# AI-Empowered Innovation Pathways for University Administrative Management: A Three-Dimensional Framework Integrating Technology, Institutions, and Talent

**Wei Xu**
*Central University of Finance and Economics, Beijing, China*

**Abstract: Artificial intelligence is now reshaping digital transformation in higher education. However, existing discussions still focus more on teaching, learning, and assessment, while giving insufficient attention to the administrative systems that support the daily operation of universities. This paper examines how AI can promote innovation in university administrative management, with particular attention to the organizational conditions under which such innovation can be implemented. Through a qualitative analysis of research on AI in higher education, digital transformation, public-sector AI adoption, and institutional AI governance, this paper identifies three long-standing core problems in university administration: fragmented data systems, inefficient administrative processes, and weak governance and capability structures. Drawing on socio-technical systems theory and the technology-organization-environment (TOE) framework, the paper develops an analytical framework composed of three dimensions: technology empowerment, institutional innovation, and talent development. The core argument is that institutional innovation plays a critical role because AI projects cannot be scaled through technical tools alone. They also require institutional authorization, process redesign, improved data governance, and clear responsibility arrangements across departments. The paper further proposes a staged implementation path to guide universities from limited pilot projects toward a more stable administrative transformation with clearer accountability.**

**Keywords: Artificial Intelligence; University Administrative Management; Digital Transformation; Governance; Talent Development**

## 1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) has become an important driver of digital transformation in higher education. Early review studies showed that most AI research in universities focused on teaching, learning, and assessment, while administrative management and organizational operations have received relatively limited attention [1,2]. This imbalance can no longer be ignored. Under growing operational pressure, universities need to provide more efficient services, process massive amounts of data, meet complex compliance requirements, and maintain service quality. Administrative work is therefore no longer a marginal support function. If AI-driven change is to reshape how universities govern themselves day to day, this is where it needs to happen.

In the Chinese higher education sector, this issue is particularly prominent. University governance is shaped by clear policy guidance, continuously expanding digital infrastructure, and the pressure to modernize public services. Administrative departments must not only improve efficiency, but also strengthen cross-departmental collaboration, ensure data consistency, improve risk-control mechanisms, and enhance service quality for teachers and students. AI matters in this context not because it is fashionable, but because many administrative bottlenecks involve large-scale information processing, repetitive workflow execution, data classification and retrieval, predictive analysis, and decision support.

### 1.1 Literature Review and Research Gap

The first stream of literature focuses on the application of AI in higher education. Zawacki-Richter, Marin, Bond, and Gouverneur [1] showed that studies published from 2007 to 2018 mainly concentrated on pedagogical applications, and later reviews reached similar conclusions. Chen, Chen, and Lin [2] pointed

 

out that the field mainly focused on intelligent tutoring, adaptive learning, and learning analytics, while governance and administrative management remained relatively underdeveloped as independent research topics. These studies are valuable, but they also reveal that universities are often treated simply as teaching sites rather than as complex organizational entities that depend on complete administrative systems.

The second stream of literature focuses on digital transformation in higher education. Marks, Al-Ali, Atassi, Abualkishik, and Rezgui [3] and Al-Ali and Marks [4] argued that many educational institutions tend to overestimate their digital maturity because they only digitize isolated processes without building coherent enterprise-level digital capabilities. Fernandez, Gomez, Binjaku, and Kajo Mece [5] further showed that digital transformation initiatives in higher education are generally fragmented, and that reform at the administrative level receives far less attention than teaching innovation. Recent synthesis studies have also identified similar obstacles, including weak digital strategy, insufficient infrastructure, clear capability gaps, strong resistance to change, and inadequate policy coordination [6-9].

The third stream of literature focuses on AI governance in public organizations and emerging institutional policies in higher education. Madan and Ashok [10] pointed out that AI adoption and diffusion in public administration are shaped by technological, organizational, and environmental conditions as well as public-value tensions. Selten and Klievink [11] argued that public organizations need to decide whether AI capacity should be assigned to specialized units or integrated into operational departments, because the two models create different implementation barriers. At the level of higher education institutions, UNESCO [12] emphasizes human-centered governance, privacy protection, and AI literacy development. An, Yu, and James [13] found that leading universities have developed generative AI guidelines covering teaching, research, and administration, while Erhardt, Kullenberg, Grigoriadis, Kumar, Christidis, and Christidis [14] showed that substantial differences remain in institutional practice.

