

# Chinese-GenAI in Higher Education: Adoption and Impact from a Chinese University students Case Study

Linwei She <sup>1, a</sup>, Yongjun Xie <sup>2, b</sup>, and Liqi Lai <sup>3, 4, c, \*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> International Business School, Jinan University, Zhuhai 519070, P.R. China

<sup>2</sup> International Energy College, Jinan University, Zhuhai 519070, P.R. China

<sup>3</sup> Modern Education Technology Centre, Jinan University, Zhuhai 519070, P.R. China

<sup>4</sup> GBA and B&R International Joint Research Center for Smart Logistics, Jinan University, Zhuhai 519070, P.R. China

<sup>a</sup> tShelinwei@jnu.edu.cn, <sup>b</sup> xieyongjun@jnu.edu.cn, <sup>c</sup> LaiLQ@jnu.edu.cn

**Abstract.** This study randomly surveyed 300 undergraduates from a Chinese university and analyzed the current status and influencing factors of university students using Chinese generative artificial intelligence(Chinese-GenAI) through methods such as descriptive statistics and variance tests. The study reveals that over 80% of respondents have used Chinese-GenAI; two-thirds of university students began using Chinese-GenAI between December 2023 and the present, while 25% started between June and December 2023. The most frequently utilized Chinese-GenAI tool is the ERNIE Bot by Baidu, and the most frequently used technology is text generation. The most common applications of Chinese-GenAI include text generation and information retrieval. Approximately 60% of university students have learned about generative AI(GenAI) knowledge or skills. The four primary scenarios where students use GenAI are course learning, academic research activities, daily life, and promotion and further education, with academic research activities being the most common scenario. Variables such as gender, grade, and college significantly impact students' use of Chinese-GenAI. Based on the survey results, this study offers recommendations from the perspectives of higher education management, corporate institutions, universities, and faculty, aiming to provide reference for integrating Chinese-GenAI into higher education teaching practices.

CCS CONCEPTS • Applied computing • Education • Interactive Learning environments

**Keywords:** Chinese-GenAI; University Students' Usage; Influencing factors; Educational Applications.

## 1. Introduction

With the rapid development of artificial intelligence technologies, particularly generative artificial intelligence (AI) like ChatGPT, the field of higher education is facing unprecedented challenges and opportunities[1,2]. At the beginning of 2023, due to concerns about the potential adverse effects of generative AI(GenAI) on students, many universities worldwide imposed policies banning the use of GenAI by students [3]. For example, Sciences Po in France strictly limited the use of ChatGPT, while India prohibited its use in exams [4]. However, simply banning the technology is not a solution. If higher education institutions persist with prohibitive measures, future professionals may possess incomplete skill sets. After months of exploration and discussion, an increasing number of universities worldwide recognize that the use of generative AI is inevitable and have begun to actively explore safe and reliable ways to integrate GenAI into education. For instance, universities such as the University of Hong Kong and Nanyang Technological University in Singapore have provided access to GenAI tools for faculty and students [5,6]. By the end of 2023, many Chinese universities had yet to provide clear guidelines or regulations for faculty and student use of GenAI.

Despite ChatGPT's many advantages, China's current laws and regulations limit the tool's use within the country, restricting Chinese university students' access to ChatGPT[7]. Since ChatGPT's

release on November 30, 2022, large AI models have initiated the largest wave of artificial intelligence ever seen globally. The academic and industrial sectors in China have also made significant advancements over the past year and a half. This progress can be roughly divided into four stages[8]: the preparation stage (rapid consensus on large models following ChatGPT's release), the growth stage (increasing quantity and quality of domestic models), the explosion stage (a surge of open-source and proprietary models across industries creating competitive landscapes), and the prosperity stage (extension and application of more modal capabilities). In response, China has developed several excellent GenAI tools, such as ERNIE Bot by Baidu, ChatGLM by Tsinghua University, and Qwen by Alibaba, partially bridging the digital divide caused by the inability to use ChatGPT.

