

Artificial Intelligence Awareness and Readiness for Utilization among Students and Lecturers of Prince Abubakar Audu University, Anyigba, Kogi State – Nigeria

Edime YUNUSA^{1*}, Ejuchegahi Anthony ANGWAOMAODOKO¹, Cosmas VICTOR¹

^{1*}Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Prince Abubakar Audu University Anyigba, Kogi State-Nigeria.

* **Correspondence:** Edime YUNUSA

The authors declare that no funding was received for this work.



Received: 10-March-2026

Accepted: 19-April-2026

Published: 21-April-2026

Copyright © 2026, Authors retain copyright. Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/> (CC BY 4.0 deed)

This article is published in the **MSI Journal of Education and Social Science**

ISSN 3107-5940 (Online)

The journal is managed and published by MSI Publishers.

Volume: 2, Issue: 2 (Apr-Jun) 2026

ABSTRACT: The increasing integration of artificial intelligence into higher education has raised critical concerns about how prepared academic actors are to engage with emerging technologies, prompting this study on artificial intelligence awareness and readiness for utilization among students and lecturers of Prince Abubakar Audu University, Anyigba, Kogi State, Nigeria. The study examined the level of awareness of artificial intelligence and assessed readiness for its utilization in teaching, learning, and research activities. The Technology Acceptance Model guided the study. A descriptive cross-sectional survey design was adopted, with a population of 7604 comprising of students and 16 selected lecturers totalling 7620 population, from which a sample of 373 was determined through Krejcie and Morgan formula. Respondents were selected using multistage sampling. Data were collected through structured questionnaires and key informant interviews and analyzed using descriptive statistics and inferential techniques, including Pearson Product Moment Correlation and One-Way Analysis of Variance. The results of the hypotheses showed a significant positive relationship between awareness and readiness ($r = 0.62, p < 0.05$), and significant differences in awareness across faculties ($F = 3.45, p < 0.05$)

and levels of study ($F = 4.12, p < 0.05$). Descriptive findings revealed that 65.6% of respondents demonstrated general awareness of artificial intelligence, while only 46.9% showed awareness of institutional policies guiding its use. In terms of readiness, 68.8% expressed willingness to use AI, whereas only 50.0% indicated adequate skills and confidence for its application. The study concluded that awareness is moderate and largely functional, while readiness is relatively high in disposition but constrained by limited competence and institutional support. The study recommended structured capacity-building programmes and the development of clear institutional frameworks to enhance effective and responsible utilization of artificial intelligence in the university.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence, Awareness, Readiness, Utilization, Students, Lecturers, Prince Abubakar Audu University.*

Background to the Study

The rapid diffusion of artificial intelligence (AI) across social institutions has intensified debates on the preparedness of higher education systems to integrate emerging technologies into teaching, learning, and knowledge production. Globally, AI is increasingly embedded in pedagogical practices, research processes, and administrative systems, thereby reshaping the organization of academic work and the nature of student learning. Recent evidence shows that AI-driven tools such as intelligent tutoring systems, automated assessment platforms, and generative AI applications are altering how knowledge is accessed, produced, and evaluated within universities (Dwivedi et al., 2023; UNESCO, 2023). These transformations are not merely technological but sociological, as they influence power relations in classrooms, redefine expertise, and raise questions about academic integrity, digital inequality, and epistemic authority. In many advanced educational systems, institutional readiness for AI adoption is supported by policy frameworks, digital infrastructure, and capacity-building initiatives that enhance both awareness and practical competence among lecturers and students (OECD, 2023; World Bank, 2022).

In developing contexts such as Nigeria, however, the integration of AI into higher education remains uneven and constrained by structural challenges, including

inadequate digital infrastructure, limited funding, and disparities in technological literacy. Nigerian universities are increasingly exposed to AI tools, particularly through widely accessible applications like generative AI platforms, yet awareness and readiness for their effective and ethical use vary significantly among academic actors. Empirical studies suggest that while students often demonstrate higher exposure to emerging digital tools due to informal learning networks, lecturers may exhibit cautious engagement shaped by concerns about reliability, academic misconduct, and lack of institutional guidance (Adeleke & Ebohon, 2023; Oloyede et al., 2024). This uneven distribution of technological competence reflects broader sociological patterns of digital inequality, where access, skills, and institutional support intersect to shape the capacity of individuals to benefit from technological change. Within this context, awareness of AI goes beyond mere familiarity; it encompasses understanding its capabilities, limitations, and implications for academic practice, while readiness involves the willingness, skills, and institutional support required for effective utilization.

Prince Abubakar Audu University, Anyigba, as a public institution located in Kogi State, operates within this broader national context of digital transition and constraint. The university's students and lecturers are increasingly encountering AI technologies in academic and non-academic activities, yet there is limited empirical evidence on the extent to which they are aware of these technologies and prepared to utilize them effectively. The absence of clear institutional policies and structured training programmes on AI further complicates this situation, potentially leading to unregulated usage, ethical concerns, and missed opportunities for enhancing teaching and learning outcomes.

Statement of the Problem

The problem that motivated this study arises from the observable gap between the growing presence of AI technologies in higher education and the uncertain level of preparedness among those expected to use them. While AI tools are increasingly accessible, their effective integration into academic work requires not only technical skills but also critical understanding and institutional support. In the absence of adequate awareness and readiness, the adoption of AI may reproduce existing

inequalities between students and lecturers, between technologically proficient and less proficient individuals, and between institutions with varying levels of resources. Furthermore, unregulated use of AI tools may undermine academic standards, raise ethical concerns, and challenge traditional modes of knowledge assessment. Despite the relevance of these issues, there is limited context-specific research focusing on Nigerian universities, particularly in institutions such as Prince Abubakar Audu University, Anyigba. This gap underscored the need to systematically examine the level of AI awareness and readiness for its utilization among students and lecturers in order to inform policy and practice.

Objectives of the Study

The study was guided by the following objectives:

- i. To examine the level of awareness of artificial intelligence among students and lecturers of Prince Abubakar Audu University, Anyigba.
- ii. To assess the readiness for the utilization of artificial intelligence in teaching, learning, and research activities among students and lecturers of Prince Abubakar Audu University Anyigba.

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated and tested for the study:

1. **H₀₁:** There is no significant relationship between the level of awareness of artificial intelligence and readiness for its utilization in teaching, learning, and research activities among students of Prince Abubakar Audu University, Anyigba.
2. **H₀₂:** There is no significant difference in the level of awareness of artificial intelligence based on respondents' socio-demographic characteristics such as faculty and level of study among students of Prince Abubakar Audu University, Anyigba.

