

# The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Primary School Chinese Language Teaching: An Analysis from Teachers' Perspectives

**Li Nailin**

Shenzhen Longhua District Experimental School Education Group

Email: cfhb89657@gmail.com

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.23391136

## ABSTRACT

Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) has entered Chinese primary education faster than curricula, assessment systems and teacher preparation have adapted to it. While a growing body of Chinese scholarship explores how GenAI can “empower” yuwen (Chinese language) teaching, considerably less attention has been paid to the disruptive effects that frontline teachers must absorb in daily practice. This article offers a qualitative, interpretive analysis of how AI affects primary school Chinese language teaching when viewed from the teacher’s position. Rather than collecting new empirical data, it analyses three bodies of material: national and international policy documents on GenAI in schools, Chinese and international research on AI in language and primary education, and published expert commentary on Chinese language education in the AI era. Read through the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) framework, the analysis identifies four interrelated areas of impact: the erosion of foundational literacy practices such as character writing and sustained reading; a crisis of authorship in writing instruction, in which teachers are pushed from cultivating expression towards verifying authenticity; the reconfiguration of teachers’ professional roles and identities; and institutional ambiguity arising from gaps between national policy, school practice, assessment and home use. The article argues that the central difficulty is not technological access but a misalignment between AI-saturated learning environments and product-oriented teaching and assessment traditions. Implications are drawn for process-oriented writing pedagogy, assessment reform, teacher professional development and home–school collaboration.

**KEYWORDS** generative artificial intelligence; primary school Chinese; yuwen teaching; teacher perspective; writing instruction; educational policy

## 1. Introduction

Since the public release of ChatGPT in late 2022, generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) tools capable of producing fluent text, images and speech on demand have spread rapidly through society. In China, domestic large language models and AI-enabled learning devices marketed to families have brought

these capabilities into children's homes as well as classrooms. For primary school Chinese language education (yuwen), the implications are unusually direct. The subject's core tasks—learning to recognise and write characters, reading texts closely and at length, and composing original written work—overlap closely with what GenAI does best: recognising and producing language.

Policy makers have responded. In May 2025, the Ministry of Education's Steering Committee on Basic Education and Instruction issued the Guide to Using Generative Artificial Intelligence in Primary and Secondary Schools (2025 Edition), which bars primary pupils from using open-ended content generation on their own, permits teachers to use GenAI in class as an aid, forbids teachers from treating it as a substitute teaching agent, and cautions against using AI-generated content to evaluate students (MOE Steering Committee, 2025a). A companion guide on AI general education sets out a staged AI curriculum beginning in primary school (MOE Steering Committee, 2025b). Internationally, UNESCO has called for a human-centred approach and an age limit for independent use of GenAI platforms (Miao & Holmes, 2023). These documents draw boundaries, but whether those boundaries hold in practice depends largely on teachers.

The stakes are particularly high in primary school. Chinese is the subject with the largest share of instructional time in the primary curriculum, primary Chinese teachers frequently serve as head teachers responsible for pupils' moral and social development, and the subject is the main site where children first learn to read and write. Habits formed at this stage shape later learning across all subjects. If AI changes how children acquire literacy, the consequences extend well beyond a single subject, and the primary Chinese teacher is the professional most directly placed to notice, interpret and respond to those changes.

Yet teachers' experience of this change remains under-examined in Chinese scholarship. Much recent work on primary yuwen adopts an "empowerment" framing, proposing how GenAI can enrich reading or poetry teaching (Geng & Tian, 2026; Zhang, 2026). Critical commentators, by contrast, warn that the humanistic core of the subject may be diluted by instrumental rationality (Wang, 2025) and that the place of knowledge in Chinese language education is being unsettled (Cheng, 2025). Between optimistic design proposals and broad cultural critique, the practical position of the classroom teacher—who must teach, assess and protect children within an AI-saturated environment—receives comparatively little systematic attention.

This article addresses that gap through an analytical, rather than empirical, approach. It asks three questions: (1) In what areas does AI affect primary school Chinese language teaching when viewed from the teacher's position? (2) What tensions and dilemmas do these effects create for teachers? (3) What conditions are needed for teachers to respond constructively? The article proceeds by reviewing relevant literature, explaining its analytical approach, presenting four areas of impact, and discussing their implications for policy and practice.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Generative AI in Education: Debates and Policy

Early Chinese responses to ChatGPT framed the question in stark terms. Jiao (2023) asked whether ChatGPT is a friend or an enemy of school education, concluding that schools cannot simply ban the technology and must instead rethink teaching and assessment. Zhou and Wang (2023) argued that

GenAI challenges education to move away from standardised knowledge transmission towards helping each learner develop as an individual. Miao (2023) examined the technical principles of GenAI and questioned its educational suitability, emphasising that statistically generated text is not equivalent to understanding and must be validated before classroom use. Chen et al. (2023) analysed teachers' coping strategies in response to ChatGPT, showing that teachers' reactions ranged from resistance to adaptive integration.

