Generative AI in Higher Education: Transforming Teaching, Research, and Student Engagement

Zhimin Deng*, Yaming Yu

XINGZHI COLLEGE ZHEJIANG NORMAL UNIVERSITY, Jinhua, 321000, China

*leooelcn@me.com, 66437369@qq.com

Abstract. Generative artificial intelligence (AI), like ChatGPT, holds significant promise for transforming higher education by improving teaching effectiveness, boosting research productivity, and facilitating personalized learning experiences. Even with these advancements, challenges like algorithmic bias, ethical dilemmas, and insufficient integration frameworks hinder its broader application. To examine the effects of generative AI, this study employs a mixed methods approach that incorporates controlled experiments, survey-based data collection, and quantitative assessments using established scales. The results indicate notable reductions in task completion times (up to 40%), increased student engagement (78% reported greater motivation), and advancements in academic performance. Ethical considerations, such as overreliance and partiality, are of utmost importance. This study offers valuable insights and a comprehensive framework for integrating generative AI, with significant implications for educators, scholars, and decision-makers. This also lays the groundwork for a more inclusive and innovative academic future.

Keywords: Generative AI, Higher Education, Teaching Efficiency, Student Engagement

1 Introduction

A major technical development with far-reaching consequences for universities is generative artificial intelligence (AI), as shown by systems like ChatGPT.When it comes to artificial intelligence, generative models are state-of-the-art. These models use intricate frameworks like Transformers to produce content that looks and sounds human.There is much promise that these skills, which have been swiftly adopted into academic and educational settings, will improve research, instruction, and student achievement[3][15].In their 2017 New Generation Artificial Intelligence Development Plan, China highlighted the enormous possibilities of AI to enhance individualized learning[2], streamline scholastic operations, and stimulate creative problem-solving[5][17].

Despite the revolutionary promise, there are many obstacles to using generative AI in universities.Traditional methods of instruction aren't always flexible enough to include these cutting-edge resources[6][16].Also, doing research and literature reviews is

R. Koul et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Educational Development and Social Sciences (EDSS 2025)*, Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research 924,
https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-400-6_84

still a tedious and time-consuming process in academia [9][12].Data privacy, minimizing algorithmic biases, and upholding academic integrity are only a few of the major ethical challenges raised by the use of generative AI[3][19].To address these issues and maximize the benefits while minimizing the challenges, it is necessary to do a thorough analysis of how generative AI has been effectively used in higher education[11][18].

An all-inclusive framework outlining the theoretical and practical aspects of generative AI integration in higher education is the goal of this project[1][4]. Intelligent pedagogical strategies are developed with the goal of improving individual learning experiences, refining research procedures, and addressing ethical challenges. Academic processes can be transformed and creative, egalitarian educational frameworks can be established with the help of generative AI, according to this study[7][10].

2 Methods

2.1 Experimental Design

This study uses a mixed-methods approach, incorporating controlled experiments, questionnaires, and longitudinal observations to assess the effects of generative AI.The independent variable is the use of generative AI tools (e.g., ChatGPT) in contrast to conventional approaches.The dependent variables are teaching efficiency, research output, and student motivation.

2.2 Participants

The sample comprised 100 university students, randomly allocated into two groups: an experimental group (n = 50) employing generative AI tools and a control group (n = 50) utilising traditional methods. Participants engaged in tasks pertinent to academic and instructional activities over a defined experimental duration.From Table 1, it can be seen that the survey instrumentation employed in this study was designed to measure key outcomes such as academic motivation, task satisfaction, and AI usage frequency.

Table 1. Survey Instrumentation.

Instrument	Purpose	Example Item	Source
Academic Motivation Scale(AMS)	Measures intrinsic and extrinsic academic motivation.	"I am highly interested in the content of this course."	Vallerand et al.,1992
Task Satisfaction Scale	Assesses satisfaction and perceived efficiency.	"The tasks completed using AI were easier and more efficient than manual tasks."	Adapted from SERVQUAL Model
AI Usage Questionnaire	Evaluates frequency and perceived utility of AI tools.	"How frequently do you use AI tools in academic tasks?"	This study

The AMS employs a 5-point Likert scale, with values ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The Task Satisfaction Scale assesses task perceptions, emphasizing efficiency and quality and incorporating open-ended responses for qualitative insights.