Scope of the Study

The scope of the study was restricted to students and lecturers within Prince Abubakar Audu University, Anyigba Kogi State Nigeria focusing on their knowledge, perceptions, and preparedness regarding AI technologies, without

extending to other institutions or non-academic staff. This delimitation allowed for an in-depth understanding of the specific institutional context while acknowledging that findings may not be generalized beyond similar settings.

Significance of the Study

The significance of the study lies in its contribution to ongoing discussions on digital transformation in higher education within Nigeria and comparable contexts. By providing empirical evidence on awareness and readiness, the study offers insights that can inform institutional policies on AI integration, guide the development of training programs for lecturers and students, and support efforts to promote ethical and effective use of AI in academic environments. It also contributes to sociological scholarship by highlighting how technological change is mediated by social structures, institutional capacities, and individual competencies within a university setting. Ultimately, the study is expected to support the development of more inclusive and responsive educational systems that can adapt to the evolving demands of the digital age.

Literature Review

Conceptual Review

Artificial intelligence (AI)

Artificial intelligence (AI) has been widely conceptualized in recent literature as the capacity of computational systems to perform tasks that typically require human intelligence, including learning, reasoning, problem-solving, and decision-making. Recent analytical work emphasizes that AI extends beyond automation to include adaptive and generative capabilities that influence knowledge production and social interaction (Dwivedi et al., 2023). In educational contexts, AI is further understood as a set of intelligent systems designed to support or transform teaching, learning, and research processes through data-driven personalization and automation (Kasneci et al., 2023). While some authors stress its technical foundation in machine learning and algorithmic modeling, others focus on its social implications, particularly its role in reshaping authority, authorship, and epistemic practices within academic environments. Drawing from these positions, this study adopts a definition of

artificial intelligence as data-driven computational systems capable of simulating human cognitive processes and reshaping educational practices through automated and adaptive functionalities.

Awareness

Awareness, in relation to artificial intelligence, has been examined as a cognitive and social process that reflects individuals' understanding, perception, and evaluative judgment of AI technologies. A recent systematic review conceptualizes AI awareness as a dynamic process encompassing knowledge of AI functions, attitudes toward its use, and recognition of its ethical and societal implications, which precedes behavioural adoption. Other studies extend this view by arguing that awareness includes not only familiarity but also critical engagement with the opportunities and risks associated with AI in specific contexts such as education (Ghimire et al., 2024).

Within Nigerian higher education, awareness has been empirically linked to exposure, digital literacy, and institutional support, indicating that it is socially conditioned rather than purely individual (Hamzat & Ansah, 2024). Based on these perspectives, this study defines AI awareness as the level of cognitive understanding, perception, and critical recognition of the functions, potentials, and implications of artificial intelligence within academic activities.

Readiness for utilization

Readiness for utilization is commonly framed within technology adoption theories as the degree to which individuals possess the skills, motivation, and institutional support required to effectively engage with a given technology. Recent empirical work conceptualizes readiness for AI as a multidimensional construct involving technical competence, behavioural intention, and environmental preparedness, particularly within educational settings (Ayanwale et al., 2025).

Similarly, Sysoyev (2023) emphasizes that readiness reflects not only willingness to use AI but also the practical capacity to integrate it into teaching, learning, and research processes. In the Nigerian context, readiness has been associated with

access to digital infrastructure, prior training, and perceived usefulness of AI tools (Hamzat & Ansah, 2024). Building on these positions, this study adopts readiness for utilization as the extent to which students and lecturers possess the required skills, willingness, and enabling institutional conditions to effectively apply artificial intelligence in academic activities.

The Level of Awareness of Artificial Intelligence among Students and Lecturers in Nigeria

The growing diffusion of artificial intelligence (AI) in higher education has intensified attention on how academic actors understand and interpret emerging technologies. Across advanced educational systems, awareness of AI has expanded rapidly, driven by the widespread adoption of generative tools such as ChatGPT, automated grading systems, and adaptive learning platforms. Empirical evidence from cross-national studies indicates that awareness levels among university students are generally high, although depth of understanding varies significantly.

For instance, a large-scale study by Dwivedi et al. (2023) found that over 80% of university students surveyed across multiple countries had heard of generative AI tools, yet fewer than half demonstrated a functional understanding of their limitations, ethical implications, and appropriate academic use. Similarly, Kasneci, E. et al. (2023) observed that while AI awareness is expanding globally, it is often shaped by informal exposure through social media and peer networks rather than structured institutional learning.

Within this global context, awareness among lecturers tends to be more uneven. Studies show that although many lecturers are familiar with AI as a concept, fewer are conversant with its practical applications in pedagogy and research. Zawacki-Richter et al. (2022) reported that lecturers' awareness is often mediated by disciplinary orientation, with those in science and technology fields exhibiting higher levels of familiarity compared to colleagues in the humanities and social sciences. This disparity reflects broader sociological patterns of knowledge stratification within academia, where access to technological discourse is unevenly distributed across disciplines.

In the Nigerian context, awareness of AI has grown significantly in recent years, largely due to increased internet penetration, mobile technology use, and exposure to global digital platforms. However, this awareness remains uneven and often superficial. Empirical studies indicate that while a majority of university students in Nigeria have encountered AI-related tools, their understanding is frequently limited to basic functionalities. For example, Adigun, M. O. et al. (2023) found that approximately 68% of undergraduate students in selected Nigerian universities reported familiarity with AI tools such as chatbots and recommendation systems, yet only 27% could accurately explain how these systems function or their implications for academic work. This suggests that awareness is largely experiential rather than conceptual.

Among lecturers, awareness appears comparatively lower and more cautious. A study by Oloyede et al. (2024) revealed that only about 45% of lecturers surveyed across federal and state universities in Nigeria reported active awareness of AI applications relevant to teaching and research. Even among those aware, many expressed uncertainty about reliability, ethical concerns, and institutional policies governing AI use. This cautious stance is shaped not only by technological factors but also by institutional conditions, including lack of formal training and absence of clear regulatory frameworks.

Case-based evidence further illustrates the uneven nature of AI awareness in Nigeria. In universities such as the University of Lagos and Ahmadu Bello University, pilot initiatives introducing AI-based learning tools have increased student exposure, yet these efforts remain limited in scale and sustainability. Students often learn about AI through informal channels such as online tutorials and peer interactions, which contributes to fragmented understanding. Lecturers, on the other hand, frequently rely on self-directed learning, which may not provide sufficient depth or consistency. This pattern reflects what sociologists describe as “differentiated access to knowledge resources,” where individuals’ awareness is shaped by their position within institutional and technological structures.

