, 2023). In this sense, the OECD (2024) notes that AI allows students to access a wide range of educational resources that promote inclusion through accessibility features.

Thus, AI has become an important support for both in-person and online education because it personalizes educational processes according to students' individual styles, abilities, and needs (Long & Magerko, 2020). In this way, AI has marked a paradigm shift by providing new perspectives and challenges for global education systems facing digital transformation (Khurshid et al., 2024). Therefore, one of the most relevant and innovative alternatives for improving education is through the implementation of AI (Chedrawi & Howayeck, 2019).

However, the integration of AI in the educational field has raised concerns due to its possible misuse for taking exams, writing essays, or any other academic activity that hinders students' academic training (Zhai, 2022). In addition, Kumar (2023) emphasizes the existence of plagiarism and academic integrity problems, pointing out that content created by AI includes inappropriate references and a lack of opinions, which generates a lack of critical thinking in students.

In turn, Maerten and Soydaner (2023) point to biases, inaccuracies, and the generation of misleading or harmful content. Meanwhile, Lubowitz (2023) mentions that reliance on AI tools affects critical thinking skills and creates a dependency that hinders student learning.

Similarly, scientific studies addressing the incorporation of AI into the educational system are required to determine its level of appropriation among students. Furthermore, Almatrafi et al. (2024) emphasize that it is valuable and important to assess the level of knowledge about the use of AI in a specific group or level of academic training in order to determine the interventions to be implemented, in addition to establishing monitoring actions for the progress of AI incorporation.

This panorama generated by AI implies major challenges in the way teachers, students and managers think and act, in addition to involving situations associated with morality and ethics when AI is used to carry out an educational activity (Duong et al., 2023; Kooli, 2023).

Vieru and Petrea (2025) found that 95.6% of students use AI tools in their academic activities; 88.2% employ virtual assistants; 42.4% use AI-based educational platforms; 17.6% use automatic content generation tools; and 8.2% use data processing tools. Regarding their usage time, 57.6% of students do so weekly; 18.8% do so daily; and 11.88% monthly. Concerning the impact of AI on their learning process, 80% of students consider that it improves their academic training; 17.6% expressed uncertainty about the existence of effects on learning; and 2.4% consider that it does not provide any benefit to their training experience. Additionally, 48.2% of students expressed concern about the use of AI in terms of inaccurate information; 16.5% believe it has a negative impact on developing critical thinking; 16.5% believe it fosters dependence on AI; and 9.4% indicate it creates data privacy issues.

Johnston et al. (2024) analyzed students' perspectives on the use of AI in terms of their interaction, trust, and regulation, mentioning that it positively impacts their learning experiences by providing personalized feedback (54.1%), facilitating language

translation (42.4%); considering the design of a university policy on AI regulation (41.1%) and improving accessibility for students with disabilities (30.5%). On the contrary, they mention the existence of problems such as algorithmic bias (55.7%), data privacy (48.5%), and excessive dependence on AI (40.5%). Likewise, they found the importance of co-creating academic policies with students to ensure equity and inclusion, in addition to promoting AI training for students on its responsible use.

Martínez-Carrera et al. (2025) found that 84.21% of students have used AI throughout their academic career; 15.79% have never used it. 68.42% use AI to search for information; 10.53% to generate images for academic tasks. The benefits of AI are highlighted by 63.16% for its speed of information; 52.63% for its ease as a support tool; and 36.84% for its innovation for academic activities. The disadvantages of AI are that it has a negative impact on the development of skills (39.47%) and a lack of reliability (28.95%). The positive impact of AI is 81.58% in improving academic performance, and 15.79% consider it a decrease in achievement. 54.84% consider it to have a positive impact on academic tasks and 18.42% consider it to have a negative impact on creativity.