At the policy level, UNESCO's guidance stresses human agency, data protection and age-appropriate design (Miao & Holmes, 2023). China's 2025 guides translate similar concerns into stage-specific rules: primary schools are expected to keep GenAI under teacher supervision, while students are told not to copy generated content into assignments or use it in tests (MOE Steering Committee, 2025a). These rules matter for this analysis because they place teachers in the role of gatekeepers, without specifying how that role is to be resourced.

## 2.2 AI and Chinese Language Teaching

The Compulsory Education Chinese Curriculum Standards (2022 Edition) define Chinese language core competencies in terms of cultural confidence, language use, thinking ability and aesthetic creativity, and call for information technology to extend learning (Ministry of Education, 2022). Recent studies draw on this mandate to propose AI-supported designs. Geng and Tian (2026) diagnose primary reading instruction as suffering from homogenised teaching, static texts and experience-based assessment, and propose GenAI-driven personalised and multimodal pathways. Zhang (2026) designs an AI-supported lesson on a Grade 3 classical poem, while acknowledging that the effectiveness of such designs remains unverified, that the digital divide limits their reach, and that technology dependence must be guarded against.

Critical voices address what such designs may overlook. Wang (2025) argues that when essay marking focuses on structural completeness and text interpretation relies on AI-generated answers, the humanistic nature of Chinese language education risks being thinned out. Guo Changbao, interviewed by Cheng (2025), observes that AI already holds far more knowledge than teachers can transmit, that much formulaic writing can be delegated to machines, and that schools cannot effectively prohibit student use. At a 2025 national forum on reading literacy in the AI era, Wen Rumin urged teachers to keep human judgement central and to guard against fragmented thinking and shallow reading (Peking University School of Education, 2025).

## 2.3 Teachers' Perspectives in International Research

International qualitative studies provide useful points of comparison. Akçin et al. (2026), interviewing 45 Turkish teachers, found strong concern about academic integrity, over-reliance and inadequate training alongside appreciation of time savings and personalisation; a Turkish language teacher in their study worried specifically about assessing students' real writing ability. Dangol et al. (2025) showed that 22 U.S. teachers negotiated personal boundaries for GenAI use shaped by district policy, professional norms and relationships with students. Verkade (2025) found that Dutch primary teachers' trust in GenAI depended on their ethical awareness, and Hastomo et al. (2026) reported that Indonesian primary teachers valued efficiency in material design but lacked pedagogical training. Across contexts, teachers are neither simple adopters nor resisters; they mediate between technology, policy and children.

## 2.4 Research Gap and Analytical Framework

Two gaps emerge. First, Chinese research on primary yuwen and AI is dominated by design proposals, while the burden placed on teachers is rarely the focus. Second, international studies of teachers' views seldom address a first-language literacy subject in which the target skills themselves—writing and reading—are what the technology performs.

This article uses the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) framework (Mishra & Koehler, 2006) as its analytical lens. TPACK holds that effective teaching with technology depends on the integration of technological, pedagogical and content knowledge rather than on any one alone. Its relevance here is distinctive: GenAI does not merely add a new tool (T) to existing practice, it unsettles content knowledge (C) itself by raising the question of which language skills remain worth teaching, and it destabilises pedagogical knowledge (P) by undermining established ways of assigning and assessing work.

## 3. Analytical Approach

This study adopts a qualitative, interpretive design based on document and literature analysis rather than fieldwork. Qualitative inquiry seeks to understand meanings and situations in depth rather than to measure them (Chen, 2000), and document analysis allows a researcher to examine how a problem is constructed across texts produced by different actors. No interviews, surveys or classroom data were collected; the analysis relies entirely on published sources.

