Undergraduates' Perception on The Influence of Institutional Artificial Intelligence Policies on Academic Use of Artificial Intelligence In Ilorin, Kwara State

Semiu Olawal Makinde[1]*, Aliyu Olayink Ubadawaki[1], Jimoh Ibrahim Idowu[1]
[1]*Al-Hikmah University, Ilorin, Nigeria*

ABSTRACT
The ethical and responsible use of AI in academia is a matter of concern as universities continue to establish policies governing its use. This study investigated undergraduates' perceptions of the influence of institutional artificial intelligence policies on their academic use of AI in universities in Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria. A descriptive survey research design was adopted. A sample of 276 undergraduate students was selected from a population of 75,110 students from two universities in the Ilorin metropolis. Data were collected through a structured questionnaire and analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The results show that undergraduates perceive institutional artificial intelligence policies as influencing their use of AI for academic activities. No significant difference was found in these perceptions based on gender or level of study. The study concludes that institutional artificial intelligence policies moderately influence undergraduates' use of AI for academic activities. It recommends that universities clarify and improve AI policies to enhance the positive impact of AI use on students' studies.

ABSTRAK
Penggunaan kecerdasan buatan (AI) secara etis dan bertanggung jawab di lingkungan akademik menjadi perhatian seiring dengan semakin banyaknya universitas yang menetapkan kebijakan terkait penggunaannya. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui persepsi mahasiswa mengenai pengaruh kebijakan institusi terkait kecerdasan buatan terhadap penggunaan AI untuk keperluan akademik di universitas di Ilorin, Negara Bagian Kwara, Nigeria. Penelitian ini menggunakan desain survei deskriptif. Sampel terdiri atas 276 mahasiswa yang dipilih dari populasi sebanyak 75.110 mahasiswa dari dua universitas di wilayah Ilorin. Data dikumpulkan melalui kuesioner terstruktur dan dianalisis menggunakan statistik deskriptif dan inferensial. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa mahasiswa merasakan adanya pengaruh kebijakan institusi terkait kecerdasan buatan terhadap penggunaan AI dalam kegiatan akademik. Tidak ditemukan perbedaan yang signifikan berdasarkan jenis kelamin maupun tingkat pendidikan mahasiswa. Penelitian ini menyimpulkan bahwa kebijakan institusi terkait kecerdasan buatan memberikan pengaruh yang cukup terhadap penggunaan AI dalam kegiatan akademik mahasiswa. Universitas disarankan untuk memperjelas dan meningkatkan kebijakan terkait AI agar penggunaan AI memberikan dampak yang lebih positif terhadap pembelajaran mahasiswa.

CONTACT
osmakintoch1@gmail.com

KEYWORDS
Artificial Intelligence, Institutional Artificial Intelligence Policies, Undergraduate.

INTRODUCTION

The advent of Artificial Intelligence (AI) technologies in higher education has revolutionized the university environment for today's students. AI tools like intelligent tutoring systems, adaptive learning platforms, virtual

assistants, automated assessment systems, and generative AI such as ChatGPT, Gemini, and Microsoft Copilot have transformed student learning by making information more accessible, academic tasks more efficient, collaborative learning more effective, and learning activities more engaging. These technologies have made personalized learning more effective by delivering immediate feedback, personalized learning paths, and anytime learning assistance, which eventually leads to better learning efficiency and engagement (Crompton & Burke, 2023; Qian & Bowman, 2026).

The advent of generative AI has further propelled this change by allowing students to generate ideas, summarize academic content, write essays, solve programming problems, analyze data sets, and get explanations specific to their level of understanding. Despite these benefits, there are significant concerns arising from the broad use of AI, including fears for academic integrity, an over-reliance on AI-generated content, a decrease in critical thinking skills, privacy, algorithmic biases, and the ethical use of AI technologies. Research indicates that AI can boost productivity and performance in education, but over-dependence on such tools could harm students' problem-solving, creativity, and self-learning skills (Kai & Kai, 2025). The concerns have led to the creation of AI governance policies by universities, efforts to enhance AI literacy, and the revision of assessment methods to foster responsible and ethical AI usage (Qian & Bowman, 2026). Generative AI tools like ChatGPT, Gemini, Microsoft Copilot, and Claude have made their presence in the lives of students a more commonplace, forcing universities to develop policies and procedures to ensure the responsible, ethical, and transparent use of these technologies, and to maintain academic integrity.