Extensive research exists on university students' ChatGPT usage. Li et al. [4] surveyed 1,190 undergraduates, finding 70% familiar with GenAI, primarily using ChatGPT for academic research. Bai et al. [9] tested ChatGPT-3.5 in education, noting subpar performance but improved results with ChatGPT-4. Strzelecki [10] identified habit as the strongest predictor of ChatGPT adoption through a TAM-based model. Nugroho et al. [11] revealed EFL students' dual perspectives: valuing writing assistance but concerned about accuracy and integrity. Polyportis & Pahos [12] expanded UTAUT framework, showing institutional policies negatively moderate usage intentions.

However, there is currently no research that examines the status quo of university students' usage of Chinese-GenAI, representing a research gap. Therefore, this study investigates the current state of university students' usage of Chinese-GenAI, exploring potential differences in usage behaviors among students of different genders, grades, and major categories, while also collecting usage suggestions to inform the integration of Chinese-GenAI in higher education and to aid in formulating educational reform policies. Specifically, the study aims to address the following questions: 1) What is the basic status of university students' usage of Chinese-GenAI? 2) What is the current state of usage in four typical scenarios? 3) Are there any differences in the usage of Chinese-GenAI among students of different genders, ages, and major categories?

## 2. Method

### 2.1 Research Object

This study selected a portion of undergraduate students from a campus of a university in China as the research objects. The campus includes six colleges: School of Humanities, School of Translation Studies, International Business School, College of Packaging Engineering, School of Intelligent Science and Engineering, and the International Energy College. In the 2024 academic year, there are over 8,000 undergraduate students enrolled at this campus.

### 2.2 Questionnaire Tool

Based on existing literature and referencing the questionnaire used by Li et al. [4], this study developed the "Survey on the Current Usage of Chinese-GenAI by University Students" (see Table 1).

Table 1: Basic Composition of the Survey Questionnaire

Questionnaire Section	Content			
Basic Information of Students	Gender, college, grade, etc. (Total 3 questions)			
Basic Situation of Students Using Chinese-GenAI	Students start time of use, tools used (multiple choice), technologies used (multiple choice), frequency of use, most commonly used functions of Chinese-GenAI (multiple choice), frequency of learning knowledge or skills about GenAI (Total 7 questions)			
Current Status of	Scenario	N	Item Examples	Rating Scale

Using Chinese-GenAI in Four Typical Scenarios	Course Learning	4	I will use Chinese-GenAI to answer the teacher's questions in class.	1 = Strongly disagree; 2= Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4= Agree; 5 = Strongly agree
	Academic Research Activities	5	I will use Chinese-GenAI to assist me in choosing research questions.	
	Daily Life	5	When encountering difficulties in daily life (such as diet, finance, and social interactions), I will seek help from Chinese-GenAI.	
	Academic and Career Advancement	3	I will let Chinese-GenAI help create or rewrite my resume.	

### 2.3 Data Collection

The study collected data via Sojump, an online survey platform, from September 15–30, 2024, yielding 325 responses. After excluding duplicates (Rafique et al., 2020), 303 valid questionnaires remained (92.41% validity rate). Participants included 145 males (47.9%) and 158 females (52.1%). Grade distribution spanned freshmen (23.8%, 72), sophomores (38.9%, 118), juniors (30.0%, 91), and seniors (7.3%, 22). Colleges represented: Humanities (13.5%, 41), Translation (6.6%, 20), International Business (32.7%, 99), Packaging Engineering (15.5%, 47), Intelligent Science/Engineering (14.9%, 45), and International Energy (16.8%, 51). Data analysis utilized SPSS 27.0 for descriptive statistics and ANOVA to assess usage variations across moderating variables.

## 3. Research Results

### 3.1 Basic Situation of University Students' Use of Chinese-GenAI

The findings indicate that over 80% of university students (83.6%) reported having used Chinese-GenAI. More than one-third of the students began using Chinese-GenAI after December 2023, while 25% of them started using it between June and December 2023. The most commonly used generative artificial intelligence tool among students is ERNIE Bot (52.1%), followed by Kimi (32.5%), Doubao (25.7%), and ChatPPT (16.8%). In terms of generative artificial intelligence techniques, text generation is the most frequently used (72.5%), followed by image generation (35.7%), video generation (11.5%), and voice generation (11.1%). Regarding usage frequency, over 60% of students (60%) reported occasional use, with 26.8% using it regularly and 13.2% having never used it. The most commonly utilized features by students are text generation (58.3%) and information retrieval (16.7%), while only 4.2% of respondents use generative artificial intelligence for tasks such as debugging code, language translation (2.3%), and interactive dialogue (2.3%). Additionally, 10.7% of students frequently engage in learning about generative artificial intelligence, nearly half of the students (47.5%) occasionally learn about it, and 41.8% have never studied it (see Table 2).