Miranda (2025) found that AI improves student performance (M=4.0; SD=0.3); allows for personalized rubrics (M=4.0; SD=0.0); need for careful and conscious use of AI (M=3.9; SD=0.6); its usefulness in facilitating learning (M=3.3; SD=1.1); usefulness of AI for individual study and homework completion (M=3.1; SD=1.2); a positive impact of AI on education (M=2.2; SD=0.9); development of assessment tests (M=1.9; SD=0.9); human feedback is more effective than that provided by AI (M=1.2; SD=0.5); replacement of face-to-face classes (M=1.1; SD=0.3).

Yan et al. (2025) found that students have a high level of interest in using AI (M=4.18; SD=0.69); have a favorable perception of the usefulness of AI in education (M=3.97; SD=0.94); frequently integrate AI into their academic activities (M=3.90; SD=0.83); AI is easy to use (M=3.83; SD=0.85); AI-generated content is accurate and reliable (M=3.74; SD=0.79); it fully meets their academic needs (M=3.53; SD=0.96); concern about AI-related plagiarism (M=3.46; SD=0.95); and mastery of AI tools (M=3.44; SD=0.90).

3. METHODOLOGY

The research approach employed was quantitative, with an explanatory scope, using the survey technique. The dependent variable was the use of AI by postgraduate students. The study participants were master's students in administration taught at the National Polytechnic Institute (IPN). The inclusion criteria were a) Enrollment in a graduate program; b) Availability of time to complete the instrument; and c) Willingness to provide informed consent to participate in the research. A total of 211 participants were invited to answer the questionnaire, and 182 responded, representing a response rate of 87.7%. The characteristics of the participants are shown in Table 1.

Based on Table 1, the main characteristics of the participants were: Gender was distributed as follows: 53% women and the remaining 47% men. Age was 25 to 29 years old, accounting for 39%. Regarding semester of study, 26% were in their first semester, 24% in their second semester, 26% in their

Table 1. Study participants (n=182)

Variable	Dimension	f
Gender	Female	96
	Masculine	86
Age	25 to 29 years	71
	30 to 34 years	60
	35 to 39 years	51
Semester	First	47
	Second	44
	Third	48
	Fourth	43
Work experience	0 to 4 years	81
	5 to 9 years	72
	10 to 14 years	29
Postgraduate program	MA	62
	MAIT	43
	MAPP	77
Have you used AI before starting your master's studies?	Yes	122
	No	60

third semester, and the remaining 24% in their fourth semester. Concerning work experience, 4% of students had worked for 5 to 9 years. In regard to the master's program in which the student was enrolled, the distribution was 42% for the MAPP, 34% for the MA, and the remaining 24% for the MAIT. Whereas for the question of whether they had used AI before beginning their postgraduate training, 67% indicated yes, and the remaining 33% indicated no.

The instrument used was a questionnaire designed for this study, focusing on the following dimensions: 1) Sociodemographic information; 2) Knowledge of AI; 3) Usefulness of AI; and 4) Benefits of AI. It was organized into items using a four-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 4 (Strongly agree).

The original data obtained from the survey are of several types. The variables that express the descriptive characteristics of the participants are dichotomous (such as gender and whether or not they used AI before starting their postgraduate studies) and polytomous (age, semester, work experience, postgraduate program). These variables are used as an ordering factor to perform the comparative analyses in the study.

The scale on the uses of AI consists of ordinal numerical variables expressed on a four-level Likert scale (1 to 4) and were considered continuous because they were analyzed using an arithmetic mean (Jamieson, 2004).

To ensure the instrument's reliability, the questionnaire was pilot tested with a group of 20 graduate students from another university. The information obtained during this test allowed for adjustments to the instrument to ensure greater clarity and relevance of each item. Validation was subsequently conducted through the judgment of eight experts: five with more than ten years of research experience, and three with twelve years of graduate-level teaching experience. Finally, the instrument's reliability was calculated using Cronbach's alpha coefficient, which was 0.889, indicating high reliability.

The study obtained ethical approval from the Ethics Committee of the Instituto Politécnico Nacional and permission was requested from the authorities of the schools that offer postgraduate studies in administration, to whom the objective of the research focused on determining the uses of AI by students was explained.