Although these studies offer valuable insights, a research gap remains. Existing literature often discusses AI applications in education, the overall trend of digital transformation, or AI governance mechanisms in public organizations as separate topics. It less often integrates these discussions into a practical framework for university administrative management. To fill this gap, this paper makes a simple argument: sustainable administrative change requires technology, institutions, and talent to move forward together, not separately.

### 1.2 Analytical Method and Research Questions

This paper adopts a qualitative conceptual analysis method. It synthesizes selected studies and policy-oriented reports related to AI applications in higher education, digital transformation, public-sector AI adoption, and AI governance in higher education institutions. The purpose is not to provide a new empirical dataset or to conduct a systematic review. Rather, the paper integrates existing research into an analytical framework to explain how universities can organize and promote AI-enabled administrative innovation.

The discussion is organized around three research questions: In the digital era, what major pain points continue to constrain university administrative management? Which AI application scenarios are most helpful for promoting administrative transformation? How should technology, institutions, and talent be integrated into a coherent implementation framework for universities?

## 2. Current Pain Points in University Administrative Management

Data fragmentation is a structural obstacle faced by many universities. Administrative work is usually distributed across academic affairs, student affairs, finance, human resources, logistics, research offices, libraries, information technology, and other functional departments. These departments often rely on systems purchased or developed at different times for different purposes, resulting in insufficient interoperability, inconsistent data definitions, repeated manual data entry, and limited data sharing. Fernandez, Gomez, Binjaku, and Kajo Mece [5] and Gkrimpizi, Peristeras, and Magnisalis [6] both show that fragmented information architecture remains one of the major barriers to digital transformation in higher education. Carmo, Lacerda, Klingenberg, and Piran [15] also noted that higher education

 

management research increasingly emphasizes the need to integrate administrative data, processes, and decision mechanisms.

Process inefficiency is another recurring constraint. Many universities still use approval systems that are lengthy, paper-dependent, highly repetitive, or only superficially digitized. Although electronic forms are used, these tools often simply replicate old processes rather than reconstruct them systematically. Delays in project applications, procurement review, leave approval, reimbursement processing, document archiving, and student service requests are therefore rooted both in workflow design flaws and in excessive staff workload. Peyton, Unnikrishnan, and Mulligan [16] found that even student support – usually seen as a frontline service – still offers plenty of room for chatbots to handle routine questions, cut response times, and make better use of existing knowledge bases.

Weak governance and limited organizational capability further reduce the practical value of AI investment. Universities may have purchased AI-related software, but its practical use remains limited when there is no university-wide digital vision, when responsibilities for data governance are unclear, and when standards for privacy, security, procurement, and accountability are inconsistent. Al-Ali and Marks [4] argued that maturity depends not only on access to technology but also on the overall coordination capacity of the institution. Rahmadi [7], Singun [8], and Mabotha and Ngcamu [9] all emphasized that lack of leadership, insufficient capability, and poor policy integration remain long-standing constraints. The deeper problem is organizational readiness rather than the simple absence of tools.

A related issue is the weakness of evaluation mechanisms. In many institutions, digital initiatives are evaluated mainly by whether a system has been successfully launched, rather than by whether it has actually shortened process cycles, improved user experience, enhanced data quality, or strengthened policy compliance. This evaluation orientation leads to a deep disconnection between visible modernization and actual operational improvement. If universities cannot establish clear performance indicators for administrative AI, they will find it difficult to distinguish scalable solutions from short-lived technical demonstrations.

## 3. AI Application Scenarios in University Administrative Management

Student service and communication support is the most visible entry point for administrative AI. Universities routinely receive large numbers of repetitive inquiries about admissions, registration procedures, fees, scholarships, course selection, graduation requirements, dormitory arrangements, campus facilities, and deadlines. Peyton, Unnikrishnan, and Mulligan [16] systematically reviewed university chatbots developed to provide support beyond classroom learning and found that closed-domain chatbots are especially suitable for routine administrative inquiries. For university managers, their practical value is clear: around-the-clock response capacity, reduced front-desk workload, more efficient access to standard information, and more consistent service channels. Such tools are particularly valuable for large universities whose service demand fluctuates seasonally but reaches high peak intensity.