Another important dimension of AI awareness in Nigeria relates to digital inequality. Access to reliable internet, digital devices, and technical support significantly

influences the extent to which students and lecturers can engage with AI technologies. Studies have shown that students in urban universities are more likely to be aware of AI tools compared to their counterparts in rural or under-resourced institutions (Adeleke & Ebohon, 2023). Similarly, younger lecturers tend to exhibit higher levels of awareness due to greater exposure to digital environments, while older academics may face barriers related to technological adaptation.

In all, the level of AI awareness among students and lecturers in Nigeria can be characterized as expanding but uneven. While exposure to AI technologies is increasing, particularly among students, depth of understanding remains limited, and significant gaps persist among lecturers. Addressing these gaps requires not only increased access to technology but also structured educational interventions that enhance conceptual understanding and critical engagement with AI.

Readiness for the Utilization of Artificial Intelligence in Teaching, Learning, and Research Activities by Students and Lecturers in Nigeria

Beyond awareness, the effective integration of artificial intelligence in higher education depends on the readiness of students and lecturers to utilize these technologies in meaningful ways. Globally, readiness encompasses a combination of technical competence, institutional support, and willingness to adopt new practices. Evidence from recent studies indicates that while many universities have made progress in developing digital infrastructure, readiness for AI integration remains uneven. Bond et al. (2023) found that although over 70% of higher education institutions in developed countries have introduced AI-related tools, fewer than 40% of lecturers feel adequately prepared to integrate them into their teaching.

Students generally demonstrate higher levels of readiness compared to lecturers, largely due to their familiarity with digital technologies. However, readiness is not uniform and often depends on access to resources and prior experience. Crompton et al. (2023) emphasized that while students may be willing to use AI tools, their readiness is often limited by lack of guidance on appropriate academic use, leading to concerns about plagiarism and overreliance on automated systems.

In Nigeria, readiness for AI utilization is shaped by a combination of structural constraints and emerging opportunities. Despite growing awareness, many universities face challenges related to infrastructure, funding, and policy development, which limit their capacity to support AI integration. A study by Adeleke and Ebohon (2023) highlighted that inadequate internet connectivity and limited access to digital tools remain significant barriers to technology adoption in Nigerian higher education. These constraints directly affect the readiness of both students and lecturers to utilize AI effectively.

Empirical data suggests that students in Nigeria exhibit moderate levels of readiness for AI utilization, particularly in informal learning contexts. For example, many students use AI tools for tasks such as summarizing texts, generating ideas, and coding assistance. However, this readiness is often pragmatic rather than structured, with limited understanding of ethical considerations and academic standards. Oloyede et al. (2024) reported that while over 60% of students surveyed indicated willingness to use AI in their studies, only 32% had received any form of formal training on its use.

Lecturers, on the other hand, demonstrate lower levels of readiness, influenced by both individual and institutional factors. Many lecturers express concerns about the reliability of AI-generated content, potential threats to academic integrity, and lack of institutional guidelines. These concerns are compounded by limited opportunities for professional development in digital pedagogy. As a result, even when lecturers are aware of AI tools, they may be reluctant to incorporate them into their teaching and research practices.

Case studies from Nigerian universities illustrate these dynamics. In some institutions, pilot programs introducing AI-based learning platforms have shown promising results, including improved student engagement and personalized learning experiences. However, these initiatives are often limited in scope and face challenges related to sustainability and scalability. For instance, a pilot AI-supported learning initiative in a federal university demonstrated increased student participation in online courses, yet lecturers reported difficulties in adapting their teaching methods due to lack of training and technical support.

Another critical aspect of readiness is institutional capacity. Universities that have invested in digital infrastructure and policy development are better positioned to integrate AI into their academic activities. However, many Nigerian institutions lack comprehensive strategies for AI adoption, resulting in fragmented and uncoordinated efforts. This institutional gap reflects broader structural issues within the higher education system, including underfunding and limited emphasis on technological innovation.

Furthermore, readiness is closely linked to issues of inequality. Students and lecturers in well-resourced universities are more likely to have access to training and technological tools, thereby enhancing their readiness for AI utilization. In contrast, those in under-resourced institutions may face significant barriers, leading to disparities in technological competence and academic opportunities. This pattern underscores the need for targeted interventions that address both individual and institutional dimensions of readiness.

In sum, readiness for the utilization of artificial intelligence among students and lecturers in Nigeria remains at a developing stage. While there is growing willingness to engage with AI technologies, significant gaps persist in terms of skills, training, and institutional support. Addressing these challenges requires coordinated efforts to improve digital infrastructure, develop clear policies, and provide capacity-building programs that enhance both technical competence and critical understanding of AI.

Theoretical Framework: Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)

Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) was developed by Fred D. Davis in 1989 and subsequently extended in recent studies on digital and AI adoption in education. The model was originally proposed to explain how users come to accept and use new technologies, emphasizing two central constructs: perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use. Recent applications of TAM in AI-related studies have expanded these constructs to include factors such as trust, ethical concerns, and digital competence, reflecting the evolving nature of intelligent technologies (Dwivedi et al., 2023; Chiu et al., 2023).

The core assumptions of TAM are that individuals' acceptance of a technology is primarily determined by their perception of its usefulness in enhancing performance and the degree to which they perceive it as easy to use. These perceptions shape users' attitudes, which in turn influence their behavioural intention and actual usage of the technology. In the context of artificial intelligence, these assumptions imply that students and lecturers are more likely to adopt AI tools if they believe such tools will improve teaching, learning, and research outcomes, and if they can interact with them without significant difficulty. The model also assumes that external variables such as training, institutional support, and prior experience indirectly influence adoption through their effects on perceived usefulness and ease of use.

One of the major strengths of TAM lies in its strong empirical support and adaptability across different technological contexts, including recent studies on AI in higher education. It provides a parsimonious yet robust framework for understanding how awareness translates into readiness and eventual utilization. Its predictive power has been validated across diverse cultural and institutional settings, making it particularly useful for examining technology adoption in developing countries such as Nigeria. Furthermore, its flexibility allows for the integration of additional variables such as digital literacy, facilitating conditions, and social influence, which are relevant in the study of AI adoption (Chiu et al., 2023).

However, TAM has been criticized for its limited consideration of broader social and institutional factors that shape technology use. Critics argue that the model places excessive emphasis on individual perceptions while underestimating structural constraints such as infrastructure deficits, policy gaps, and power relations within institutions. In contexts like Nigerian universities, where systemic challenges significantly influence technology adoption, this limitation becomes particularly evident. Additionally, TAM does not fully capture ethical concerns and academic norms that are central to the use of AI in educational settings.

Despite these limitations, the relevance of TAM to the present study is strong and direct. The concept of awareness of artificial intelligence among students and lecturers aligns with the cognitive stage of the model, where individuals form perceptions about a technology's usefulness and ease of use. Similarly, readiness for

utilization corresponds to the behavioural intention and actual usage components of TAM, as it reflects the extent to which individuals are prepared and willing to integrate AI into their academic activities.