Participants were required to provide informed consent before completing the instrument, and anonymity was ensured by removing any personally identifiable information from the data set. All responses were treated confidentially and stored securely.

Data collection was conducted using a

Google form distributed via email, which stated the study's objective and guaranteed the confidentiality of the information obtained. The study was conducted from May 2nd to 30th, 2025.

Data analysis was performed using SPSS version 26, using descriptive statistics such as frequency (f), percentage (%), mean (M), and standard deviation (SD) to organize and present demographic data and responses to each item. Data were also tested for normality using the *K-S* test and the homogeneity of variances (Levene's test); for this reason, parametric tests such as *t* and *F* were used to identify significant differences in AI literacy with respect to the variables of gender, program, semester, and work experience, with a significance level (*p*) of 0.05.

In the same way, the following was calculated for the ANOVA test: The Eta Square (η^2) effect size with the following criteria: 0.01 (low), 0.06 (medium) and 0.14 (high), and the Scheffé post hoc test to compare specific pairs of means between groups and determine which are significantly different.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Results on the validity of the measurement model

The results in Table 2 demonstrate strong convergent validity across all factors of the measurement model. Each factor has factor loadings above the 0.70 threshold, indicating that individual items correlate well with their respective constructs. Reliability measures, including Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability, consistently exceed 0.70, confirming internal consistency and reliability (Henseler et al., 2015; Hair et al., 2017). Furthermore, mean variance extracted (AVE) values exceed 0.50, establishing adequate convergent validity by showing that each construct captures more variance from its items than from measurement error (Hair et al., 2006). These findings, taken together, validate the robustness of the constructs related to the AI uses scale.

The construct validity of the instrument was carried out based on the exploratory factor analysis: The KMO statistical test had a result of 0.886 with the Bartlett test of sphericity that was statistically significant (p = 0.00), so a good fit of the data to a three-component factor model was determined with 78.42% (knowledge of AI F1= 39.48%, usefulness of AI F2 = 24.85% and benefits of AI F3=14 .09%).

4.2. Results on AI uses

With respect to the time spent using AI tools by graduate students, this is shown in Table 3.

Based on Table 3, the time of use of AI tools by graduate students, it was found that 67% use them daily, 29% weekly and the remaining 4% monthly.

Table 2. Convergent validity results

Dimension	Factor	Mean variance extracted AVE ≥ 0.50	Composite reliability CR ≥ 0.70	Cronbach´s alpha α ≥ 0.70
AI knowledge	0.908	0.803	0.965	0.948
Usefulness of AI	0.831	0.788	0.968	0.955
Benefits of AI	0.892	0.829	0.941	0.921

Based on Table 4, it was found that 95% of graduate students use AI to guide them in generating research ideas; 91% use AI to search for information; 78% for essay writing; 75% for editing and proofreading texts; and 59% for creating presentations or visual content.

As detailed in Table 5, the study participants gave the following items the highest mean scores: "I identify the benefits of AI"; "I use AI tools; I am familiar with the term AI"; and "I recognize the basic principles of AI".

Table 3. Time of use of AI for academic activities

Time	f
Daily	122
Weekly	52
Monthly	8

In contrast, the items with the lowest mean scores among participants were, "I recognize the risks associated with AI" and "I understand the limitations of AI". These results indicate a recognition by students that they have limited information regarding the limitations and risks associated with the use of AI.

As detailed in Table 6, the study participants rated the following items with the highest mean scores: "AI requires a regulatory framework for its use in academic training"; "it is necessary to include training in the use of AI tools in the postgraduate program"; "AI has a positive impact on academic training"; "AI promotes the analysis and synthesis of information" and "AI fosters research and innovation".