Institutional AI policies generally include rules around appropriate and inappropriate use, disclosure of AI use for assignments, plagiarism and attribution, and guidance for students and faculty on using AI in teaching, learning, and assessment (Perkins et al., 2024). Institutional AI policies also aim to strike a balance between the educational value of AI and the potential risks of over-dependence on AI technologies, such as reduced critical thinking, algorithmic bias, misinformation, privacy issues, and inequity in access to AI tools. As a result, several universities are rethinking how they assess students, with a growing focus on methods that are more difficult for students to cheat on, like open-ended, competency-based, and process-oriented assessments. According to UNESCO (2023) and the European Commission (2026), institutions are expected to develop AI literacy programs, training, and ethical guidance for students, preparing them for the responsible and effective use of AI in academic settings. There is a lack of empirical research on how undergraduate students perceive the AI policies. This lack of understanding presents a significant issue for universities: if they do not have an understanding of student perspectives, they may be designing policies that are disconnected, too punitive, or too confusing, which can encourage students to use AI behind their back, increase academic anxiety, or fail to foster the academic technology literacy required for students. Therefore, this study investigates undergraduates' perception on the influence of institutional artificial intelligence policies on academic use of artificial intelligence in Ilorin, Kwara State.

Research Purpose

The primary objective of this study is to investigate the perceived impact of institutional AI policies on undergraduates' academic use of artificial intelligence in Kwara State. Specifically, this study will:

1. Examine undergraduates' perceived influence of institutional artificial intelligence policies on their use of artificial intelligence for academic activities.
2. Determine the significant difference between male and female undergraduates' perceived influence of artificial intelligence policies on their academic use of artificial intelligence.
3. Determine the significant differences in the undergraduates' perceived influence of artificial intelligence policies on their academic use of artificial intelligence based on the level of study.

Research Question

1. How do undergraduates perceive the influence of institutional artificial intelligence policies on their actual use of artificial intelligence for academic activities?

Research Hypotheses

H_{01}: There is no significant difference between male and female undergraduates ' perceived influence of artificial intelligence policies on their academic use of artificial intelligence.

H_{02}: There is no significant difference in the undergraduates' perceived influence of artificial intelligence policies on their academic use based on the level of study.

METHODS

The study adopted descriptive research of the survey type. This design is appropriate because it is a scientific method that involves observing and describing the behaviour of the problem and collecting relevant and adequate data. This design, therefore, gathered information and collected data from the respondents through the use of a

researcher-designed questionnaire. The population for this study consisted of all undergraduate students in Ilorin metropolis. The target population was all undergraduates in the University of Ilorin and Al-Hikmah University. These universities were selected because they were the two universities in the Ilorin metropolis. The sampled population was selected through multistage sampling procedures. A simple random sampling technique was used to select the respondents across all levels of study. In determining the sample size of this study, the tabulation sample size of Research Advisors (2006) at 95% confidence and 5.0% margin of error was employed. Random sampling techniques were employed in selecting the respondents. A total of 276 teachers were sampled.

The instrument for this study was a researcher-designed questionnaire, which was used to collect data for this study. The questionnaire has two sections; Section A contains the demographic information of respondents, such as gender, level, and area of specialization, and Section B focuses on undergraduates' perceived influence of institutional artificial intelligence policies on their actual use of artificial intelligence for academic activities. The questionnaire is a four-point Likert scale, ranging from Strongly Agree (SA)- 4 points, Agree (A)-3 points, Disagree (D)- 2 points, to Strongly Disagree (SD).

The instrument was reviewed by three experts in the Department of Science Education, Al-Hikmah University, and the researcher-designed questionnaire was validated. This was done to determine the appropriateness of the questionnaire and to ascertain its face and content validity. In order to determine the reliability of the instruments, the instrument was pilot tested for reliability on thirty-six (36) randomly selected students from Ladoke Akintola University of Technology (LAUTECH), Nigeria. Cronbach's Alpha statistical tool was used to establish the reliability coefficient of the instrument section by section at a 0.05 level of significance. The coefficient of reliability results yielded a 0.75 coefficient of reliability.