2.3 Data Collection

Data were collected via online survey platforms, capturing quantitative metrics such as task completion time and Likert scale responses, along with qualitative feedback regarding user experiences. Controlled experiments monitored objective metrics, including task quality scores assessed by independent reviewers.

2.4 Statistical Analysis(spss 26)

2.4.1 Descriptive Statistics.

Participant demographics and baseline characteristics were summarised.

2.4.2 Independent T-tests.

Compared the average scores of the experimental and control groups on task efficiency, motivation, and satisfaction.

2.4.3 Correlation Analysis.

Investigated correlations between outcomes (such as motivation and satisfaction) and the frequency of using generative AI.

2.4.4 Regression Analysis.

The predictive role of artificial intelligence (AI) usage on academic performance markers was investigated.

3 Results

3.1 Teaching and Learning Outcomes

The experimental group surpassed the control group in teaching efficiency, decreasing lesson preparation time by 35% ($p < 0.01$). Seventy-eight percent of students in the experimental group reported heightened interest and motivation when utilizing AI-powered teaching tools [6] [13]. The average satisfaction scores for AI-generated teaching materials exceeded those of traditionally prepared resources by 25%.

3.2 Data Tables

As shown in Table 2, the descriptive statistics highlight that the experimental group exhibited higher academic motivation and task satisfaction compared to the control group.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics.

Variable	Experimental Group(n=50)	Control Group(n=50)	Mean	SD
Age(years)	20.5	20.7	20.6	0.5
Academic Motivation	4.2	3.5	3.85	0.7
Task Satisfaction	4.5	3.2	3.85	1.0

From Table 3, it is evident that independent t-test results indicate significant differences in key outcomes between the experimental and control groups.

Table 3. Independent t-test Results.

Variable	Experimental Group Mean	Control Group Mean	t-value	p-value
Academic Motivation	4.2	3.5	4.12	<0.01
Task Satisfaction	4.5	3.2	5.20	<0.01

Table 4 shows that a strong positive correlation exists between generative AI usage and academic motivation ($r = 0.65$, $p < 0.01$).

Table 4. Correlation Analysis

Variable	Frequency Correlation(r)	p-value
Academic Motivation	0.65	<0.01
Task Satisfaction	0.72	<0.01

Regression results in Table 5 confirm that generative AI usage significantly predicts academic motivation and task satisfaction.

Table 5. Regression Analysis.

Variable	β	t-value	p-value
Academic Motivation	0.45	3.21	<0.01
Task Satisfaction	0.52	4.01	<0.01

4 Discussion

The results demonstrate that generative AI can greatly enhance academic efficiency and personalize experiences. Previous research has shown that AI has the ability to improve educational processes and reduce cognitive load [3] [12]. Our findings corroborate these claims. The significance of AI in improving learner engagement and task satisfaction is emphasized by the strong correlations and predictive effects [8] [14] [15]

Still, obstacles persist. From Tables 1 through 5, it can be seen that while generative AI offers significant improvements, ethical considerations such as algorithmic bias and over-reliance remain important[3][19][20]. There needs to be domain-specific AI training due to the challenges with AI's contextual understanding in some industries[4][6]. Scalable solutions for different types of academic settings, analyses of multidisciplinary applications, and evaluations of governance frameworks to mitigate ethical hazards should all be part of future study.

5 Conclusion

Generative AI is a significant improvement in higher education that improves classroom efficiency, student engagement, and research output. This study delivers practical outcomes as well as a strong foundation for incorporating artificial intelligence into academic activities. The statistics show significant revolutionary potential; nonetheless, ethical and practical obstacles must be addressed for long-term implementation. This research lays the groundwork for a dynamic and inclusive academic future in the field of artificial intelligence.

Acknowledgments

This research was funded by the Higher Education Research Project 2024 of the Independent Colleges Branch of the Zhejiang Higher Education Society.