Based on Table 7, study participants gave the highest mean scores to the following items: "AI empowers an organization's

Table 4. Academic activities carried out using AI

For which of the following academic activities have you used AI tools? (Indicate all that apply)	f
Search for information	165
Essay writing	142
Editing and proofreading	136
Creating presentations or visual content	108
Guidance for generating research ideas	172

Table 5. Knowledge of AI

Item	MA		MAIT		MAPP	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
I am familiar with the term AI	3.11	0.67	3.05	0.72	3.01	0.77
I recognize the basic principles of AI	3.09	0.69	3.01	0.72	3.02	0.73
I use AI tools	3.23	0.58	3.18	0.66	3.22	0.60
I understand the limitations of AI	2.88	0.92	2.95	0.91	2.85	1.03
I identify the benefits of AI	3.25	0.75	3.43	0.68	3.38	0.71
I recognize the risks associated with AI	2.77	0.96	2.71	0.94	2.70	0.93

Table 6. Usefulness of AI in academic training

Item	MA		MAIT		MAPP	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
AI promotes the analysis and synthesis of information	3.52	0.38	3.48	0.41	3.42	0.48
AI fosters research and innovation	3.51	0.41	3.58	0.37	3.53	0.39
AI promotes collaboration between students	3.38	0.72	3.35	0.78	3.33	0.75
AI provides personalized feedback	3.21	0.78	3.15	0.82	3.18	0.79
AI has a positive impact on academic training	3.89	0.25	3.81	0.27	3.83	0.26
AI replaces face-to-face classes	1.51	0.18	1.44	0.19	1.33	0.17
AI fully meets academic needs in postgraduate studies	3.42	0.45	3.36	0.51	3.31	0.57
AI motivates learning	3.33	0.45	3.42	0.39	3.38	0.39
AI requires a regulatory framework for its use in academic training	3.95	0.13	3.92	0.15	3.91	0.16
It is necessary to include training in the use of AI tools in the postgraduate program	3.93	0.15	3.90	0.17	3.91	0.16

Table 7. Benefits of IA

Item	MA		MAIT		MAPP	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Using AI is important for the workplace	3.35	0.44	3.58	0.29	3.11	0.59
AI helps improve organizational processes	3.63	0.25	3.75	0.21	3.51	0.31
The use of AI involves ethical criteria	3.28	0.54	3.33	0.57	3.21	0.68
AI helps reduce errors in job performance	3.72	0.31	3.85	0.27	3.62	0.42
AI is relevant to organizations	3.85	0.27	3.91	0.18	3.81	0.32
AI empowers an organization's human capital	3.91	0.17	3.94	0.13	3.87	0.20
A regulatory framework for the use of AI in every organization is necessary.	3.88	0.19	3.75	0.21	3.62	0.28

human capital"; "a regulatory framework for the use of AI in every organization is necessary"; "AI is relevant to organizations" and AI helps reduce errors in job performance. These results indicate graduate students' recognition of the relevance of AI in the workplace and its usefulness in creating a regulatory framework in each organization.

Regarding the findings by gender, age, semester and work experience, they are shown in tables 8, 9, 10 and 11.

Table 8. t test for gender

Gender	M	*t*	*p*
Female	3.03	1.876	0.211
Masculine	3.52		

Table 9. ANOVA test for age

Statistics						
M			**ANOVA**		**Post-hoc Scheffé**	
25 to 29 years (G1)	30 to 34 years (G2)	35 to 39 years (G3)	*F*	Sig. (bilateral)	Contrast groups	Sig.
3.75	3.48	2.81	5.897	0.000	G1 with G3	0.000

Table 10. ANOVA test for semester

Statistics							
M				**ANOVA**		**Post-hoc Scheffé**	
First (1)	Second (2)	Third (3)	Fourth (4)	*F*	Sig. (bilateral)	Contrast gropus	Sig.
2.36	3.15	3.55	3.82	6.234	0.000	1 with 2	0.009
						1 with 3	0.006
						1 with 4	0.000

Table 11. ANOVA test for work experience

Statistics						
M			**ANOVA**		**Post-hoc Scheffé**	
0 to 4 years (G1)	5 to 9 years (G2)	10 to 14 years (G3)	*F*	Sig. (bilateral)	Contrast groups	Sig.
3.05	3.85	2.99	3.508	0.001	G1 with G2	0.008
					G1 with G3	0.005

Based on Table 8, there are no significant differences regarding gender (t = 1.876, p = 0.211). This finding implies that both men and women use AI equally in their postgraduate academic training.