Table 2: Status of College Students Using Chinese-GenAI

Dimension	Item	N	Percentage (%)	Dimension	Item	N	Percentage (%)
Have used Chinese-GenAI tools	Used	252	83.2	Technologies Used in Chinese-GenAI	Text Generation	253	83.5
	Not Used	51	16.8		Image Generation	113	37.3

Start Time of Use	Before December 2022	18	5.9	(multiple choice)	Voice Generation	31	10.2
	December 2022 - June 2023	44	14.5		Video Generation	23	7.6
	June - December 2023	76	25.1		Other	14	4.6
	Since December 2023	117	38.6		None Used	37	12.2
	Never Used	48	15.8	Frequency of Using Chinese-GenAI	Occasionally	181	59.7
Tools Used in Chinese-GenAI (multiple choice)	ERNIE Bot	157	51.8		Frequently	82	27.1
	IFlytek Spark	40	13.2	Never Used	40	13.2	
	ChatGLM	35	11.6	Most Commonly Used Functions of Chinese-GenAI (ranking)	Text Generation	198	65.3
	ChatPPT	54	17.8		Information Search	49	16.2
	Doubao	78	25.7		Language Translation	7	2.3
	Qwen	29	9.6		Dialogue Interaction	7	2.3
	Kimi	104	34.3		Grammar Checking	6	2.0
	Tiangong AI	32	10.6		Code Debugging	8	2.6
	Mita AI	26	8.6		Other	1	0.3
	ERNIE-Geo	22	7.3	None Used	34	11.2	
	Qwen-Many	7	2.3	Frequency of Learning Knowledge or Skills about GenAI	Never Learned	122	40.6
	Other	32	10.6		Occasionally Learned	158	52.1
	Never Used	53	17.5		Frequently Learned	22	7.3

### 3.2 The Usage of Generative Artificial Intelligence by University Students in Four Typical Scenarios

This research examined university students' use of Chinese-GenAI in four typical scenarios: Course Study, Academic Research Activities, Daily Life, and Promotion and Further Education (see Table 3). The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was found to be 0.950, indicating a highly reliable measure.

Table 3: Status of College Students Using Chinese-GenAI College Students' Use of GenAI in Four Typical Scenarios (n=303)

Item Type	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	SD
	n(%)	n(%)	n(%)	n(%)	n(%)		
Course Learning						2.95	1.010

1. I use Chinese-GenAI to answer questions from the teacher in class.	65 (21.5)	82 (27.1)	65(21.5)	67(22.1)	24(7.9)	2.68	1.253
2. I use Chinese-GenAI to assist in completing course assignments.	40 (13.2)	56 (18.5)	90(29.7)	87(28.7)	30(9.9)	3.04	1.183
3. I use Chinese-GenAI to look up information related to course content.	32 (10.6)	24 (7.9)	91(30.0)	111(36.6)	45(14.9)	3.37	1.152
4. I have Chinese-GenAI to evaluate my assignments and provide feedback.	63 (20.8)	75 (24.8)	81(26.7)	60(19.8)	24(7.9)	2.69	1.227
Academic Research Activities						3.028	1.039
1. I use Chinese-GenAI to assist me in selecting research topics.	44 (14.5)	56 (18.5)	93(30.7)	87(28.7)	23(7.6)	2.96	1.166
2. I use Chinese-GenAI to assist in writing.	44 (14.5)	42 (13.9)	97(32.0)	89(29.4)	31(10.2)	3.07	1.193
3. I use Chinese-GenAI to revise papers or reports.	49 (16.2)	60 (19.8)	92(30.4)	78(25.7)	24(7.9)	2.89	1.189
4. I use Chinese-GenAI to help extract key information from reading literature.	42 (13.9)	42 (13.9)	92(30.4)	102(33.7)	25(8.3)	3.09	1.165
5. I use Chinese-GenAI to translate foreign academic articles or materials.	43 (14.2)	40 (13.2)	92(30.4)	91(30.0)	37(12.2)	3.13	1.215
Daily Life						2.51	1.044
1. When facing difficulties in daily life (e.g., diet, finance, social interactions), I seek help from Chinese-GenAI.	72 (23.8)	75 (24.8)	72(23.8)	60(19.8)	24(7.9)	2.63	1.259
2. I ask Chinese-GenAI questions about common knowledge in life, society, history, geography, culture, etc.	54 (17.8)	45 (14.9)	96(31.7)	83(27.4)	25(8.3)	2.93	1.211
3. When I am bored, I interact and chat with Chinese-GenAI.	91 (30.0)	74 (24.4)	63(20.8)	50(16.5)	25(8.3)	2.49	1.297
4. I have Chinese-GenAI design diversified entertainment content (such as riddles, games, etc.) to relax.	96 (31.7)	84 (27.7)	63(20.8)	43(14.2)	17(5.6)	2.34	1.218
5. I will let Chinese-GenAI provide	123	76	56(18.5)	36(11.9)	12(4.0)	2.14	1.187