Three categories of material were analysed. The first comprises policy documents: the Chinese curriculum standards (Ministry of Education, 2022), the two 2025 national AI guides (MOE Steering Committee, 2025a, 2025b) and UNESCO's guidance (Miao & Holmes, 2023). The second comprises academic research on GenAI in education, in Chinese language teaching and in primary schools internationally, selected for relevance to teachers' practice. The third comprises published expert commentary on Chinese language education in the AI era (Cheng, 2025; Peking University School of Education, 2025; Wang, 2025).

Analysis followed the logic of thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), adapted to documentary sources. Materials were read repeatedly; passages bearing on teachers' work were coded (for example, "detecting AI-written work", "handwriting decline", "policy without resources"); codes were grouped into candidate themes; and themes were reviewed against the material and against the TPACK framework. To reflect a teacher's perspective, each theme was examined by asking what a given policy requirement, research proposal or expert claim would demand of a primary Chinese teacher in an ordinary classroom.

The approach has clear limits. Findings are interpretive syntheses, not empirical evidence of how particular teachers think or act. Their trustworthiness rests on transparent sourcing and on consistency across different kinds of material (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), and they are best read as a framework to be tested by future fieldwork.

## 4. Findings: Four Areas of Impact

The analysis identified four interrelated areas in which AI affects primary Chinese teaching from the teacher's position. Table 1 summarises each area, its main manifestations, the dilemma it creates for teachers, and the TPACK domain most directly affected. The sections that follow discuss each in turn.

**Table 1**

Four Areas of AI Impact on Primary Chinese Teaching from Teachers' Perspectives

| Area of impact             | Main manifestations                                                                                 | Dilemma for teachers                                                                 | TPACK domain most affected    |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Foundational literacy      | Voice input and predictive text; AI summaries replacing whole-book reading; weaker character recall | Defending effortful practices against effortless tools; scaffolding vs. substitution | Content knowledge             |
| Authorship in writing      | AI-generated compositions; temptation of automated marking; template-based assessment exposed       | Shift from cultivating expression to verifying authenticity; risk of false suspicion | Pedagogical knowledge         |
| Teacher roles and identity | Faster preparation; weakened authority as knowledge source; new guiding role                        | Identity change without change in workload or accountability                         | Pedagogical content knowledge |
| Institutional ambiguity    | Home use beyond school control; unchanged assessment; tool-focused training; digital divide         | Responsibility for enforcing policy without local guidelines or resources            | Integrated TPACK and context  |

### 4.1 The Erosion of Foundational Literacy Practices

Primary Chinese teaching rests on slow, embodied practices: copying characters stroke by stroke, reading texts aloud and returning to them, and building vocabulary through repeated use. AI-enabled tools compress or bypass these practices. Voice input and predictive text allow children to produce written Chinese without recalling character forms; AI summaries can replace the reading of whole books; and instant explanations can substitute for the effort of working out a difficult passage. The familiar phenomenon of recognising characters but being unable to write them (*tibi wangzi*) is thereby likely to begin earlier in a child's schooling.

From the teacher's position, the difficulty is that these practices are deliberately effortful. Their value lies in the cognitive and motor work they demand, which is precisely what AI removes. Wen Rumin's warning about fragmented thinking and shallow reading (Peking University School of Education, 2025) captures the stake. The "empowerment" literature is not blind to this: Zhang (2026) explicitly cautions against technological dependence. But design proposals that add AI-generated images, dialogues and summaries to lessons can unintentionally reinforce a pattern of fast, effortless input. Teachers must therefore defend practices whose benefits are slow and invisible against tools whose benefits are immediate and visible—a contest in which they often lack support from parents and students alike.

The 2022 curriculum standards give particular weight to whole-book reading, which requires sustained attention, tolerance of difficulty and personal response over weeks rather than minutes (Ministry of Education, 2022). This is precisely the kind of reading most easily short-circuited by summaries and question-answering tools. At the same time, the picture is not one-sided. For pupils

who struggle with decoding or vocabulary, AI-generated explanations and read-aloud functions can provide genuine scaffolding, as design-oriented studies point out (Geng & Tian, 2026). The teacher's task is therefore not simply to exclude AI but to distinguish scaffolding, which supports a child towards independent performance, from substitution, which performs the task in the child's place. Making that distinction requires close knowledge of each pupil, which is difficult to sustain in large classes.

In TPACK terms, the impact falls on content knowledge. Teachers must decide which foundational skills remain non-negotiable and justify that decision to pupils and families who can see that a machine performs the same task instantly.