In the specific context of Prince Abubakar Audu University, Anyigba, the model provides a useful lens for examining how varying levels of awareness influence perceptions and, ultimately, readiness for adoption. For instance, students who are more aware of AI tools may perceive them as useful for academic tasks such as research and writing, thereby increasing their readiness to use them. Conversely, lecturers with limited awareness or negative perceptions may exhibit low readiness due to concerns about complexity or academic integrity. By linking awareness, perception, and readiness within a coherent analytical structure, TAM offers a practical and theoretically grounded framework for understanding the adoption of artificial intelligence in the university setting.

Research Design

The study adopted a descriptive cross-sectional survey design. This method was used to help the researchers obtain information relevant to the research and to describe situations as they exist in reality.

Study setting

The research was conducted at Prince Abubakar Audu University (PAAU), Anyigba, Kogi State, Nigeria. The setting, Prince Abubakar Audu University is located in Anyigba, Dekina local government Area in the Eastern Senatorial District of Kogi State, Nigeria.

Population size

The target population were selected Lecturers and the final year students from faculties of Arts and humanities; Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, Agriculture, Law, Management sciences, College of Health Sciences and Faculty of Education of the institution with a population of 7,604 according to the Dean and Head of department of various faculties in 2025. Then 16 selected Lecturers across the selected Faculties bringing the total population of the study to 7620

Table 1: Population of Final year students

Faculty	Population of Final year students	Number of selected Lecturers
Social sciences	1353	2
Law	63	2
Basic medical science	136	2
Agricultural sciences	610	2
Natural sciences	2270	2
Management science	1114	2
Arts and humanities	954	2
Education	1104	2
Total	7604	16

Sample Size Determination and Sampling Techniques

Sample size was determined using Krejcie and Morgan (1970) a final sample of 373 target population was obtained.

$$S = \frac{X^2 NP(1-P)}{d^2 (N-1) + X^2 P(1-P)}$$

S = required sample size

X^2 = the table value of chi-square for 1 degree of freedom at the desired confidence level (3.841).

N = the population size

P = the population proportion (assumed to be 0.50) since this provided the maximum sample size

d = the degree of accuracy expressed as a proportion (0.05).

$$S = \frac{X^2 NP(1-P)}{d^2 (N-1) + X^2 P(1-P)}$$

$$d^2 (N-1) + X^2 P(1-P)$$

$$S = \frac{3.841 \times 1,552 \times 0.50 (1-0.50)}{0.05^2 (1,552-1) + 3.841 \times 0.50 (1-0.50)}$$

$$(0.05)^2 (1,552-1) + 3.841 \times 0.05(1-0.50)$$

$$S = \frac{3.841 \times 1,552 \times 0.25}{0.0025 \times 1,551 + 0.19205 \times 0.50}$$

$$0.0025 \times 1,551 + 0.19205 \times 0.50$$

$$S = \frac{1,490}{3.9 + 0.096025}$$

$$3.9 + 0.096025$$

$$S = \frac{1,490}{3.9}$$

$$3.9$$

$$S = 373$$

Therefore, a total of three hundred and seventy-three (373) copies of questionnaire were administered to the final year students. A total of 320 copies of the questionnaire were collected out of 373, giving a response rate of 85.0%, upon which the analysis was based.

Sampling Techniques

The study adopted a multistage sampling technique to ensure systematic and representative coverage of the study population. At the first stage, faculties within Prince Abubakar Audu University, Anyigba were stratified to reflect the academic structure of the institution, including Social Sciences, Natural Sciences, Arts and Humanities, Law, Management Sciences, Education, Agriculture, and Medicine. In the second stage, proportionate sampling was used to allocate the sample across the selected faculties based on student population size. At the third stage, 373 copies of questionnaire were administered exclusively to final year students (400 and 500 levels) who were selected through simple random sampling within their respective faculties. The focus on final year students was informed by their higher level of academic exposure, familiarity with research activities, and greater likelihood of interacting with digital tools, including artificial intelligence.

In addition to the survey, lecturers were incorporated into the study through purposive sampling for the Key Informant Interview (KII). A total of 16 lecturers were deliberately selected across the faculties to provide in-depth insights based on

their academic experience, involvement in teaching and research, and presumed exposure to emerging technologies. This approach was justified on the grounds that lecturers, unlike students, were not the primary respondents for the quantitative instrument but were included to enrich the study with qualitative perspectives that could explain and validate the survey findings.

The combination of probability sampling for students and purposive selection of lecturers ensured both representativeness and depth in data collection. While the questionnaire captured general patterns of awareness and readiness among students, the lecturers' interviews provided contextual understanding of institutional practices, capacity gaps, and policy-related issues, thereby strengthening the validity and overall rigor of the study.

Instrument of Data Collection

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire and Key Informant Interview (IDI). The structured questionnaire was designed in line with the study objectives. The instrument consisted of three sections: Section A captured respondents' socio-demographic characteristics; Section B examined the level of awareness of artificial intelligence among students; Section C explored the readiness to utilize Artificial Intelligence among student. While Key Informant Interview was used for the selected lecturers of the university with the guides following the research aim and objectives respectfully.

Reliability and Validity

The instrument was subjected to face and content validity by experts in the Faculty of Social Sciences, Prince Abubakar Audu University. A pilot study was conducted among students outside the selected departments, and reliability was established using Cronbach's Alpha, with coefficients of 0.70 and above indicating acceptable internal consistency.

Ethical Considerations

Participation was voluntary, informed consent was obtained, and anonymity was assured. Ethical sensitivity was maintained.

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

Table 2: Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Socio-Demographic Characteristics

Variable	Category	Frequency (N=320)	Percentage (%)
Sex	Male	149	46.6
	Female	171	53.4
Age in years	16–25	227	70.9
	26–35	85	26.6
	36–45	8	2.5
Marital Status	Married	47	14.7
	Single	273	85.3
Religious Affiliation	Christianity	167	52.2
	Islam	153	47.8
Level of Study	100 Level	58	18.1
	200 Level	63	19.7
	300 Level	69	21.6
	400 Level	87	27.2
	500 Level	43	13.4
Faculty	Social Sciences	113	35.3
	Law	33	10.3
	Natural Sciences	57	17.8
	Arts & Humanities	41	12.8
	Management Sciences	28	8.8
	Agriculture	16	5.0
	Medicine	14	4.4
	Education	18	5.6

Source: Field Survey Research, (2026)

A cursory look at the sex distribution on Table 2 shows a slightly higher proportion of female respondents, with 171 (53.4%) compared to 149 (46.6%) males. This near balance suggests that the study captures perspectives from both genders without significant bias, although the marginal female dominance may reflect enrolment patterns in certain faculties within the

university. The implication for the study is that findings on awareness and readiness for artificial intelligence are unlikely to be skewed by gender imbalance, thereby enhancing the representativeness of responses across male and female participants.

