

“Adopting AI in Indian Education: Challenges of Change and Strategies for Resistance Management”

Prof. Purushotham C J, Ms. Amulya A V

1. Assistant professor, Department of MBA, Visvesvaraya Technological University, Muddenahalli, Karnataka, India (purushotham151987@gmail.com)
2. MBA student, Department of MBA, Visvesvaraya Technological University, Muddenahalli, Karnataka, India (amulyavenkatesh0528@gmail.com)

Abstract

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is transforming the education sector in India, offering innovative solutions for teaching, learning, and institutional management. However, the adoption of Artificial Intelligence in Indian educational institutions faces significant resistance due to various factors, including job insecurity, limited digital literacy, rigid hierarchies, and concerns about the diminishing role of human educators. This study explores the multifaceted nature of resistance to AI adoption in Indian higher education and examines strategies for effective change management in such environments. Employing a mixed-methods approach, the research combines structured surveys and semi-structured interviews across selected universities and colleges in India. The analysis draws from both quantitative and qualitative data to uncover patterns of resistance and highlight the importance of leadership, communication, and continuous professional development in mitigating opposition to technological change. The study also evaluates the relevance and limitations of classical change management models within the Indian academic context. Findings indicate that resistance to AI is more behavioral and psychological than technical, emphasizing the need for human-centered change strategies that promote trust, transparency, and collaboration. Institutions that implemented inclusive training programs and participatory decision-making processes reported smoother transitions and higher AI adoption rates. The study contributes to both theoretical and practical discussions by offering a contextualized framework for managing technological change in Indian education, underscoring the importance of aligning innovation with organizational culture and stakeholder engagement to ensure sustainable AI integration.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligent, Education, Change Management, Organizational Resistance, Higher Education in India, Technology, Strategies.

Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is quickly transforming the education sector across the globe by providing tools to support personalisation of learning, simplify administrative processes, and make data-driven decisions. For India, AI offers a chance to revamp and modernize an unwieldy and heterogeneous system of education. The National Education Policy: 20 (NEP 2020) explicitly recommends leveraging disruptive technologies like AI and machine learning in order to enhance teaching/learning experience and make institutions perform better. The adoption of Artificial Intelligence (AI) is haphazard in Indian higher education constrained by limited digital literacy, institutional inertia, and rampant opposition by faculty and students.

Change theories such as Lewin's (1947) Three-Step Model and Kotter's (1996) Eight-Step Process have helped in explaining how schools work through technological advancements. But, these models must be contextualized to tackle the challenges of the Indian academic milieu, where cultural diversity, a hierarchically driven governance structure, and traditional pedagogical practices impact the progress and the success of possibilities for change. Challenges to edtech implementation The resistance to edtech implementation in education is generally attitudinal rather than technical, situated around job security, autonomy, and the ethical considerations around AI use in classrooms.

The move to digital learning—now accelerated by COVID-19—has led to greater recognition of AI products like adaptive learning systems and automated assessments. But obstacles remain, including insufficient training, distrust in technology and concerns that teacher-student interaction may take a hit. In addition, ethical and language-related issues aside from bureaucratic barriers hinder barriers to implementation of AI, especially in low-resource regions.

This article explores the reasons why there's some resistance to AI in higher education in India and looks at how institutions are responding to these changes. The research aims to shed light on the human and organizational elements that affect technology adoption, providing information to help create more inclusive and sustainable implementation strategies. Additionally, it addresses a significant gap in existing literature by providing a culturally relevant analysis of how AI is transforming education in India.

2. Literature Review

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has come to be recognized as a disruptive driver in the global education space. AI is offering solutions that will improve or maximize teaching efficiencies, customize learning experiences, and optimize institutional processes. We have seen various types of intelligent tutoring systems, predictive analytics, and adaptive learning spaces that have shown promise in maximizing processes, both academic and administrative (Luckin et al, 2016). In India, the institutional push to adopt AI into education has been through its National Education Policy (NEP) 2020, encouraging the integration of emerging technologies to transform teaching and learning (Ministry of Education, 2020). While the policy advocacy has been strong, actual use in practice across institutions remains inconsistent due to disparities in infrastructure, teacher training, and level of digital readiness.