## 4.2 A Crisis of Authorship in Writing Instruction

Writing is where the impact is sharpest. Primary composition (xizuo) aims to help children express their own experience and feelings in coherent language. GenAI can now produce a grade-appropriate composition in seconds. International teachers already identify academic integrity as their primary concern (Akçin et al., 2026), and the 2025 Chinese guide explicitly tells students not to copy generated content or use AI to complete personal and creative tasks (MOE Steering Committee, 2025a).

For teachers, this produces a shift in role. Marking a composition has traditionally meant responding to a child's expression; it now also involves judging whether the child wrote it. Suspected AI texts tend to be fluent but generic, with vocabulary and structure beyond the child's usual level and little of the concrete, idiosyncratic detail that marks genuine childhood writing. Yet such judgements are uncertain. Guo Changbao notes that AI-generated assignments are usually unremarkable and may go unnoticed by a teacher who is not paying close attention (Cheng, 2025). A teacher who wrongly suspects a pupil may damage trust and motivation; a teacher who never suspects may reward work the child did not do. Since primary pupils are forbidden from using open-ended generation independently, any such use is likely to happen at home, further beyond the teacher's view.

The deeper problem is that AI exposes a long-standing weakness of writing pedagogy. Guo argues that school writing has been oriented towards exam formats, producing formulaic prose that machines now replicate easily (Cheng, 2025). Where instruction and assessment reward a polished final product built from templates, AI is simply a more efficient route to that product. The crisis of authorship is therefore not only a matter of cheating; it reveals that much assessed writing did not require authentic authorship in the first place.

The temptation to outsource is not limited to pupils. Automated essay marking and AI-generated feedback promise to relieve one of the heaviest parts of a Chinese teacher's workload. Yet the national guide warns against using AI-generated content to evaluate students (MOE Steering Committee, 2025a), and Wang (2025) cautions that machine marking privileges measurable features such as structure and keyword coverage over feeling and individuality. Teachers thus face a mirror image of their pupils' dilemma: the same technology that would save them time may erode the attentive, personal response that gives primary writing instruction its value. The more constructive responses visible in the literature involve redesigning tasks rather than detecting misuse—writing in class, keeping learning journals, linking prompts to shared class experiences, and asking pupils to talk about their drafts—so that the process of writing becomes visible and valued.

### 4.3 The Reconfiguration of Teachers' Roles and Identities

AI also reshapes how teachers see themselves. On the one hand, it offers practical relief: lesson planning, resource preparation and differentiated exercises become faster, as research on poetry and reading instruction demonstrates (Geng & Tian, 2026; Zhang, 2026) and as teachers elsewhere report (Hastomo et al., 2026). On the other hand, it challenges the teacher's authority as a source of knowledge. If AI knows more than any teacher can transmit (Cheng, 2025), the knowledgeable yuwen teacher who explains texts and corrects errors loses part of their professional distinctiveness.

The policy response—that teachers must not let AI replace them as a teaching agent (MOE Steering Committee, 2025a)—protects the teacher's position formally, but it does not define what the teacher's distinctive contribution now is. Expert commentary suggests an answer: the teacher becomes a guide to critical judgement, aesthetic experience and cultural meaning rather than a transmitter of information (Peking University School of Education, 2025; Wang, 2025). This is an attractive vision, but it asks teachers to shift professional identity while their daily workload, assessment duties and accountability measures remain largely unchanged. Dangol et al. (2025) describe teachers negotiating personal boundaries between relief and displacement; Chinese primary teachers are likely to face a similar ambivalence, intensified by heavy marking loads and parental expectations.

Role change may also be uneven across the profession. Teachers who are comfortable with digital tools may adopt AI quickly for preparation but have less experience in judging its pedagogical limits, while experienced teachers may possess strong pedagogical judgement but feel less confident with the technology. TPACK suggests that neither group alone holds the integrated knowledge required (Mishra & Koehler, 2006), which points to the value of collaborative school-based teaching research rather than individual adaptation. Moreover, the primary Chinese teacher's role has always included moral and emotional education. Responding to a child's writing about family, friendship or loss is a relational act that AI cannot perform, and it is in this relational dimension that teachers' professional identity may find its firmest ground.

