

From Expert to Facilitator? A Qualitative Exploration of Business Faculty Identity and Job Demands in the GenAI Era

With the influx of industry companies incorporating AI into their day-to-day processes, faculty in business colleges are being encouraged to incorporate AI into their coursework. Extant research indicates that professors are concerned about student plagiarism, cheating, and the lack of critical thinking. However, other factors are of concern.

While integrating this work may require emotional and academic effort, the faculty's professional identity could be threatened. Educators are recognized as providers of knowledge and play a crucial role in passing knowledge to their students; they are seen as subject-matter experts. With the rise of generative AI (GenAI), some faculty members may worry that they are shifting into roles as facilitators of the tool and develop a sense that their identities as teachers are being challenged.

Faculty identity is related to their self-concept, their self-perception, and a sense of belonging to the education profession (Shao & Sun, 2025). With the advent of AI, there is potential disruption to educators' identities. They are transitioning from experts to facilitators.

Job demands are defined as the physical, psychological, social, or organizational facets that require consistent physical (i.e., cognitive) and mental (i.e., emotional) effort and costs (Demerouti et al., 2001; Bakker et al., 2004). Examples of this are workload, emotional demands of the job, and high work pressure. Bakker et al. (2004) state that job resources are the physical, psychological, social, or organizational facets of the job that are practical for achieving work-related goals, can reduce job demands and the associated physical and psychological costs, or can support personal growth and development.

Extant research has used the Jobs Demand-Resource (JD-R) model to explain burnout in jobs (Bakker et al., 2005; Tims et al., 2012) such as teaching. However, there is limited research on how JD-R can be used to explain faculty professional identity reconstruction and workload when incorporating GenAI into the business curriculum and coursework. In addition, researchers have not explored the workload implications and which resources can help alleviate some of the demand-related issues. This leads us to the following research question: *How do business faculty at Jesuit universities describe their experiences of integrating generative AI into their coursework and its perceived influence on their professional identities?*

Our research plans to address this question and explore the following:

- Limited empirical research examines how Gen AI disrupts business faculty professional identity or their transition from subject expert to AI facilitator.
- The JD-R model has not been applied to Gen AI adoption in Jesuit business education, leaving gaps in understanding which Gen AI-related demands strain faculty and which resources provide support.
- Limited qualitative, theory-driven evidence on faculty's lived experiences with Gen AI integration is absent, which limits understanding of how educators navigate this technological shift.

Keywords: generative artificial intelligence, faculty identity, JD-R, higher education

References

- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Euwema, M. C. (2005). Job resources buffer the impact of job demands on burnout. *Journal of occupational health psychology, 10*(2), 170.
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the job demands-resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management, 43*(1), 83–104.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20004>.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 499.
- Shao, J., & Sun, S. (2025). Teacher Identity in the Era of Intelligence. *Journal of Educational Theory and Practice, 2*(1).
- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2012). Development and validation of the job crafting scale. *Journal of vocational behavior, 80*(1), 173-186.