psychological counseling.	(40.6)	(25.1)					
Promotion and Further Education						2.55	1.160
1. I will let Chinese-GenAI help plan activities.	74 (24.4)	53 (17.5)	93(30.7)	60(19.8)	23(7.6)	2.69	1.249
2. I will let Chinese-GenAI help create or rewrite my resume.	76 (25.1)	76 (25.1)	74(24.4)	59(19.5)	18(5.9)	2.56	1.224
3. I will interact with Chinese-GenAI to simulate job interviews.	98 (32.3)	69 (22.8)	66(21.8)	54(17.8)	16(5.3)	2.41	1.252

### 3.3 Differences in the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence Among University Students

This study employed difference tests and post-hoc multiple comparisons to explore the impacts of factors such as gender, grade level, and college on students' use of Chinese-GenAI.

#### (1) Gender

The results of the independent samples t-test indicate that gender has a significant impact on university students' use of Chinese-GenAI: the number of females who have used Chinese-GenAI is significantly higher than that of males ( $p=0.021<0.05$ ). Females also have a significantly higher frequency of use compared to males ( $p=0.025<0.05$ ). However, there were no significant differences in the starting time of use ( $p=0.947>0.05$ ) or the frequency of learning about generative artificial intelligence skills ( $p=0.102>0.05$ ).

In terms of the two major typical scenarios, gender also significantly affects the use of generative artificial intelligence: 1) Course Learning( $p=0.001<0.05$ ), and 2) Academic Research Activities( $p=0.01<0.05$ ), with females using generative artificial intelligence significantly more than males. There were no significant differences between male and female students in the usage of generative artificial intelligence in daily life and Promotion and Further Education settings (see Table 4).

Table 4: Differences in the Use of Chinese-GenAI Among College Students of Different Genders

Gender	Course Learning	Academic Research Activities	Daily Life	Promotion and Further Education
	M±SD	M±SD	M±SD	M±SD
Male (N=145)	2.68±1.05	2.87±1.08	2.44±1.06	2.41±1.20
Female (N=158)	3.20±0.91	3.17±0.98	2.57±1.03	2.68±1.10
t	-4.57	-2.58	-1.06	-2.07
p	0.001**	0.01*	0.29	0.39

Note: \* $p<0.05$ , \*\* $p<0.001$

#### (2) Grade

The homogeneity of variance test results indicates that students from different grade levels do not meet the conditions of homogeneity of variance regarding their usage of Chinese-GenAI ( $sig<0.05$ ). Thus, Welch's ANOVA was used for differential analysis: 1) There are significant differences across grades regarding whether students have used Chinese-GenAI ( $p=0.001<0.05$ ), with sophomore students being the most frequent users, followed by third and senior students, and finally freshman students. 2) There are significant differences in the frequency of learning about generative artificial intelligence knowledge or skills among different grades ( $p=0.01<0.05$ ), with

junior students learning the most, followed by sophomore and senior students, and freshman students learning the least.