The researcher obtained a letter of introduction was taken to the University of Ilorin and Al-Hikmah University to seek permission from relevant authorities before administering the questionnaire. The researcher, with the help of research assistants, administered the questionnaire to Unilorin and Al-Hikmah University students. Concerning ethical issues for this study, the researcher sought consent from the respondents and subsequently informed them about the study procedure and the importance of the study. The respondents were not compelled to respond to the instrument and voluntarily participated in the process. All the respondents were given a sense of autonomy, and anonymity, confidentiality, and privacy of the respondents were maintained and considered. Data collected was treated with utmost confidentiality and anonymity. The data collected were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics with the use of the SPSS software version 27.0. Frequency counts, percentage, and mean were used to answer the research question. Hypothesis 1 was tested using an independent t-test, and hypothesis 2. All hypotheses will be tested at the 0.05 level of significance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Demographic Data

The data gathered through the questionnaires were analysed using frequency count and percentage for demographic data and the research question.

Table 1. Gender of the Respondents

Gender	Frequency	%
1. Male	127	46.1%
2. Female	149	53.9%
Total	**276**	**100%**

Descriptive statistics (frequency count & percentage) were used to calculate and summarise the distribution of gender in the study. As shown in Table 2, female students have the highest number of respondents (F = 149, 53.9%). While the males have the lowest number of respondents (F=127, 46.1%).

Table 2. Level of Study of the Respondents

Level	Frequency	%
1. 100L	82	29.7
2. 200L	88	31.9
3. 300L	52	18.8
4. 400L	32	11.6
5. 500L	22	8.0
Total	**276**	**100**

Descriptive statistics (frequency count & percentage) were used to calculate and summarise the distribution of students' levels in the study. As shown in Table 2, 100-level students are 82 (29.7%) of the respondents; 200-level students are 88 (31.9%) of the respondents; 300-level students are 52 (18.8%) of the respondents; 400-level students are 32 (11.6%) of the respondents, and 500-level students are 22 (8.0%) of the respondents.

Analysis of Result

Research Question 1: How do undergraduates perceive the influence of institutional artificial intelligence policies on their use of artificial intelligence for academic activities?

Table 3. Undergraduates perceive the influence of institutional artificial intelligence policies on their use of artificial intelligence for academic activities

No.	Items	Mean	Std. Deviation
1.	I know that my institution has policies in place for the use of artificial intelligence for academic purposes.	3.30	0.93
2.	The policies at my institution have an impact on my use of artificial intelligence tools for assignments and coursework.	3.58	0.67
3.	I use artificial intelligence tools responsibly due to my institution's artificial intelligence policies.	3.52	0.64
4.	The use of artificial intelligence in academic work is clearly defined in my institution's artificial intelligence policies.	3.06	0.88
5.	I avoid inappropriate use of artificial intelligence because I understand the consequences outlined in my institution's artificial intelligence policies.	2.96	0.92
6.	My institution's artificial intelligence policies encourage me to use AI ethically for learning and research.	2.79	1.08
7.	The existence of institutional artificial intelligence policies has increased my confidence in using artificial intelligence tools appropriately for academic activities.	3.25	0.76
8.	I disclose the use of artificial intelligence in academic work as required by my institution's artificial intelligence policies.	3.27	0.75
9.	The advice I get from my lecturers on institutional AI policies shapes my academic approach to using artificial intelligence tools.	4.07	13.5
10.	My institution's artificial intelligence policies positively impact the way I use artificial intelligence for academic pursuits.	3.45	1.37
	Grand Mean	**3.43**	

Table 3 shows that undergraduates perceive the influence of institutional artificial intelligence policies on their use of artificial intelligence for academic activities. In order to answer this research question 1, a benchmark of 2.5 was set for this analysis. The benchmark of 2.5 was calculated by adding up each value of the 4- Likert scale and divided by 4 (SA = 4, A = 3, D = 2, and SD = 1. 4+3+2+1=10 divided by 4 = 2.5. Therefore, any statement equal to or above 2.5 was considered in agreement, while statements below were considered not in agreement. The analysis shows that all the mean values are above the 2.5 benchmark. Also, the grand mean of 3.43 was found to be above the benchmark of 2.5. Since the grand mean is above the benchmark 2.5, this implies that undergraduates perceive the influence of institutional artificial intelligence policies on their use of artificial intelligence for academic activities.

Hypothesis Testing

H_{01}: There is no significant difference between male and female undergraduates ' perceived influence of artificial intelligence policies on their academic use of artificial intelligence.