An examination of the age structure indicates that the majority of respondents fall within the 16–25 age bracket, accounting for 227 (70.9%), followed by those aged 26–35 with 85 (26.6%), while only 8 (2.5%) are within 36–45 years. This distribution clearly reflects a predominantly youthful population, consistent with undergraduate student demographics. The implication is that the study largely captured the perspectives of younger individuals who are more likely to be digitally inclined and exposed to emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence, which explain relatively higher awareness and openness to its utilization.

With respect to marital status, the data reveal that 273 respondents (85.3%) are single, while only 47 (14.7%) are married. This pattern aligns with the age distribution and reinforces the student-dominated nature of the sample. The predominance of single respondents suggests fewer family or social responsibilities that might otherwise limit engagement with digital technologies. Consequently, this may positively influence both awareness and readiness for AI utilization, as respondents are more likely to have the time and flexibility to explore and adopt such technologies.

A consideration of religious affiliation shows a fairly balanced representation, with 167 respondents (52.2%) identifying as Christians and 153 (47.8%) as Muslims. This near parity reflects the religious diversity typical of the study area and indicates that the sample is socially inclusive. The implication for the study is that findings on AI awareness and readiness are not confined to a particular religious group, thereby supporting broader generalization within similar socio-cultural contexts.

In relation to level of study, the distribution shows that 400-level students constitute the largest group with 87 respondents (27.2%), followed by 300 level with 69 (21.6%), 200 level with 63 (19.7%), 100 level with 58 (18.1%), and 500 level with 43 (13.4%). This spread demonstrates a reasonable representation across different academic stages, with a slight concentration in the higher levels. The implication is that respondents at advanced levels, who are more academically experienced, may have greater exposure to research tools and digital

technologies, thereby contributing to higher levels of awareness and readiness for AI utilization observed in the study.

A closer observation of faculty distribution reveals that the largest proportion of respondents comes from Social Sciences with 113 (35.3%), followed by Natural Sciences with 57 (17.8%), Arts and Humanities with 41 (12.8%), Law with 33 (10.3%), Management Sciences with 28 (8.8%), Education with 18 (5.6%), Agriculture with 16 (5.0%), and Medicine with 14 (4.4%). This indicates a concentration of respondents in disciplines that are more theory-oriented, particularly within the Social Sciences. The implication is that awareness of AI may be more influenced by general digital exposure rather than specialized technical training, while readiness for utilization may vary across faculties depending on the extent to which AI applications are integrated into their respective academic fields.

Table 3: Level of Awareness of Artificial Intelligence Among Students of Prince Abubakar Audu University Anyigba Kogi State (N = 320)

ITEMS	Yes	No	Can't Say	Mean/SD
Heard about AI and understand its meaning	210	60	50	2.50 / 0.75
Aware AI is used in education globally	195	70	55	2.44 / 0.78
Familiar with AI tools	180	85	55	2.39 / 0.80
Aware AI supports learning	175	90	55	2.38 / 0.81
Aware AI supports assignments	205	65	50	2.48 / 0.76
Aware AI supports research	170	95	55	2.36 / 0.82
Aware of benefits	185	80	55	2.41 / 0.79
Aware of risks	150	110	60	2.28 / 0.85
Aware of ethics	165	100	55	2.34 / 0.83
Aware of policies	120	140	60	2.19 / 0.88

Source: Field Survey Research, (2026)

The distribution of responses on the level of awareness of artificial intelligence among students on Table 3 reveals a generally positive orientation toward AI, although with observable gaps in deeper and institutional knowledge. The responses indicate that 210 out of 320 participants affirmed that they have heard about AI and understand its meaning, yielding a mean score of 2.50 with a standard deviation of 0.75, which suggests a relatively high and consistent level of basic awareness. This pattern is sustained across related items, as 195 respondents acknowledged awareness of AI use in education globally (Mean = 2.44, SD = 0.78), while 180 respondents indicated familiarity with common AI tools such as chatbots and writing assistants (Mean = 2.39, SD = 0.80). These figures point to widespread exposure to AI technologies, likely driven by increasing access to digital platforms and informal learning channels among students in particular.

Further examination shows that 175 respondents agreed that AI supports teaching activities (Mean = 2.38, SD = 0.81), and 205 recognized its role in assisting assignments (Mean = 2.48, SD = 0.76), reflecting stronger awareness of student-centered applications than lecturer-driven pedagogical uses. Similarly, awareness of AI in research activities is moderately expressed, with 170 respondents affirming this (Mean = 2.36, SD = 0.82), indicating that while AI is recognized as useful in research, its practical implications may not be fully understood. Awareness of the benefits of AI (Mean = 2.41, SD = 0.79) remains relatively high, but this declines when attention shifts to more critical dimensions such as risks and ethical concerns. Only 150 respondents indicated awareness of AI risks (Mean = 2.28, SD = 0.85), and 165 acknowledged ethical concerns such as plagiarism (Mean = 2.34, SD = 0.83), suggesting a partial understanding of the broader implications of AI use.

A more pronounced limitation emerges in relation to institutional awareness, where only 120 respondents reported awareness of policies guiding AI use (Mean = 2.19, SD = 0.88), representing the lowest mean score in the table and the highest variability. This indicates that knowledge of formal regulatory frameworks is weak and unevenly distributed among respondents. The overall grand mean of 2.38, with an average standard deviation of 0.81, confirms that awareness of AI is moderately high but not deeply grounded. The implication of this finding is that while students are increasingly exposed to AI technologies, their understanding remains largely

functional and experience-based rather than structured and policy-informed. This suggests the need for institutional efforts to deepen awareness through formal orientation, curriculum integration, and ethical guidelines to ensure informed and responsible engagement with AI in academic settings.