For the starting time and usage frequency of Chinese-GenAI, the conditions for homogeneity of variance were met ( $\text{Sig} > 0.05$ ), so a one-way ANOVA was conducted: 1) There are significant differences in the starting time of using Chinese-GenAI among students of different grades ( $p = 0.000 < 0.05$ ), with senior students starting the earliest, followed by third and sophomore students, while freshman students begin last. 2) There is also a significant difference in the usage frequency of Chinese-GenAI among students from various grades ( $p = 0.000 < 0.05$ ), with senior students using it most frequently, followed by junior students and sophomore, and freshman students learning the least.

The analysis of variance revealed that the use of Chinese-GenAI among university students in four typical scenarios met the assumption of homogeneity ( $\text{Sig} > 0.05$ ). Consequently, a one-way ANOVA was employed for differential analysis. Significant differences were found among different grades regarding the use of Chinese-GenAI in three typical scenarios: 1) Course Learning ( $p = 0.001 < 0.05$ ), with junior students  $>$  senior students  $>$  sophomore students  $>$  freshman students; 2) Academic Research Activities ( $p = 0.001 < 0.05$ ), with senior students  $>$  junior students  $>$  sophomore students  $>$  freshman students; 3) Promotion and Further Education ( $p = 0.026 < 0.05$ ), with senior students  $>$  sophomore students  $>$  junior students  $>$  freshman students. However, no significant differences were observed in the use of Chinese-GenAI in daily life scenarios among students from different grades ( $p = 0.553 > 0.05$ ) (see Table 5).

Table 5: Differences in the Use of Chinese-GenAI Among College Students of Different Grades

Grade	Course Learning	Academic Research Activities	Daily Life	Promotion and Further Education
	M±SD	M±SD	M±SD	M±SD
<b>Freshman</b> (N=72)	2.33±0.94	2.54±1.03	2.43±1.05	2.22±1.16
<b>Sophomore</b> (N=118)	3.01±0.94	3.02±0.98	2.56±1.00	2.64±1.22
<b>Junior</b> (N=91)	3.29±0.95	3.32±0.99	2.44±1.09	2.61±1.17
Senior (N=22)	2.95±1.01	3.45±1.01	2.74±1.09	2.92±1.13
F	14.67	9.86	0.70	3.14
p	0.001**	0.001**	0.553	0.026*

Note: \* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.001$

### (3) Colleges

The results of the homogeneity of variance test indicated that the assumption was not met regarding whether students from different colleges have used Chinese-GenAI ( $\text{sig} < 0.05$ ). Hence, Welch's ANOVA method was applied for differential analysis. There exists a significant difference in the usage of Chinese-GenAI among students from different colleges ( $p = 0.001 < 0.05$ ), with the order of usage frequency being: School of Translation Studies  $>$  School of Humanities  $>$  International Business School  $>$  School of Intelligent Science and Engineering  $>$  International Energy College  $>$  College of Packaging Engineering.

For other questions that met the conditions of homogeneity of variance ( $\text{sig} > 0.05$ ), a one-way ANOVA was utilized for further analysis: 1) A significant difference was found in the starting time of using Chinese-GenAI among different colleges ( $p = 0.001 < 0.05$ ), with the School of Intelligent Science and Engineering  $>$  School of Translation Studies = International Business School  $>$  School of Humanities  $>$  International Energy  $>$  College of Packaging Engineering; 2) There is a notable difference in the frequency of usage of Chinese-GenAI among students from various colleges ( $p = 0.001 < 0.05$ ), with the School of Intelligent Science and Engineering  $>$  School of Translation