Document management, workflow optimization, and approval process reform provide another set of practical opportunities. AI does not need to replace existing positions comprehensively in order to create value. Its more realistic contribution often lies in precise support for specific tasks, such as intelligent document classification, OCR-based automatic data extraction, policy retrieval assistance, automatic meeting-summary generation, preliminary form checking, and optimized workflow routing. Carmo, Lacerda, Klingenberg, and Piran [15] pointed out that process optimization and automation are core management dimensions of digital transformation in higher education institutions. When these functions are integrated with workflow systems, they can effectively shorten processing cycles, reduce repetitive clerical work, and improve full-process traceability. Universities should prioritize scenarios with stable rules, clear data structures, and measurable service outcomes.

Data-driven analysis and decision support can effectively strengthen the functional performance of administrative management. Many decisions concerning resource allocation, staffing, student support, risk management, and performance monitoring are made under conditions of incomplete information. Marks, Al-Ali, Atassi, Abualkishik, and Rezgui [3] noted that universities generally lack integrated data architectures that support mature decision

 

making. AI can play a practical role through data aggregation, pattern recognition, anomaly warnings, and management dashboard support. Specific application scenarios include early-warning mechanisms for high-risk students, service-demand prediction models, anomaly detection in financial processes, and support for research management planning. That said, researchers studying public-sector AI have a clear warning: do not treat AI as a fully autonomous decision-maker. Madan and Ashok [10] and Selten and Klievink [11] both indicate that AI adoption in public organizations must remain attentive to public values, accountability, and institutional context.

Governance support also deserves attention as an application area. The widespread adoption of generative AI has made universities increasingly aware that AI use must be supported by clear acceptable-use norms, transparency requirements, data-protection measures, source-verification mechanisms, and accountability systems. An, Yu, and James [13] showed that many leading universities have developed specific guidelines for different stakeholders, while Erhardt, Kullenberg, Grigoriadis, Kumar, Christidis, and Christidis [14] found that actual practices still differ significantly across institutions. Similar challenges arise when AI is used in internal document drafting, policy interpretation, case preparation, human-resource support, or student communication. Governance mechanisms should therefore be systematically incorporated at the beginning of application design.

AI can also provide effective support for administrative planning in research management, finance, and human resources. Universities can use data analytics to monitor funding application progress, detect reporting anomalies, predict service demand, support staffing analysis, and identify workflow bottlenecks across offices. Such applications are most appropriate when they serve as useful complements to existing accountability mechanisms. Administrative departments usually need systems that improve work consistency and traceability, rather than opaque automation solutions that make responsibility more difficult to assign.

## 4. A Three-Dimensional Framework: Technology, Institutions, and Talent

AI-driven university administrative reform can be understood as a process of three-dimensional coordinated change. This framework is built on two interrelated theoretical perspectives. Bostrom and Heinen's [17] socio-technical perspective makes clear that technical tools alone are not enough; organizations perform well only when technical systems and social arrangements are designed together. The technology-organization-environment (TOE) framework suggests that technology adoption is shaped not only by technological characteristics, but also by organizational capability and external institutional conditions [18]. For university administrative management, these two perspectives jointly support a comprehensive analytical framework that integrates technical infrastructure, institutional rules, and human capability.

**Table 1. Summary of the Three-Dimensional Framework for AI-Enabled University Administrative Management**

| Dimension | Main function | Main administrative tasks | Risks if the dimension is neglected |
|---|---|---|---|
| Technology empowerment | Provides infrastructure, data, and tools | Data integration, workflow platforms, knowledge bases, identity and access control, AI-enabled service tools | Isolated systems, poor data quality, repeated manual operation, insufficient scalability |
| Institutional innovation | Provides authorization, rules, and coordination mechanisms | Top-level strategy, data governance, process redesign, privacy and security standards, cross-departmental coordination | Pilot projects remain fragmented, responsibility boundaries are unclear, compliance risks increase |
| Talent development | Provides operational and governance capability | Leadership literacy, staff training, professional support, role-based AI application, performance evaluation | Tools are underused or misused, staff resistance increases, related policies are difficult to implement effectively |

Within this framework, technology empowerment provides tools and infrastructure; institutional innovation establishes rules, authorization, and coordination mechanisms; and talent development cultivates the human capability required to use, evaluate, and continuously maintain new systems. The three dimensions can be distinguished analytically, but in practice they are closely interdependent. Weakness in any one dimension will constrain progress in the other two. Table 1 summarizes the internal logic of the framework and identifies

 

the management risks that commonly arise when each dimension is neglected.