Responses from the Key Informant Interviews section in support of the above findings had the following, as a lecturer from the management science said that:

“I understand artificial intelligence to mean systems that can perform tasks that normally require human thinking, like writing, analysing data, or even suggesting ideas. In my own teaching and research, I have come across tools like ChatGPT and some data analysis software, but honestly, my understanding is still basic. I know what these tools can do, but I cannot really explain how they work technically. Most of what I know, I learnt on my own or from colleagues, not from any formal training in the university” **(IDI/1/ Male /Senior Lecturer/39yrs/Faculty of Social Sciences/PAAU/Anyigba).**

Another participant said:

“I have a fair level of awareness of artificial intelligence, especially in relation to research. In my field, we use tools that can assist with data analysis and simulations, so I have interacted with AI in that sense. However, my awareness is more about application than theory. I am also aware that there are ethical concerns, like whether using AI-generated content is acceptable in academic writing, but there is no clear direction from the university, so we are all trying to figure it out individually” **(IDI/1/ Male/Lecturer I/34yrs/Faculty of Management Sciences/PAAU/Anyigba).**

Another participant said:

“To be honest, my awareness of artificial intelligence is still limited. I have heard about it mostly in discussions about how it is affecting education and even the legal profession. I know students

are already using some of these tools, but I am not very familiar with how they work. I am also concerned about misuse, especially plagiarism, because if a student submits work generated by AI, it becomes difficult to assess originality. Without clear guidelines, it is hard to fully engage with it” (**IDI/1/Female/Lecture II/ Faculty of Law/38yrs/PAAU/Anyigba**).

A close reading of the interview responses on awareness, when considered alongside the questionnaire results, reinforces the pattern of moderate but uneven knowledge of artificial intelligence among lecturers and students. The survey data show relatively high agreement on basic awareness, with items such as having heard about AI (Mean = 2.50) and awareness of its use in education (Mean = 2.44), which indicates that respondents are generally familiar with the concept and its presence in academic contexts. This is clearly echoed in the interview statements where lecturers repeatedly describe AI in functional terms, referring to tools for writing, data analysis, and research support. However, both data sources converge in revealing that this awareness is largely superficial. The lecturers’ admission that their understanding is “basic,” “application-based,” or derived from “personal exploration” aligns with the lower mean scores recorded for deeper dimensions of awareness such as risks (Mean = 2.28) and institutional policies (Mean = 2.19).

The qualitative responses further deepen this finding by showing that awareness is not systematically developed through institutional mechanisms but rather through informal and individual efforts. This convergence implies that while AI has gained visibility within the university environment, it has not yet been internalized as structured knowledge, and this limits the capacity of both lecturers and students to engage critically with its implications. The absence of clear institutional guidelines, as emphasized in the interviews, also explains why awareness of policies recorded the lowest mean score, suggesting that institutional silence contributes to fragmented and uneven understanding of AI.

Table 4: Readiness for Utilization of AI Among Students of Prince Abubakar Audu University
Anyigba Kogi State (N = 320)

Items	Yes	No	Can't Say	Mean/SD
Willing to use AI	220	55	45	2.55 / 0.72
Possess skills	160	105	55	2.33 / 0.83
Confident using AI	150	110	60	2.28 / 0.85
Ready to integrate AI	155	100	65	2.28 / 0.86
Access to devices/internet	200	70	50	2.47 / 0.77
Open to training	240	40	40	2.63 / 0.69
Adapt methods	170	90	60	2.34 / 0.82
Use AI ethically	165	95	60	2.33 / 0.83
Improve performance	175	85	60	2.36 / 0.81
Continuous learning	230	45	45	2.58 / 0.71

Source: Field Survey Research, (2026)

In contrast, the pattern of responses on readiness for the utilization of artificial intelligence on Table 4 reflects a cautious but progressive disposition toward adoption. The data show that 220 respondents expressed willingness to use AI in academic activities (Mean = 2.55, SD = 0.72), indicating a strong positive attitude and relatively low dispersion in responses. This willingness is further reinforced by the high number of respondents (240) who indicated openness to training (Mean = 2.63, SD = 0.69), as well as 230 respondents who expressed readiness to continuously learn AI-related skills (Mean = 2.58, SD = 0.71). These figures suggest that both students and lecturers recognize the relevance of AI and are inclined toward developing the competencies required for its use.

However, this positive disposition is moderated by lower levels of technical competence and confidence. Only 160 respondents reported possessing the basic skills to use AI tools (Mean = 2.33, SD = 0.83), while 150 indicated confidence in applying such tools (Mean = 2.28, SD = 0.85). Similarly, readiness to integrate AI into teaching and learning activities is moderate, with 155 respondents affirming this (Mean = 2.28, SD = 0.86), reflecting uncertainty in translating willingness into

practical application. These relatively lower mean scores, coupled with higher standard deviations, indicate variability in skill levels and confidence, suggesting that readiness is not evenly distributed across respondents.

Access to enabling resources appears relatively adequate, as 200 respondents confirmed access to internet and digital devices (Mean = 2.47, SD = 0.77), which supports the potential for AI adoption. Nonetheless, readiness also depends on the ability to use these tools ethically and effectively. While 165 respondents indicated that they can use AI responsibly (Mean = 2.33, SD = 0.83), the moderate score suggests that ethical competence is still developing. Similarly, 175 respondents expressed willingness to rely on AI to improve academic performance (Mean = 2.36, SD = 0.81), indicating cautious acceptance rather than full reliance.

The overall grand mean of 2.42, with an average standard deviation of 0.79, shows that readiness for AI utilization is slightly higher than awareness but remains at a moderate level. The findings imply that although students and lecturers are generally willing and open to adopting AI technologies, their readiness is constrained by gaps in skills, confidence, and institutional support. This suggests that increasing readiness requires targeted capacity-building initiatives, including training programs, technical support, and clear institutional policies that can bridge the gap between willingness and effective utilization.

Responses from the Key Informant Interviews section in support of the above findings had the following, as a lecturer said that:

“I am willing to use artificial intelligence in my teaching and research because I can see that it has the potential to make work easier and improve learning. But the truth is that I am not fully prepared yet. I don’t have the technical skills to use many of these tools effectively. If the university organizes training or workshops, I would definitely participate, because right now my readiness is more about interest than actual ability” **(IDI/2/ Male /Professor/51yrs/Faculty of Arts and Humanities/PAAU/Anyigba).**

Another participant said:

“I would say I am open to using artificial intelligence, especially for teaching and assessment, but I am not completely confident yet. I can use basic digital tools, but integrating AI into my teaching requires more knowledge than I currently have. Also, issues like poor internet connection sometimes discourage me from trying new technologies. If there is better infrastructure and proper guidance, I think I will be more ready to use AI effectively”
(IDI/2/ Male/ Senior Lecturer /41yrs/Faculty of Education/PAAU/Anyigba).

Another participant said:

“I have started using some artificial intelligence tools for my research and administrative work, so I would say I am moderately ready. However, I still feel there is a gap in my skills, especially when it comes to more advanced applications. I am also not entirely sure about what is acceptable and what is not in terms of using AI in academic work. If there are clear policies and continuous training, it will increase my confidence and make me more prepared to fully integrate AI into my work.”
(IDI/2/Female/Lecture II/ Faculty of Agriculture/38yrs/PAAU/Anyigba).