Studies > International Business School > School of Humanities > International Energy College > College of Packaging Engineering; 3) A significant difference exists in the frequency of learning about generative artificial intelligence knowledge or skills across different colleges ( $p = 0.001 < 0.05$ ), with the School of Intelligent Science and Engineering > International Business School > School of Humanities > School of Translation Studies > International Energy College > College of Packaging Engineering. Additionally, significant differences were observed in the use of Chinese-GenAI by students from different colleges in three typical scenarios: 1) Course Learning ( $p = 0.001 < 0.05$ ), with International Business School > School of Intelligent Science and Engineering > School of Translation Studies > School of Humanities > International Energy College > College of Packaging Engineering; 2) Academic Research Activities ( $p = 0.001 < 0.05$ ), with International Business School > School of Intelligent Science and Engineering > School of Translation Studies > School of Humanities > International Energy College > College of Packaging Engineering; 3) Promotion and Further Education ( $p = 0.002 < 0.05$ ), with International Business School > School of Intelligent Science and Engineering > School of Translation Studies > School of Humanities > International Energy College > College of Packaging Engineering. However, no significant differences were found in the use of Chinese-GenAI in daily life scenarios among students from different colleges ( $p = 0.08 > 0.05$ ) (see Table 6).

Table 6: Differences in the Use of Chinese-GenAI Among College Students from Different Colleges

College	Course Learning	Academic Research Activities	Daily Life	Promotion and Further Education
	M±SD	M±SD	M±SD	M±SD
School of Humanities (N=41)	2.85±0.69	2.92±0.93	2.67±0.88	2.52±1.00
School of Translation Studies (N=20)	3.06±0.84	3.21±0.86	2.35±0.96	2.68±1.07
International Business School (N=99)	3.44±0.87	3.41±0.95	2.66±1.05	2.81±1.14
College of Packaging Engineering (N=47)	2.13±0.92	2.35±1.02	2.13±0.96	2.92±1.13
School of Intelligent Science and Engineering (N=45)	3.21±0.89	3.25±0.94	2.48±1.09	1.99±1.05
International Energy College (N=51)	2.53±1.08	2.73±1.20	2.50±1.16	2.37±1.30
F	16.91	9.18	1.99	3.90
p	0.001**	0.001**	0.08	0.002*

Note: \* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.001$

## 4. Discussion

### 4.1 University Students' Familiarity, Acceptance, and Learning Needs Regarding Chinese-GenAI

The majority of the students participating in the survey are familiar with Chinese-GenAI, with many using it frequently or occasionally. The most commonly used Chinese-GenAI tools include ERNIE Bot, Doubao, iFLYTEK Spark, and ChatPPT, among others. The predominant function utilized by students is text generation, along with other multimedia content generation capabilities such as image generation, voice generation, and video generation. This indicates that university students exhibit a high level of acceptance towards this technology, which has permeated their daily academic and personal lives. It is foreseeable that as the multimedia content generation capabilities of generative artificial intelligence improve, a greater number of university students will begin to utilize these functions (Strzelecki, 2023). Additionally, nearly 60% of students occasionally or

frequently engage in learning knowledge and skills related to generative artificial intelligence, highlighting a strong demand among university students for acquiring relevant knowledge and skills in this area[13].

## 4.2 Frequency of Chinese-GenAI Use Across Four Typical Scenarios

Among four key scenarios analyzed, GenAI's role in Academic Research is most prominent. Over half of respondents rated its academic utility as "Neutral" or higher, confirming Chinese-GenAI as a critical research assistant. Notably, 60% use it for topic selection, fostering critical thinking through creative text generation [14], while 70% leverage its writing and translation capabilities for literature processing [15]. Studies highlight its efficiency in streamlining repetitive tasks and expanding information access [16], necessitating updated academic governance frameworks.

In Course Learning, 80% of students employ Chinese-GenAI for coursework support, particularly for terminology clarification and assignment automation. While alleviating academic burdens, its overuse risks hindering higher-order skill development[17], urging pedagogical redesign. Minimal usage for classroom Q&A suggests effective student engagement, whereas limited adoption for feedback reflects tool-underutilization [18].

For Daily Life, 60% utilize Chinese-GenAI for general knowledge queries, with 40% engaging it for entertainment or emotional support. This aligns with its emerging role as a personalized life companion [19] and niche mental health resource [20], signaling growth potential in personalized services.

Moreover, Chinese-GenAI is now aiding university students in their academic progression and job-seeking activities. More than half of the students employ Chinese-GenAI to help plan creative activities, and nearly 50% utilize it to create or revise resumes and engage in simulated interviews. Comparatively, university students tend to use Chinese-GenAI less frequently in the context of academic advancement and job-seeking, which may be attributed to the fact that only upperclassmen (e.g., seniors) have relevant needs in this regard. In this study, lower-grade students demonstrated insufficient demand for this particular scenario.