Table 4. Independent Sample t-test showing a significant difference between male and female undergraduates' perceived influence of artificial intelligence policies on their academic use of artificial intelligence

Gender	N	X	SD	Df	T	Sig. (2-tailed)	Decision
Male	127	36.52	29.65				
				274	1.722	.086	Not Rejected
Female	149	32.16	3.67				

The independent samples t-test indicates that there is no significant difference between male and female undergraduates' perceived influence of artificial intelligence policies on their academic use of artificial intelligence. The sample included 127 male students with a mean of 36.65 (SD = 29.65) and 149 female students with a mean of 32.16 (SD = 3.67). The t-value was 1.722, with a p-value of .086. Since the p-value exceeds the threshold alpha level of 0.05. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between male and female undergraduates ' perceived influence of artificial intelligence policies on their academic use of artificial intelligence.
H_{02}: There is no significant difference in the undergraduates' perceived influence of artificial intelligence policies on their academic use based on the level of study.

Table 5. Independent Sample t-test showing a significant difference in the undergraduates' perceived influence of artificial intelligence policies on their academic use based on the level of study

Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.184	4	0.546	1.432	0.223
Within Groups	103.338	271	0.381		
Total	105.522	275			

Table 5 shows that the level of study did not significantly affect the perceptions of the undergraduates on the impact of institutional AI policies on the use of AI for academic work ($p = 0.223 > 0.05$). So, the null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the undergraduates' perceived influence of artificial intelligence policies on their academic use based on the level of study.

Discussion of Findings

The study revealed that undergraduates believed that institutional AI policies had an impact on their academic activities with AI. The discovery indicates that institutional guidance has a significant impact on student choices regarding the proper and moral use of AI tools like ChatGPT, Gemini, Microsoft Copilot, and other generative AI applications. General perceptions about AI policies suggest that students are aware of institutional guidelines and expectations related to the responsible use of AI, academic integrity, and transparency. As universities embrace AI in the classroom, communicating policies carefully can help guide students to leverage AI as a tool for learning, not a means to replace their own work or critical thinking. This result is consistent with Perkins et al. (2024), who stated that effective institutional AI policies can educate students on the appropriate use of AI tools, foster academic honesty, and responsible technology use.

The study also found no statistically significant difference between male and female undergraduates in their perception of how much institutional AI policies affect their academic use of AI. This indicates that both male and female students generally interpret and respond to institutional AI policies in similar ways. The discovery suggests that the impact of institutional policies does not vary across gender, but rather it is linked to a common academic setting where all students are subject to the same policies, expectations, and institutional advice about how to use AI.

The study also found no statistically significant difference in undergraduates' perceived influence of institutional AI policies based on their level of study. This indicates that students of different academic levels (100L to 500L) have similar perceptions of institutional AI policies. The uniformity of the implementation of institutional rules and policies for all undergraduate programmes may be responsible for this finding. Students at all levels of

academic achievement will likely have similar expectations for academic honesty, institutional rules, and expectations about AI use.

CONCLUSIONS

The study concludes that institutional artificial intelligence policies influenced undergraduates' use of AI for academic activities. There was no significant difference in the perceived influence of these policies across genders or educational levels, suggesting a fairly consistent perception among undergraduates. The study recommends that universities should clarify and improve AI policies to improve the positive impact on students' use of AI in their studies.

REFERENCES

An, Q., Koh, J. H. L., & Liu, Q. (2026). Generative artificial intelligence in higher education: A systematic review of student use and learning outcomes. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.10561

Crompton, H., & Burke, D. (2023). Artificial intelligence in higher education: The state of the field. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *20*(1), 22. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00392-8

European Commission. (2026). *Guidelines on the ethical use of artificial intelligence and data in teaching and learning for educators - publications office of the EU*. Publications Office of the EU. https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/f692aa0b-17a7-11f1-8870-01aa75ed71a1/

Kai, K., & Kai, K. (2025). Generative AI in Higher education: A systematic review of its effects on learning outcomes and academic performance [Review of *Generative AI in Higher education: A systematic review of its effects on learning outcomes and academic performance*]. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, *54*(3). https://doi.org/10.1177/00472395251400089

Perkins, M., Furze, L., Roe, J., & MacVaugh, J. (2024). The artificial intelligence assessment scale (AIAS): A framework for Ethical integration of generative AI in Educational assessment. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, *21*(06). https://doi.org/10.53761/q3azde36

Qian, Y., & Bowman, N. A. (2026). Toward responsible integration: A review of applications, capabilities, and perceptions of generative AI in Higher education. *Education Sciences*, *16*(2), 323. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci16020323

UNESCO. (2023, September 7). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research* [Review of *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*]. Unesco.Org; UNESCO. https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/guidance-generative-ai-education-and-research