References

1. Chiu,T.K.F.(2023).The impact of Generative AI(GenAI)on practices,policies and research direction in education:A case of ChatGPT and Midjourney.Interactive Learning Environments.https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2023.2253861.
2. Bozkurt,A.,Karadeniz,A.,Bańeres,D.,Guerrero-Roldán,A.-E.,&Rodríguez,M.E.(2021).Artificial Intelligence and Reflections from Educational Landscape:A Review of AI Studies in Half a Century.Sustainability,13(2),800.https://dx.doi.org/10.3390/SU13020800.
3. Alasadi,E.,&Baiz,C.R.(2023).Generative AI in Education and Research:Opportunities,Concerns,and Solutions.Journal of Chemical Education.https://dx.doi.org/10.1021/acs.jchemed.3c00323.
4. Kumar,D.,Haque,A.,Mishra,K.,Islam,F.,Mishra,B.K.,&Ahmad,S.(2023).Exploring the Transformative Role of Artificial Intelligence and Metaverse in Education:A Comprehensive Review.Metaverse Research.https://dx.doi.org/10.56294/mr202355.
5. Kadaruddin,K.(2023).Empowering Education through Generative AI:Innovative Instructional Strategies for Tomorrow's Learners.International Journal of Business Learning and Education.https://dx.doi.org/10.56442/ijble.v4i2.215.
6. Pendy,B.(2023).Artificial Intelligence:The Future of Education.Journal of Intelligence and Strategic Studies.https://dx.doi.org/10.59141/jiss.v2i11.801.
7. Kurvinen,E.,Järvinen,J.,&Kaila,E.(2022).ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN EDUCATION–WHERE ARE WE NOW?Education and Artificial Intelligence Journal.https://dx.doi.org/10.36315/2022v2end087.

8. Sun,T.(2023).Potential Use of Artificial Intelligence in ESL Writing Assessment:A Case Study of IELTS Writing Tasks.International Journal of Technology Enhanced Learning.https://dx.doi.org/10.22554/ijtel.v7i2.137.
9. Lei,W.,&Liao,X.(2022).Research Hotspots and Trends of Educational Application of Artificial Intelligence at Home and Abroad in the Past Ten Years–Visual Analysis Based on CiteSpace.Computers in Education.https://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3551708.3551719.
10. Pugachova,K.(2023).TRANSFORMING EDUCATION WITH ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE:CHALLENGES,OPPORTUNITIES,AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS.Perspectives of Innovations,Economics&Business.https://dx.doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2023-11(17)-475-484.
11. Vaswani,A.,Shazeer,N.,Parmar,N.,Uszkoreit,J.,Jones,L.,Gomez,A.N.,...&Polosukhin,I.(2017). Attention is All You Need.Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems,30.
12. Brown,T.B.,Mann,B.,Ryder,N.,Subbiah,M.,Kaplan,J.,Dhariwal,P.,...&Amodei,D.(2020).Language Models are Few-Shot Learners.arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165.
13. Radford,A.,Narasimhan,K.,Salimans,T.,&Sutskever,I.(2018).Improving Language Understanding by Generative Pre-Training.OpenAI.
14. Ramesh,A.,Pavlov,M.,Goh,G.,Gray,S.,Voss,C.,Radford,A.,...&Sutskever,I.(2021).Zero-shot text-to-image generation.arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.12092.
15. Raffel,C.,Shazeer,N.,Roberts,A.,Lee,K.,Narang,S.,Matena,M.,...&Liu,P.J.(2020).Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer.Journal of Machine Learning Research,21(140),1-67.
16. He,K.,Zhang,X.,Ren,S.,&Sun,J.(2016).Deep Residual Learning for Image Recognition.Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition,770-778.
17. LeCun,Y.,Bengio,Y.,&Hinton,G.(2015).Deep learning.Nature,521(7553),436-444.
18. Devlin,J.,Chang,M.W.,Lee,K.,&Toutanova,K.(2018).BERT:Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding.arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805.
19. Kingma,D.P.,&Welling,M.(2013).Auto-encoding Variational Bayes.arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114.
20. Amodei,D.,Olah,C.,Steinhardt,J.,Christiano,P.,Schulman,J.,&Mane,D.(2016).Concrete Problems in AI Safety.arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.06565.