Based on Table 9, significant differences were found for age (F = 5.897, p = 0.000), and the homogeneity of variances test showed a value of p = 0.216 > 0.05, indicating that the data variance is homogeneous. This result suggests that each age group uses AI differently in their postgraduate academic training, and a large sample size was found across the three age groups in the study (η^2 = 0.16). A statistically significant difference was also found between the 25 to 29 age group and the 35 to 39 age group.

From Table 10, it is determined that there are significant differences by semester (F = 6.234, p = 0.000) and the homogeneity of variances test with a p = 0.305 > 0.05, so it is concluded that the variance of the data is homogeneous. This result implies different uses of AI in the participants of this educational level with a medium effect size (η^2 = 0.08).

Based on Table 11, significant differences were found for work experience (F = 3.508, p = 0.000), and the homogeneity of variances test showed a p = 0.403 > 0.05, leading to the conclusion that the data variance is homogeneous. This result indicates that AI use varies according to participants' years of work experience, with a small effect size (η^2 = 0.01).

5. DISCUSSION

The results of the research conducted with postgraduate students in administration confirm the findings of Vieru and Petrea (2025) that they continuously use AI in their academic training. However, this differs from the findings of Martínez-Carrera et al. (2025), who reported that no students had used AI. Furthermore, the students used AI in a variety of academic tasks during their postgraduate studies, thus aligning with the findings of Martínez-Carrera et al. (2025).

The findings of this study indicate that students have sufficient knowledge about AI tools and their uses, as well as their benefits in academic training, which aligns with the findings reported by Yan et al. (2025) and Miranda (2025). In addition, this confirms the findings reported by Vieru and Petrea (2025), Martínez-Carrera et al. (2025), and Johnston et al. (2024) regarding the positive impact of AI on academic training.

Also, a similar result was found with the investigation by Yan et al. (2025) in that AI fully satisfies academic needs, and with Miranda (2025) in that AI replaces face-to-face classes.

In this way, the findings of the research confirm what was established by Aroca (2025) regarding the fact that the human capital working in organizations is in a process of academic training that considers the use of AI tools that will allow them to include them in their activities for better decision making.

Also, it coincides with what Hernández (2018) and Onete et al. (2014) pointed out, that the training of administrators at the postgraduate level develops competencies associated with a strategic intervention based on data analysis using AI tools in order to position the organization in which they work.

6. CONCLUSION

The research findings serve as a basis for integrating AI-related content into graduate program curricula to strengthen their academic training in light of the growing role of AI in the world. The results indicate that students increasingly incorporate AI tools as they progress through their postgraduate studies. Conversely, both men and women use AI equally in their postgraduate studies.

Thus, the use of AI in education is not without challenges, and consolidating an effective integration requires an understanding of both the technology and its implications for students' learning processes. Specifically, at the postgraduate level, educational institutions must define regulatory criteria for its use by educational stakeholders.

It is also important to recognize that AI does not replace human interactions such as relationships between students, with teachers, and with the educational community, which are important because they allow for a comprehensive training that includes critical thinking, empathy, creativity, and reasoned decision-making in a collaborative environment.

Therefore, this research provides useful and up-to-date information that will allow the postgraduate level to expand their institutional reach and project themselves in national and international spheres by integrating AI tools into their academic training, thereby achieving the study's objective.

It is important to recognize the limitations of the study, such as the sample size focused on a single HEI and only one area of knowledge such as administration. Consequently, the results obtained in the research must be replicated to contrast and refute, in order to expand the empirical evidence on the uses of AI in academic training at the postgraduate level.