Resistance to technological adoption has been the subject of research on organizational behavior for a long time. Zaltman and Duncan (1977) suggested that resistance is typically a psychological reaction, caused by fear of change, threats to authority or expertise, interference with established modes of operation. In the case of AI, anthropomorphizing applications increases that fear of losing people-based decision-making and judgment. Oreg (2003) pointed out that resistance includes behavioral, affective and cognitive dimensions. In academic settings, teaching staff are often resistant to AI because of inadequate training, fear of losing their jobs, and a general mistrust of the pedagogical advantages of AI technology (Selwyn, 2011). Similarly, administrative personnel may resist automation because of concerns about disrupting established routines and top-down hierarchies. These issues are especially relevant in the Indian situation, where institutions tend to be controlled by inflexible bureaucratic frameworks and restricted participatory decision-making.

Sound change management is critical to managing resistance and making successful AI adoption a possibility. Traditional approaches such as Lewin's (1947) Three-Step Model—unfreezing, changing, and refreezing—provide essential advice on the stages of organizational change. Kotter's (1996) Eight-Step Process expands on this by emphasizing leadership, urgency creation, and institutionalization of new behaviors. While these models are broadly utilized, they are not readily transferable to Indian educational organizations. Hofstede (2001) emphasized that organizational culture plays a major role in how change occurs in organizations, particularly in collectivist countries (e.g. India) that maintain respect for authority, and wherein communication is hierarchal. Some adaptations will have to be made based on culture and this means incorporation of inclusive leadership, localized experiences and training, and maintaining communication strategies.

Numerous research have noted difficulties to AI acceptance in Indian education. Kshetri (2018) identified weaknesses in infrastructure and a lack of regulatory frameworks as barriers to adoption. Bansal and Agarwal (2022) highlighted faculty resistance based on unclear job roles and lack of digital literacy. Importantly, the 'digital divide' between urban and rural areas remains a challenge to equitable access to AI technology in education. Ethical considerations such as data privacy, algorithmic bias, and the marginalization of non-English-speaking or low-income student groups remain under-addressed in institutional policies (Dwivedi et al., 2021). These systemic issues underscore the need for robust institutional strategies and government support mechanisms to facilitate effective AI deployment.

Despite growing global and national interest, there remains a distinct research gap in understanding how Indian institutions manage internal resistance during AI implementation. Most existing literature focuses either on the technological applications of AI or on general change management strategies, with few studies situated at the intersection of these domains within Indian academia. Particularly lacking is empirical evidence on the perceptions of faculty and administrators and how leadership approaches can mitigate resistance and build institutional readiness. This study seeks to bridge that gap by examining the human, structural, and cultural dimensions of AI adoption in Indian higher education, offering context-specific insights and strategic recommendations for sustainable digital transformation.

3. Statement of the Problem

While Artificial Intelligence (AI) has the potential to enhance educational delivery and administration, its integration into Indian educational institutions has been inconsistent and often met with resistance. Despite policy support from the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020, challenges persist beyond infrastructure and digital skills. Deeper issues such as fear of job loss, distrust in technology, lack of training, and limited involvement of stakeholders in decision-making processes remain largely unaddressed.

Existing literature predominantly focuses on the technological benefits of AI or policy-level aspirations, with limited attention to the internal dynamics of change management within institutions. Traditional models of change often fail to account for the hierarchical, resource-constrained, and culturally complex nature of Indian academia. Exclusion of faculty and administrators from AI planning further exacerbates resistance, resulting in poor adoption and misalignment with institutional goals.

This study addresses the lack of empirical, context-specific research on managing resistance to AI in Indian higher education. It aims to identify key resistance factors, assess the effectiveness of current change strategies, and develop a practical framework suited to India's unique educational context. Understanding and addressing these challenges is vital to ensuring that AI adoption contributes meaningfully to inclusive and sustainable educational reform.