An interpretive synthesis of the readiness dimension similarly reveals consistency between the quantitative and qualitative evidence, while also highlighting underlying constraints that shape adoption. The questionnaire results indicate a generally positive disposition toward AI utilization, as reflected in high mean scores for willingness to use AI (Mean = 2.55), openness to training (Mean = 2.63), and readiness to continuously learn (Mean = 2.58). These figures suggest that respondents are not resistant to AI but are inclined toward its adoption. The interview responses strongly support this pattern, with lecturers explicitly expressing willingness and interest in integrating AI into teaching and research.

However, the survey also shows comparatively lower mean scores for skills (Mean = 2.33), confidence (Mean = 2.28), and integration into teaching (Mean = 2.28), indicating that readiness is constrained by limited competence and uncertainty. This is vividly illustrated in the interview narratives where lecturers acknowledge gaps in technical skills, lack of confidence, and uncertainty about appropriate usage. Furthermore, the issue of infrastructural limitations, particularly unreliable internet access, emerges in the qualitative data and provides context for why readiness does not translate into effective utilization despite high willingness. The interviews also introduce an important institutional dimension by emphasizing the absence of training programs and clear policies, which directly affects lecturers' confidence and preparedness. Taken together, the integration of both data sources suggests that readiness for AI utilization in the university is aspirational rather than fully realized. While there is a strong willingness to adopt AI, actual readiness is mediated by structural constraints, skill deficits, and lack of institutional support, indicating that meaningful integration of AI will depend on deliberate efforts to bridge these gaps.

Analysis of the Tested Hypotheses

Hypothesis one

There is no significant relationship between the level of awareness of artificial intelligence and readiness for its utilization in teaching, learning, and research activities among students and lecturers.

Table 5: Pearson Correlation between AI Awareness and Readiness among Students

Variables	Mean	SD	r-value	p-value
AI Awareness	2.38	0.81		
AI Readiness	2.42	0.79	0.62	0.000

Decision Rule: Reject H₀ since $p < 0.05$.

Decision: Since the p-value (0.000) is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Interpretation: The result reveals a statistically significant positive relationship ($r = 0.62$) between awareness of artificial intelligence and readiness for its utilization. This indicates that as the level of awareness increases, readiness to utilize AI also increases among students and lecturers. The strength of the correlation suggests a

moderate to strong association, implying that awareness plays a critical role in shaping readiness.

Conclusion: There is a significant relationship between awareness of artificial intelligence and readiness for its utilization in teaching, learning, and research activities. Awareness is therefore a key determinant of readiness within the university context.

Implication: The finding suggests that improving awareness through structured training, curriculum integration, and institutional sensitization programs will likely enhance readiness and promote effective utilization of AI technologies among students

Hypothesis Two

There is no significant difference in the level of awareness of artificial intelligence based on respondents' faculty and level of study.

Given that the independent variables (faculty and level of study) are categorical with more than two groups, and the dependent variable (awareness) is measured on a scale, the most appropriate statistical technique is One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

Table 6: One-Way ANOVA Showing Differences in AI Awareness by Faculty

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p-value
Between Groups	4.82	7	0.69	3.45	0.002
Within Groups	62.40	312	0.20		
Total	67.22	319			

Decision Rule: Reject H_0 since $p < 0.05$.

Decision Rule: Reject the null hypothesis (H_0) if $p < 0.05$.

Decision: Since the p-value (0.002) is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Interpretation: The analysis indicates a statistically significant difference in the level of AI awareness across faculties. This suggests that respondents from different

academic disciplines vary in their level of awareness, likely due to differences in exposure, curriculum content, and technological engagement within their fields.

Table 7: One-Way ANOVA Showing Differences in AI Awareness by Level of Study

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p-value
Between Groups	3.95	4	0.99	4.12	0.003
Within Groups	63.27	315	0.20		
Total	67.22	319			

Decision: Since the p-value (0.003) is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Interpretation: There is a statistically significant difference in AI awareness across levels of study. Higher-level students and lecturers are likely to exhibit greater awareness due to increased academic exposure and research engagement.

Conclusion: There are significant differences in the level of awareness of artificial intelligence based on faculty and level of study.

Implication: The findings imply that interventions to improve AI awareness should be tailored according to disciplinary and academic level differences. Faculties with lower awareness levels require targeted sensitization and capacity-building programs, while efforts at different academic levels should focus on progressively deepening understanding and application of AI technologies.

Discussion of Findings

The findings on the level of awareness of artificial intelligence reveal a generally moderate but uneven pattern among respondents. The grand mean score of 2.38 with an average standard deviation of 0.81 indicates that while awareness exists, it is not deeply grounded. High response rates on basic awareness indicators such as familiarity with AI (Mean = 2.50) and awareness of its use in education (Mean = 2.44) suggest that respondents have been exposed to AI technologies, largely at a functional level. However, lower mean scores on awareness of risks (Mean = 2.28) and institutional policies (Mean = 2.19) indicate limited critical and institutional

understanding. This pattern is reinforced by the qualitative responses where lecturers described their knowledge as “basic” and largely self-acquired. These findings align with the position of Dwivedi et al. (2023), who argue that awareness of AI is expanding globally but remains largely superficial, with limited understanding of its broader implications.

Similarly, Kasneci et al. (2023) observed that awareness is often driven by informal exposure rather than structured learning, which explains the gaps identified in this study. The significant differences observed across faculties ($F = 3.45$, $p = 0.002$) and levels of study ($F = 4.12$, $p = 0.003$) further indicate that awareness is socially distributed and influenced by academic exposure and disciplinary orientation, consistent with earlier findings by Zawacki-Richter et al. (2022) on variations in technological familiarity across fields. The rejection of the second hypothesis therefore supports the objective by demonstrating that awareness is not uniform but varies significantly across institutional categories.

The findings on readiness for the utilization of artificial intelligence indicate a moderately high disposition toward adoption, with a grand mean of 2.42 and an average standard deviation of 0.79. High mean scores on willingness to use AI (Mean = 2.55), openness to training (Mean = 2.63), and readiness to continuously learn (Mean = 2.58) suggest that respondents are positively inclined toward AI integration. However, this willingness is constrained by lower scores in technical competence (Mean = 2.33), confidence (Mean = 2.28), and practical integration into teaching and learning (Mean = 2.28).

The interview responses provide further depth to this finding, as lecturers expressed readiness in principle but acknowledged limitations in skills, infrastructure, and institutional support. This aligns with the position of Adeleke and Ebohon (2023), who identified infrastructural deficits and limited capacity as key barriers to digital technology adoption in Nigerian universities. It also supports the findings of Oloyede et al. (2024), which emphasize that readiness for AI in Nigeria is shaped by both individual willingness and institutional constraints. The significant positive relationship between awareness and readiness ($r = 0.62$, $p = 0.000$) confirms that awareness is a strong predictor of readiness, leading to the rejection of the first

hypothesis. This implies that increased awareness is likely to enhance readiness for utilization, thereby directly linking the two objectives of the study.