## 4.3 Differences in Chinese-GenAI Usage Among University Students Based on Gender, Grade, and College

The survey findings indicate that there are significant differences in the use of Chinese-GenAI among university students of different genders across most dimensions, including whether they have used Chinese-GenAI, the frequency of use, and the usage of Chinese-GenAI in typical scenarios such as course learning and academic research activities. Overall, female students demonstrate more proactive behaviors in utilizing Chinese-GenAI. This result contrasts with previous findings [4,21], which suggests that female students have a clear advantage in technology usage. However, there are no significant gender differences in the timing of initiating Chinese-GenAI usage, the learning of Chinese-GenAI related knowledge and skills, and its application in contexts such as academic progression and daily life scenarios. This lack of significant differences may be attributed to the low overall usage levels of generative artificial intelligence among university students in academic progression and daily life contexts, where gender disparities have yet to become apparent[22,23]

Grade-level variations show sophomores as peak users. Freshmen lag in adoption timing, likely due to high school exam priorities during 2023-2024 enrollment. Seniors surpass lower grades in academic/research usage, benefiting from university experience and resource access, though daily-life engagement remains consistent across cohorts [24]. There are also significant differences in the dimensions of Chinese-GenAI usage among students from different colleges. Students from the School of Intelligent Science and Engineering and the School of International Business exhibit clear advantages across all dimensions, whereas students from other colleges show varied performance in different dimensions. This outcome is likely related to their respective disciplines, as students in the

School of Intelligent Science and Engineering are more likely to encounter generative artificial intelligence. Students in the School of International Business often have access to richer international resources and channels for introducing advanced technology, enabling them to engage with the latest technological trends more readily. Additionally, students in translation programs can recognize the impact of generative artificial intelligence through professional research dynamics, which encourages usage behavior. In contrast, students from the School of Humanities, the International Energy School, and the School of Packaging Engineering have been relatively slow to engage with generative artificial intelligence, resulting in lower usage frequencies.

## 5. Conclusion

This study investigates the current status of Chinese-GenAI usage among university students, exploring potential differences in usage behaviors based on gender, grade, and academic discipline. The aim is to provide insights that contribute to the integration of Chinese-GenAI into higher education and inform the development of educational reform policies in universities. However, the study's limitations include that the sample was drawn from a single university in China, despite the diversity in the academic backgrounds of the students. Given the emerging nature of research on Chinese-GenAI usage in higher education, future research should further assess and refine the scales utilized in this study for subsequent investigations.

## Acknowledgments

Jinan University Teaching Quality and Teaching Reform Project: Exploration of Personalized Teaching Models for General Education Elective Courses Based on Generative Artificial Intelligence - A Case Study of "Easy Photography Learning" (Project No.: JG2024074).Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area Universities Online Open Course Alliance Education Research and Reform Project: Research on the Application of Blended Teaching Models Based on Generative Artificial Intelligence (Project No.: WGKM2024040).2024 Guangdong Undergraduate Teaching Quality and Teaching Reform Project: AI Course Construction and Practice of "Microcomputer Principle and Application" Based on Knowledge Graph (Project No.: 487).

## References

- [1] Epstein, Z., Hertzmann, A., Investigators of Human Creativity, Akten, M., Farid, H., Fjeld, J., ... & Smith, A. (2023). Art and the science of generative AI. *Science*, 380(6650), 1110-1111.
- [2] Rawas, S. (2024). ChatGPT: Empowering lifelong learning in the digital age of higher education. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29(6), 6895-6908.
- [3] Lim, W. M., Gunasekara, A., Pallant, J. L., Pallant, J. I., & Pechenkina, E. (2023). Generative AI and the future of education: Ragnarök or reformation? A paradoxical perspective from management educators. *The international journal of management education*, 21(2), 100790.
- [4] Li Yan, Xu Jie, JIA Chengyuan & ZHAI Xuesong(2024). Investigation of College Students' Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) Usage Status and its Implication: Taking Zhejiang University as an Example. *Open Education Research* (01), 89-98. doi:10.13966/j.cnki.kfjyyj.2024.01.010.
- [5] Yu, E. (2023) . Another major university is supporting generative AI use but with serious guardrails [EB/OL]. [2023-12-22]. <https://www.zdnet.com/article/another-major-university-is-supporting-generativeai-use-but-with-serious-guardrails/>.
- [6] Nanyang Technological University (NTU) (2023) . NTU Position on the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in Research [EB/OL].[2023-12-17]. <https://www.ntu.edu.sg/research/resources/use-of-gai-in-research>.