4. Research Objectives

1. To identify the key factors contributing to resistance against AI adoption in Indian educational institutions.
2. To examine the role of institutional leadership and communication in facilitating AI-driven change.
3. To analyze the effectiveness of existing change management practices in overcoming resistance within academic environments.

5. Research Methodology

The research was conducted in a mixed-method approach, where both quantitative and qualitative approaches to the problem of resistance to the implementation of AI and change management in Indian higher education were combined. The complexity of the research issue necessitated the use of the research strategy in order to quantify the quantifiable trends, and the rich institutional experiences.

The exploratory research design is descriptive. The descriptive characteristics determined patterns of resistance and the behaviour of the institutions, whereas the exploratory dimension of the research explored the underlying factors of culture and behaviour that can influence the adoption of AI.

The sample frame comprised educational institutions of higher learning in five Indian states, namely, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Delhi and West Bengal, which had a documented history of engagement in digital transformation over the past three years. Institutions had been selected to offer variety between public, private and autonomous institutions. The stakeholders who took part in AI planning or implementation were targeted in the study through purposive sampling. The participants were 120 respondents of a survey and 15 of in-depth interviews. The method of data collection was an application of a standardized questionnaire (with Likert-type questions concerning

the usefulness of AI, training sufficiency, and the perceived impact on work) and a semi-standardized interview guide on the theme of leadership, communication, and institutional preparedness.

The SPSS was used to test quantitative data by performing descriptive statistics and correlation analysis to check the connection between resistance and other most significant factors such as training, leadership support, and job security. Manual coding was carried out and qualitative data analyzed themmatically and also this was triangulated with survey information in order to give reliability. Every ethical procedure was used. A process of informed consent was obtained, confidentiality was guaranteed, and the participants had been given the right to make withdrawals at any point.

6. Data Interpretation and Analysis

This part includes important takeaways from the quantitative and qualitative analyses that were performed to study the factors of resistance AI adoption along with the institutional responses in Indian higher education.

As for the quantitative data with regard to the survey sample of 120 participants, faculty members comprised about 62% of respondents, while mid-level administrators accounted for 25%, and technicians occupied 13%. A considerable portion (58%) reported limited familiarity with AI tools and public institutions represented 70% of this sample. Participants also showed elevated concern regarding job security (mean score = 4.1) as well as career advancement opportunities given a lack of training programs available (mean = 4.3), both indicating hurdles to greater technology penetration at their organizations.

The results from correlation analysis confirm that there is a significant negative relationship between the degree of institutional support and resistance ($r = -0.52$, $p < 0.01$). Respondents subjected to stronger training offered by leadership active in role modeling appropriate behaviors showed reduced levels of opposition that communicated more than were required displayed less resistance leading to strong conclusions on supportive environments diminishing barriers to change.

It showed a predominance of top-down implementation and poor stakeholder involvement in the qualitative observations, comprising of 15 interviews of academic and administrative leaders. Study subjects condemned lack of communicate and training. There were also criticisms that AI will destroy the human aspect of teaching and that most teachers find it as a threat to the human side of education.

The one that is interesting is the fact that even the institutions which managed to succeed with AI adoption, engaged stakeholders when planning, provided directed capacity building, and piloted technology in a phased manner. All these all-encompassing plans led to the suppression of anxiety and an increase in openness among the staff.

7. Findings

Qualitative and quantitative data analysis demonstrated several core findings when it comes to the nature and responsibilities of resisting AI in educational institutions in India:

1. Extreme Psychological Barriers: Many of the research participants were terrified that would harm their position in the workplace or cut their relevance in the organization. Originally, this mental obstacle was due to confusion, ambiguity and fear of technological redundancy.