ПРИМЕНА ВЕШТАЧКЕ ИНТЕЛИГЕНЦИЈЕ КОД СТУДЕНАТА ПОСТДИПЛОМСКИХ СТУДИЈА ИЗ ОБЛАСТИ МЕНАЏМЕНТА

Edgar Oliver Cardoso Espinosa

Извод

Циљ овог истраживања јесте утврђивање начина примене вештачке интелигенције међу студентима постдипломских студија из области менаџмента у процесу њиховог академског образовања. Истраживање је засновано на квантитативном приступу, са експланаторним карактером, при чему је као техника прикупљања података коришћена анкета. У истраживању су учествовали студенти уписани на мастер академски програм из области менаџмента. Као истраживачки инструмент коришћен је посебно конструисан упитник, заснован на петостепеној Ликертовој скали. Организација и анализа података спроведене су применом дескриптивне статистике (фреквенције, проценти, аритметичка средина и стандардна девијација) и инференцијалне статистике, уз примену параметарских *t*- и *F*-тестова. Главни резултати истраживања показују да студенти препознају предности вештачке интелигенције и користе алате засноване на овој технологији. Такође, испитаници препознају потребу за успостављањем регулаторног оквира којим би се уредила њена примена у процесу академског образовања. Резултати указују и на потребу за укључивањем обука за коришћење алата вештачке интелигенције у програме постдипломских студија, као и на позитиван утицај вештачке интелигенције на академско образовање. Поред тога, истиче се значај вештачке интелигенције за развој и унапређење људског капитала у организацијама, као и потреба за успостављањем регулаторног оквира за њену примену у свакој организацији. Нису утврђене статистички значајне разлике у погледу пола испитаника *(t* = 1,876; *p* = 0,211). Насупрот томе, утврђене су статистички значајне разлике у зависности од старости (*F* = 5,897; *p* = 0,000; η^2 = 0,16), године студија (*F* = 6,234; p = 0,000; η^2 = 0,08) и радног искуства (*F* = 3,508; *p* = 0,000; η^2 = 0,01). Основни закључак истраживања јесте да је потребно размотрити успостављање институционалног регулаторног оквира за примену вештачке интелигенције на нивоу постдипломских студија. Истовремено, наглашава се да вештачка интелигенција не представља замену за наставу која се реализује непосредно, односно у учионици.

Кључне речи: студенти, предности, академско образовање, вештачка интелигенција, постдипломске студије, примена

References

Almatrafi, O., Johri, A., & Lee, H. (2024). A systematic review of AI literacy conceptualization, constructs, and implementation and assessment efforts (2019-2023), Computers and Education Open, 6, 100173.

Aroca, M. (2025). Habilidades contemporáneas adaptadas a la a Gestión del Talento Humano en la era digital. PSICOLOGÍA UNEMI, 9 (16), 69-78. 2197

Chedrawi, C., & Howayeck, P. (2019). Artificial intelligence a disruptive innovation in higher education accreditation programs: Expert systems and AACSB. Lecture Notes in Information Systems and Organization, 30, 115–129.

Duong, C.D., Vu, T.N., & Ngo, T.V.N. (2023). Applying a modified technology acceptance model to explain higher education students' usage of ChatGPT: A serial multiple mediation model with knowledge sharing as a moderator. The International Journal of Management Education, 21 (3), 100883.

Jamieson, S. (2004). 'Likert scales: How to (ab)use them'. Medical Education, 38 (12), 1217–1218.

Johnston, H., Wells, R., Shanks, E., Boey, T., & Parsons, B. (2024). Student perspectives on the use of generative artificial intelligence technologies in higher education. International Journal Educational Integrity, 20 (2) (2024).

Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., Anderson, R. & Tatham, R. (2006). Multivariate Data Analysis: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Hair, J., Matthews, L., Matthews, R. & Sarstedt, M. (2017). PLS-SEM or CB-SEM: updated guidelines on which method to use. International Journal of Multivariate Data Analysis, 1 (2), 107-123.

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 43 (1), 115-135.

Hernández, G. (2018). La formación en administración: reflexiones para la construcción de un modelo educativo. Universidad & Empresa, 20 (34), 9-52.