### 4.1 Technology Empowerment: The Foundational Layer

Technology empowerment is the core of the foundational layer because any AI project depends on basic digital infrastructure, usable data resources, and tools suited to specific scenarios. These tools include interoperable information systems, reliable identity and access-control mechanisms, searchable knowledge bases, structured workflow platforms, and clear data standards. Marks, Al-Ali, Atassi, Abualkishik, and Rezgui [3] and Al-Ali and Marks [4] both showed that institutions with weak data architectures struggle to move beyond superficial digital transformation. Carmo, Lacerda, Klingenberg, and Piran [15] further pointed out that technology integration is a necessary precondition for improving operational efficiency in higher education management.

However, technology use should not be equated simply with software procurement. Many universities introduce advanced tools before clarifying task scenarios, which often leads to project failure. A more pragmatic approach is to define the application scenario first, then plan the system architecture, and finally procure tools. Institutions should first identify which services or workflows require improvement, then determine the data sources and system interfaces needed for the corresponding scenarios, and only then select AI-enabled solutions. This path helps avoid implementation difficulties in which advanced technical tools are disconnected from the organizational structure.

### 4.2 Institutional Innovation: The Pivotal Layer

Institutional innovation is the core of the framework. In university management practice, technology can be purchased and employees can be trained, but cross-departmental data sharing, process optimization, responsibility arrangements, and the implementation of compliance rules all require formal institutional authorization. Madan and Ashok [10] make a related argument in public-administration research by emphasizing that AI adoption is shaped by organizational conditions, absorptive capacity, and public-value considerations.

Institutional innovation includes at least five core tasks: formulating a high-level AI and digital transformation strategy; clarifying data ownership and management responsibilities; systematically reconstructing administrative processes before automation; establishing standards for privacy, security, and transparency; and building coordination mechanisms across functional departments. Selten and Klievink [11] pointed out that the organizational placement of AI capacity itself changes the implementation barriers that institutions face. An, Yu, and James [13] and Erhardt, Kullenberg, Grigoriadis, Kumar, Christidis, and Christidis [14] further showed that policies and guidelines are not symbolic add-ons, but important components of institutional implementation capacity.

For Chinese universities, this dimension is especially important because administrative authority, budgeting, data access, and formal process control are usually dispersed and embedded within existing bureaucratic structures. Without clear institutional authorization, AI projects may remain limited to local exploration by a single office or technical team. Such projects may achieve results during the pilot stage, but they are difficult to scale. It is therefore the coordination mechanism at the institutional level that can transform scattered digital experiments into broader administrative-system reform.

### 4.3 Talent Development: The Execution Layer

Talent development is the core of the execution layer because the effectiveness of administrative transformation ultimately depends on the understanding and actions of the people involved. Universities need at least three types of capability. First, leaders need strategic literacy so that they can distinguish feasible AI agendas from symbolic claims. Second, administrative staff need operational AI literacy so that they can use relevant tools responsibly, evaluate work outcomes objectively, and identify potential risks. Third, professionals in information technology, data management, and institutional research need stronger technical and governance literacy to support AI implementation effectively.

UNESCO [12] pointed out that AI integration depends not only on institutional norms, but also on the substantive improvement of human capability. Recent evidence in higher education supports this view. Mogelvang, Cipriani, and

 

Grassini [19] found that structured training can effectively improve the use and acceptance of generative AI among higher education staff. Mabotha and Ngcamu [9] likewise emphasized that persistent deficiencies in digital literacy and skills remain long-term barriers to transformation in the sector. For university managers, training should not follow a one-size-fits-all model. It should be based on specific role requirements and application scenarios, and should be closely connected to daily tasks such as document processing, service response, data reporting, and meeting support, so as to ensure practical relevance and effectiveness.