2. Poor Training and Digital Preparedness: Over 50 percent of the people who completed a survey revealed that they did not have adequate knowledge or preparation with regards to the use of AI tools. This gap led to worries, misunderstandings, and doubt of the usefulness of AI integration.

3. Poor Communication and Top-Down Implementation: Much of the introduced AI-based systems were followed without appropriate consultation of the faculty and the administrative faculties at the institution level. Resistance was greatly caused by the lack of communication and participatory planning.

4. Importance of Leadership Influence: Low degrees of resistance were noted in institutions where the leadership was active and involved. Transparency, less fear, and acceptance were created with help of leaders who could follow AI application examples and engaged into an open chat.

5. Inclusive Institutions had Easier Transitions: Colleges and universities that included faculty in deciding matters, that also gave them consistent support, as well as the feedback sessions had a very smooth experience as far as the adoption of AI was concerned.

8. Suggestions

In accordance with the above findings, the following proposals are presented to educational leaders, policymakers and technology implementers:

1. Create AI Training Programs that are Context-Specific: Institutions need to develop practical based training programs that are need-based and tailored to the roles, training and understanding of technology by the faculty and staff.

2. Assure Participatory Change Planning: Instead, decision-makers should engage vital participants, such as faculty, IT teams, as well as administrative staff members in all phases of AI planning and implementation. Inclusive planning helps create a sense of trust and create a sense of ownership of the change.

3. Build an Open Dialogue Plan: Open communication should also be created to clarify the myths of AI and make all stakeholders knowledgeable about its prerogative, scope, and advantages.

4. Integrate Change Management into Policy Design: The policymakers/ institutional leaders are suggested to ensure that the actions strategies on change management are included in the plans of AI implementation (not only based on technical changes but also connected with emotional changes).

5. Market Leadership as the Change Agents: Leadership at all levels must not be apposed to the use of AI, but must be observed to actively use it. Their participation has the ability to gain confidence and an optimistic view of a change.

9. Conclusion

Artificial Intelligence presents immense potential to enhance the quality, efficiency, and accessibility of education in India. However, its effective execution is dependent on not only on infrastructure and policy frameworks but also on the ability of institutions to manage internal resistance and facilitate organizational change. According to this study, opposition to AI is deeply rooted in psychological discomfort, lack of preparedness, and exclusion from planning processes. It also highlights that when institutions invest in training, foster inclusive leadership, and maintain transparent communication, the path to AI adoption becomes smoother and more sustainable.

The study contributes to academic literature by providing an empirical, context-specific understanding of resistance in Indian educational institutions. It bridges a critical gap between theoretical change management models and the practical realities of technology integration in emerging economies. The proposed conceptual framework offers a strategic approach for managing resistance and can serve as a reference for educational leaders aiming to modernize their institutions through AI.

In conclusion, overcoming resistance to AI in Indian education calls for more than just technological readiness. It demands a human-centered approach that aligns digital innovation with institutional culture, leadership vision, and

stakeholder engagement. Only through such a balanced strategy can Indian education systems fully realize the transformative promise of AI.

References:

1. Aleven, V., Sewall, J., Baker, R. S. J. d., Wang, Y., & Popescu, O. (2016). Enhancing MOOCs with intelligent tutoring systems. *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM Conference on Learning@Scale*, 143–152. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2876034.2876050>
2. Bansal, P., & Agarwal, S. (2022). Barriers to technology adoption in Indian higher education: A faculty perspective. *Journal of Educational Technology in Developing Areas*, 9(2), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jreda.2022.09205>
3. Burnes, B. (2004). Kurt Lewin and complexity theories: Back to the future? *Journal of Change Management*, 4(4), 309–325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1469701042000317843>
4. Graesser, A. C., Chipman, P., & Leeming, F. (2009). Deep learning and emotion in serious games. In *Serious Games: Mechanisms and Effects* (pp. 105–124). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203891885-8>
5. Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2022). *Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning*. Center for Curriculum Redesign. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003179118>
6. Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452231151>
7. Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Harvard Business Review Press. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2007.00432.x>