- [7] Hung, J., & Chen, J. (2023). The benefits, risks and regulation of using ChatGPT in Chinese academia: a content analysis. *Social Sciences*, 12(7), 380. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci12070380>.
- [8] SuperCLUE. (2024, September 2). Benchmark Evaluation Report of Chinese Large Models, August 2024. Retrieved from [https://mp.weixin.qq.com/s/uxU\\_rWvP9HWOMzg7Zg6oKA](https://mp.weixin.qq.com/s/uxU_rWvP9HWOMzg7Zg6oKA).
- [9] Bai, Y., Li, J., Shen, J., & Zhao, L. (2024). Investigating the Efficacy of ChatGPT-3.5 for Tutoring in Chinese Elementary Education Settings. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*.
- [10] Strzelecki, A. (2023). To use or not to use ChatGPT in higher education? A study of students' acceptance and use of technology. *Interactive learning environments*, 1-14.
- [11] Nugroho, A., Andriyanti, E., Widodo, P., & Mutiaraningrum, I. (2024). Students' appraisals post-ChatGPT use: Students' narrative after using ChatGPT for writing. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 1-13.
- [12] Polyportis, A., & Pahos, N. (2024). Understanding students' adoption of the ChatGPT chatbot in higher education: the role of anthropomorphism, trust, design novelty and institutional policy. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 1-22.
- [13] Jo, H., & Park, D. H. (2023). AI in the workplace: Examining the effects of ChatGPT on information support and knowledge acquisition. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 1-16.
- [14] Dai Ling, Zhao Xiaowei & Zhu Zhitian. (2023). Smart Inquiry: A New Model of Conversational Learning Based on ChatGPT. *Open Education Research* (06), 42-51+111. <https://doi.org/10.13966/j.cnki.kfjyyj.2023.06.005>.
- [15] Lee, T. K. (2023). Artificial intelligence and posthumanist translation: ChatGPT versus the translator. *Applied Linguistics Review*, (0).
- [16] Liu Baochun, Gou Minghan (2023). The Impact of New Generation AI Tools like ChatGPT on Educational Research and Countermeasures [J]. *Journal of Soochow University (Educational Science Edition)*, 11(3): 54-62.
- [17] Yan, D. (2023). Impact of ChatGPT on learners in a L2 writing practicum: An exploratory investigation. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28(11), 13943-13967.
- [18] Jukiewicz, M. (2024). The future of grading programming assignments in education: The role of ChatGPT in automating the assessment and feedback process. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 52, 101522.
- [19] Chen Yukun (2023). Educational Transformation in the Era of ChatGPT/Generative Artificial Intelligence [J]. *Journal of East China Normal University (Educational Science Edition)*, 41(7): 103-116.
- [20] Song Yunya (2023). Digital Psychology: Opportunities and Challenges for Mental Health Empowered by Artificial Intelligence [J]. *Global Media Journal*, 10(3): 1-4.
- [21] Volman, M., & van Eck, E. (2001). Gender equity and information technology in education: the second decade[J]. *Review of Educational Research*, 71 (4) : 613-634.
- [22] Banh, L., & Strobel, G. (2023). Generative artificial intelligence. *Electronic Markets*, 33(1), 63.
- [23] Barros, A., Prasad, A., & Śliwa, M. (2023). Generative artificial intelligence and academia: Implication for research, teaching and service. *Management Learning*, 54(5), 597-604.
- [24] Aelenei, C., Jury, M., Darnon, C., Sicard, A., Maggio, S., & Martinot, D. (2023). Self-enhancement values and academic achievement: An interaction with students' parental level of education and gender? *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93(2), 626-640.