### 4.4 The Closed-Loop Logic of the Three Dimensions

The three dimensions should be understood as a loop rather than a line. They reinforce one another instead of moving mechanically from one stage to the next. Technology without institutional support produces only scattered tool collections that lack authority and unified standards. Institutions without talent support produce policies that are difficult to implement effectively. Talent without technological support creates capable administrative teams that still work within inefficient systems. Sustainable change depends on mutual reinforcement and coordinated evolution among the three dimensions.

This closed-loop logic also explains why universities should be cautious about single-solution thinking. Even if a campus has successfully deployed a chatbot, meeting assistant, or policy retrieval tool, administrative transformation will still be difficult to realize if the underlying data architecture, governance rules, and staff work practices do not change substantively. Conversely, even ambitious digital policies may have limited effect if staff do not receive the time, incentives, and systematic training necessary to use new systems. Substantive results are more likely only when technology, institutional rules, and human capability are advanced together within a single administrative reform agenda.

## 5. Implementation Path for Universities

The practical implementation path can proceed in orderly stages. The first stage is diagnostic preparation. Universities should systematically identify key administrative pain points, select high-frequency and low-risk use cases, establish baseline service indicators, and conduct a comprehensive assessment of existing data and workflow infrastructure. Suitable early pilot projects usually involve tasks such as FAQ support, internal knowledge retrieval, document information extraction, or meeting-summary generation, because these scenarios offer visible benefits and controllable risks.

The second stage is institutional embedding. After the value of pilot projects has been sufficiently verified, universities should work to formally establish governance mechanisms. This includes identifying lead responsible departments, defining approval authority at different levels, developing data and privacy management rules, and connecting AI applications with broader digital transformation strategy. At this stage, process redesign is more fundamental than simply adding more tools. Large-scale automation of inefficient workflows merely preserves inefficient processes in a new form. The core goal of this stage is to replace scattered trial-and-error exploration with standardized integration mechanisms.

The third stage is scaled optimization. More mature institutions should incorporate validated AI application scenarios into a more complete service ecosystem, connect them with performance evaluation mechanisms, and build continuously operating feedback and optimization mechanisms. Evaluation indicators should not be limited to efficiency improvement and cost reduction. They should also cover accuracy, user satisfaction, compliance, explainability, and staff adaptation. Universities should also establish regular review mechanisms because AI capabilities, legal and regulatory requirements, and institutional risk patterns are all evolving rapidly. In this sense, AI-driven administrative innovation is not a one-time project, but a continuing process of governance-capacity building.

At every implementation stage, universities should clearly distinguish between supportive automation tasks and decisions that require human judgment. Sensitive matters involving disciplinary action, personnel appointment, student status, or resource allocation should retain human review even when AI is used for preliminary screening or drafting. This principle echoes the core message of leading AI guidance documents: AI should remain trustworthy and human-centered. It allows universities to become

 

more efficient without sacrificing fair procedures or clear lines of accountability.

## 6. Conclusion

University administrative management continues to face systemic challenges in data integration, process efficiency, governance capacity, and staff professionalism. AI can play a positive role in optimizing student services, automating workflows, strengthening decision support, and enhancing governance capacity, but its value extends far beyond the procurement of technical tools. The more difficult task is to translate a digital vision into concrete institutional arrangements and daily administrative practice.

By integrating socio-technical systems theory with the technology-organization-environment (TOE) framework, this paper explains why administrative AI should be understood as an integrated reform project involving tools, rules, and people. Technology provides infrastructure and applications; institutions provide authorization, standards, and coordination; and talent provides the capability to use and improve new systems. Among the three dimensions, institutional innovation is especially critical because it determines whether isolated pilot projects can evolve into scalable administrative reform.

The practical implication of this paper is that universities should begin by solving specific service and workflow problems, then promote the establishment of formal governance mechanisms and the systematic optimization of processes, and finally achieve continuous improvement through evaluation feedback and staff capability development. This staged approach helps reduce the risks associated with fragmented experimentation and makes AI application more consistent with the basic requirements of accountability, fairness, and public service responsibility.