Kooli, C. (2023). Chatbots in education and research: A critical examination of ethical implications and solutions. Sustainability, 15 (7), 5614.

Khurshid, S. Khurshid, S., & Khalid, H. (2024). Learning for an uncertain future: artificial intelligence a challenge for Pakistani education system in the era of digital transformation, Qualitative Research Journal, 24 (5), 196-206.

Kumar, A. (2023). Analysis of ChatGPT tool to assess the potential of its utility for academic writing in biomedical domain. Biology, Engineering, Medicine and Science Reports, 9 (1), 24-30.

Long, D., & Magerko, B. (2020, April 25–30). What is AI literacy? Competencies and design considerations. Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, ACM, 1-16.

Lubowitz, J.H. (2023). ChatGPT, an artificial intelligence chatbot, is impacting medical literature. Arthroscopy: The Journal of Arthroscopic & Related Surgery, 39 (5), 1121–1122.

Maerten, A.S., & Soydaner, D. (2023). From paintbrush to pixel: A review of deep neural networks in AI-generated art. arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2302.10913

Martínez-Carrera, S., Sánchez-Martínez, C., Fernandes, S., & Ricoy, M.-C. (2025). The Use of AI by Undergraduate Students of Social Education in Spain and Portugal: A Case Study. Education Sciences, 15 (3), 390.

Méndez, L., Pellegrino, A., Robaina, S., & Vigorito, A. (2021). Trayectorias académicas y laborales de personas doctoradas en ciencias sociales y humanidades. Evidencia para Uruguay. Revista Mexicana de Investigación Educativa, 26 (91),1087-1121.

Miranda, S. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in Education: An Exploratory Survey to Gather the Perceptions of Teachers, Students, and Educators Around the University of Salerno. Education Sciences, 15 (8), 975.

Mowbray, J. (2015). The postgraduate capstone experience: Negotiatingthe pedagogical tensions. Journal of Learning Design, 8 (2), 43-52.

Naqvi, A. (2020). Artificial intelligence for audit, forensic accounting, and valuation: A strategic perspective. Toronto: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

OECD (2024). The potential impact of artificial intelligence on equity and inclusion in education", In OECD artificial intelligence papers. Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development, 23, OECD.

Onete, B., Pleșea, D., Teodorescu, I., & Cîrstea, A. (2014). Evolutions and Opportunities of Business Education in the Context of Educational Reform for the Digital Age. Amfiteatru Economic, 16 (37), 746-758.

Talati, D. (2024). AI (artificial intelligence) in daily life https://doi.org/10.36227/techrxiv.170751714.46556037/v1

Terwiesch, C. (2023). Would Chat GPT3 get a Wharton MBA? In A prediction based on its performance in the operations management, The Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania.

Vieriu, A., & Petrea, G. (2025). El impacto de la inteligencia artificial (IA) en el desarrollo académico estudiantil. Ciencias de la Educación, 15 (3), 343.

Yan, Y., Wu, B., Pi, J., & Zhang, X. (2025). Perceptions of AI in Higher Education: Insights from Students at a Top-Tier Chinese University. Education Sciences, 15 (6), 735. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15060735

Younis, B. (2025). The artificial intelligence literacy (AIL) scale for teachers: A tool for enhancing AI education, Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education, 41 (1), 37-56.

Zemel, R., Wu, Y., Swersky, K., Pitassi, T., & Dwork, C. (2013). Learning fair representations. International Conference on Machine Learning. 28, 325–33.

Zhang, C., & Lu, Y. (2021). Study on artificial intelligence: The state of the art and future prospects. Journal of Industrial Information Integration, 23, 100224,

Zhai, X. (2022). ChatGPT user experience: Implications for education, SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4312418

Zhu, J., Zhang, Y., Qiu, T., Pan, Y. (2025). Graduate Education in China. In: Feng, Z., Wang, Q., Liu, N. (eds) Education in China and the World, Singapore: Springer.