Furthermore, the findings of the study are strongly supported by the theoretical framework adopted, namely the Technology Acceptance Model. The significant relationship between awareness and readiness corresponds with the model's assertion that users' perceptions of a technology influence their intention to adopt it. In this study, awareness reflects the cognitive stage where individuals form perceptions about artificial intelligence, while readiness represents the behavioural intention to utilize it. The moderate levels of readiness despite high willingness can be explained by the model's emphasis on perceived ease of use and external variables such as training and institutional support, which were found to be inadequate in this context. Furthermore, the observed variations across faculties and levels of study highlight the role of external factors in shaping technology acceptance, thereby reinforcing the applicability of the model. The findings therefore justify the theoretical position that awareness is a foundational determinant of readiness and that both are influenced by broader institutional conditions, confirming the relevance of the Technology Acceptance Model in explaining AI adoption within the university setting.

Conclusions

The evidence from both quantitative and qualitative data consistently show that awareness of artificial intelligence is present but remains largely moderate and uneven in depth. While a substantial proportion of respondents demonstrated familiarity with AI tools and their general applications in teaching, learning, and research, this awareness is predominantly functional and not sufficiently grounded in critical understanding or institutional frameworks. The relatively lower awareness of ethical concerns, risks, and especially institutional policies indicates that exposure to AI has not been matched with structured guidance or formal integration into academic practice. Variations across faculties and levels of study further suggest that awareness is shaped by academic exposure, disciplinary orientation, and access to technological resources, rather than a coordinated institutional effort.

In relation to readiness for the utilization of artificial intelligence, the study established that both students and lecturers exhibit a generally positive disposition toward adopting AI technologies. The high levels of willingness, openness to training, and readiness for continuous learning reflect a recognition of the relevance of AI in contemporary academic work. However, this readiness is not fully actualized, as it is constrained by limited technical competence, low confidence in practical application, and inadequate institutional support systems. The gap between willingness and actual preparedness highlights the influence of structural factors such as digital infrastructure, access to training, and absence of clear policies guiding AI use.

The findings also demonstrate that awareness significantly influences readiness, indicating that individuals who are more knowledgeable about AI are more likely to be prepared to utilize it effectively. In summary, the study concluded that while there is a strong foundation for the adoption of artificial intelligence within the university, meaningful utilization will depend on deliberate efforts to deepen awareness, build technical capacity, and provide an enabling institutional environment that supports responsible and effective use of AI in teaching, learning, and research.

Recommendations

Arising from the conclusions, the study put forth the following recommendations:

1. The university should introduce structured and continuous capacity-building programmes on artificial intelligence for both lecturers and students. This should go beyond general sensitization to include hands-on training workshops, curriculum integration, and discipline-specific applications of AI in teaching, learning, and research. Such programmes should also incorporate ethical guidelines and academic integrity standards to address the observed gaps in awareness of risks and institutional policies. By doing this, the institution can transform the current functional awareness into deeper, critical understanding while simultaneously improving the technical competence and confidence required for effective utilization.

2. There should also be development and implementation of a clear institutional framework for artificial intelligence adoption within the university. This should include formal policies, usage guidelines, and provision of enabling infrastructure such as reliable internet access, digital tools, and technical support systems. Establishing a coordinated support structure, possibly through a dedicated digital innovation or e-learning unit, will help bridge the gap between willingness and actual readiness identified in the findings. Such an approach ensures that the growing interest in AI among students and lecturers is supported by an environment that facilitates responsible, consistent, and sustainable utilization.

Suggestions for Further Studies

1. Further research should examine the impact of artificial intelligence utilization on academic performance and research productivity among university students and lecturers in Nigerian universities.
2. Institutional determinants of artificial intelligence adoption in higher education, focusing on policy frameworks, infrastructure, and digital capacity in Nigerian universities.

REFERENCES

1. Adeleke, A. A., & Ebohon, O. J. (2023). Digital transformation and higher education in Nigeria: Opportunities and challenges. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28(9), 11521–11539.
2. Ayanwale, M. A., Idowu, K. O., Adelana, O. P., Shosanya, S. O., Falebita, O. S., & Adewale, K. A. (2025). Quantifying teachers' readiness for artificial intelligence adoption in education: A mathematical modeling perspective. *Scientific Reports*, 15, 26043.
3. Bond, M., Bedenlier, S., Marín, V. I., & Händel, M. (2023). Emergency remote teaching in higher education: Mapping the landscape of research. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 71(1), 1–31.

4. Chiu, T. K. F., Meng, H., Chai, C. S., King, I., Wong, S. L., & Yam, Y. (2023). Creation and evaluation of a pre-tertiary artificial intelligence (AI) curriculum. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 4, 100138.
5. Crompton, H., Jones, M. V., & Burke, D. (2023). Affordances and challenges of artificial intelligence in education: A systematic review. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 4, 100118.
6. Dwivedi, Y. K., Kshetri, N., Hughes, L., Slade, E. L., Jeyaraj, A., Kar, A. K., Baabdullah, A. M., Koohang, A., Raghavan, V., Ahuja, M., Albanna, H., Albashrawi, M. A., Al-Busaidi, K. A., Balakrishnan, J., Barlette, Y., Basu, S., Bose, I., Brooks, L., Buhalis, D., ... Wright, R. (2023). So what if ChatGPT wrote it? Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI. *International Journal of Information Management*, 71, 102642.
7. Ghimire, A., Prather, J., & Edwards, J. (2024). Generative AI in education: Educators' awareness, sentiments, and influencing factors.
8. Hamzat, A. A., & Ansah, S. D. (2024). Artificial intelligence awareness and readiness among undergraduate students in Kwara State universities, Nigeria.
9. Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdinger, F. W., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., ... Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 103, 102274.
10. OECD. (2023). OECD digital education outlook 2023: Towards an effective digital education ecosystem. OECD Publishing.
11. Oloyede, A. A., Afolabi, R. F., & Ojo, A. I. (2024). Artificial intelligence adoption in Nigerian universities: Readiness, perceptions and policy implications. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 52(2), 215–233.

12. Sysoyev, P. V. (2023). Artificial intelligence in education: Awareness, readiness and practice of using AI technologies in professional activities by university faculty.
13. UNESCO. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. UNESCO Publishing.
14. World Bank. (2022). Digital technologies in education: Opportunities and challenges in low- and middle-income countries. World Bank Publications.
15. Zawacki-Richter, O., Bond, M., Marin, V. I., & Gouverneur, F. (2022). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 19(1), 1–27.