This study also has several limitations. Its method is a qualitative conceptual review rather than one based on original empirical data, and the proposed framework has not been empirically tested through surveys, interviews, case studies, or performance indicators. Therefore, the paper provides an analytical and practical framework rather than causal empirical evidence. Future research can further examine the specific paths through which different types of universities implement administrative AI in practice, compare successful and unsuccessful pilot projects, and develop quantifiable evaluation indicators to measure efficiency improvement, service-quality enhancement, data-governance improvement, and staff adaptation. Such research will help deepen and refine the framework proposed in this paper and provide stronger empirical support for administrative decision making.

## References

[1] Zawacki-Richter, O., Marin, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education: Where are the educators? International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 16, Article 39. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0

[2] Chen, L., Chen, P., & Lin, Z. (2020). Artificial intelligence in education: A review. IEEE Access, 8, 75264-75278. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2988510

[3] Marks, A., Al-Ali, M., Atassi, R., Abualkishik, A. Z., & Rezgui, Y. (2020). Digital transformation in higher education: A framework for maturity assessment. International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications, 11(12), 504-513. https://doi.org/10.14569/IJACSA.2020.0111261

[4] Al-Ali, M., & Marks, A. (2022). A digital maturity model for the education enterprise. Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education, 26(2), 47-58. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603108.2021.1978578

[5] Fernandez, A., Gomez, B., Binjaku, K., & Kajo Mece, E. (2023). Digital transformation initiatives in higher education institutions: A multivocal literature review. Education and Information Technologies, 28, 12351-12382. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11544-0

[6] Gkrimpizi, T., Peristeras, V., & Magnisalis, I. (2023). Classification of barriers to digital transformation in higher education institutions: Systematic literature review. Education Sciences, 13(7), Article 746. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13070746

[7] Rahmadi, I. F. (2024). Research on digital transformation in higher education: Present concerns and future endeavours. TechTrends, 68, 647-660.

 

https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-024-00971-0

[8] Singun, A., Jr. (2025). Unveiling the barriers to digital transformation in higher education institutions: A systematic literature review. Discover Education, 4, Article 37. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-025-00430-9

[9] Mabotha, P. A. P., & Ngcamu, B. S. (2026). Digital transformation in the higher education sector: A systematic literature review. Administrative Sciences, 16(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci16010001

[10] Madan, R., & Ashok, M. (2023). AI adoption and diffusion in public administration: A systematic literature review and future research agenda. Government Information Quarterly, 40(1), Article 101774. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2022.101774

[11] Selten, F., & Klievink, B. (2024). Organizing public sector AI adoption: Navigating between separation and integration. Government Information Quarterly, 41(1), Article 101885. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2023.101885

[12] UNESCO. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. UNESCO. https://www.unesco.org/en/digital-education/ai-future-learning/guidance

[13] An, Y., Yu, J. H., & James, S. (2025). Investigating the higher education institutions' guidelines and policies regarding the use of generative AI in teaching, learning, research, and administration. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 22, Article 10. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-025-00507-3

[14] Erhardt, C., Kullenberg, H., Grigoriadis, A., Kumar, A., Christidis, N., & Christidis, M. (2025). From policy to practice: The regulation and implementation of generative AI in Swedish higher education institutes. International Journal for Educational Integrity, 21, Article 21. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-025-00195-6

[15] Carmo, J. E. S., Lacerda, D. P., Klingenberg, C. O., & Piran, F. A. S. (2025). Digital transformation in the management of higher education institutions. Sustainable Futures, 9, Article 100692. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sftr.2025.100692

[16] Peyton, K., Unnikrishnan, S., & Mulligan, B. (2025). A review of university chatbots for student support: FAQs and beyond. Discover Education, 4, Article 21. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-025-00397-7

[17] Bostrom, R. P., & Heinen, J. S. (1977). MIS problems and failures: A socio-technical perspective. Part I: The causes. MIS Quarterly, 1(3), 17-32. https://doi.org/10.2307/248710

[18] Tornatzky, L. G., & Fleischer, M. (1990). The processes of technological innovation. Lexington Books.

[19] Mogelvang, A., Cipriani, E., & Grassini, S. (2025). Generative AI in action: Acceptance and use among higher education staff pre- and post-training. Technology, Knowledge and Learning. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-025-09915-w

 