### 4.4 Institutional Ambiguity

The final area concerns the institutional environment. National guidance is now relatively clear in principle, but several gaps remain between policy and the classroom. First, the guide's stage-specific rules assume that pupil use can be supervised, yet much use occurs at home through parents' phones or learning devices, beyond school control. Second, assessment has not changed in step: if examinations and homework continue to reward standardised answers and model compositions, teachers are asked to discourage AI use while working within a system that values what AI produces. Third, professional development tends to focus on operating tools rather than on pedagogical and ethical judgement, a gap noted across international studies (Akçin et al., 2026; Hastomo et al., 2026). Fourth, the digital divide means that rural and urban schools, and families with different resources, experience AI very differently, a limitation acknowledged even by proponents of AI-supported design (Zhang, 2026).

For the individual teacher, these gaps translate into responsibility without clear tools. Teachers are expected to implement national principles, interpret them at school level, communicate them to parents, and enforce them in assessment, often without school-specific guidelines or time allocated for

redesigning tasks. Verkade (2025) found that ethical awareness was a prerequisite for teachers' trust in GenAI; without institutional support for building that awareness, teachers are left to improvise.

Families form a further layer of this ambiguity. AI-enabled learning devices and homework apps are marketed to parents as tools for raising achievement, and parents anxious about results may welcome tools that produce better-looking homework. Teachers are therefore asked to communicate a policy that may run against parents' immediate interests, often through informal channels such as class messaging groups. Without shared school-level messaging, individual teachers bear the social cost of explaining why a polished AI-assisted composition is less valuable than a child's imperfect but genuine one.

## 5. Discussion

Taken together, the four areas suggest that AI's impact on primary Chinese teaching is not primarily a technical problem. The most serious difficulties arise where AI meets existing weaknesses: product-oriented writing assessment, an emphasis on standard answers, limited time for process-based teaching, and weak home-school coordination. In this sense, AI acts less as the cause of a new crisis than as an amplifier of older tensions, a point that echoes both Guo's critique of formulaic writing (Cheng, 2025) and international findings that integrity concerns reflect the need to rethink assessment (Akçin et al., 2026).

This interpretation also cautions against two opposite reactions. Prohibition alone is unlikely to work: expert commentary notes that bans are hard to enforce (Cheng, 2025), and much use occurs outside school. Uncritical adoption, however, risks accelerating the very problems identified above. A more defensible position, consistent with both the national guide and UNESCO's human-centred approach (Miao & Holmes, 2023), treats AI as a supervised aid whose use is justified by specific learning purposes. Under this position, AI may legitimately reduce teachers' preparation time, generate differentiated practice, or offer pupils models to analyse critically, while the core literacy acts of writing, sustained reading and personal response remain the child's own.

Read through TPACK, the analysis suggests that GenAI disturbs all three knowledge domains at once. Technological knowledge is the least difficult to acquire; the harder questions concern content (which literacy skills remain essential, and why) and pedagogy (how to design tasks that make thinking and authorship visible). Professional development that concentrates on tools therefore addresses the smallest part of the problem.

Several implications follow. First, writing instruction should become more process-oriented: drafting in class, oral rehearsal before writing, staged feedback on drafts, and prompts rooted in pupils' lived experience make authorship visible and reduce the value of outsourced products. Second, assessment should reward process and personal voice rather than polished templates, consistent with the policy instruction not to rely on AI to evaluate students (MOE Steering Committee, 2025a). Third, schools need local guidelines that translate national principles into concrete expectations for homework, classroom use and parent communication. Fourth, teacher development should prioritise pedagogical and ethical reasoning, including how to discuss AI openly with children rather than only police it. Finally, the humanistic core of *yuwen*—cultural transmission, emotional expression and aesthetic experience (Wang, 2025)—should be made explicit as the rationale for practices AI cannot replace.

These implications return the focus to teachers. The national guides rightly position teachers as the guardians of appropriate use; the analysis here suggests that this role can be sustained only if teachers receive the time, assessment structures and institutional backing that make it workable.

## 6. Conclusion

This article has analysed, from teachers' perspectives, how artificial intelligence affects primary school Chinese language teaching. Drawing on policy documents, research literature and expert commentary, it identified four areas of impact: the erosion of foundational literacy practices, a crisis of authorship in writing instruction, the reconfiguration of teachers' roles and identities, and institutional ambiguity. It argued that these impacts are intensified by existing product-oriented practices and that responses should focus on pedagogy, assessment and institutional support rather than on technology alone.

From a teacher's perspective, the central question raised by AI is not whether machines can read and write, but what children still need to learn to do themselves, and why. Answering that question requires teachers to articulate the value of their subject more explicitly than before. In this sense, the disruption brought by AI also offers an opportunity: to renew primary Chinese education around authentic expression, deep reading and cultural understanding rather than around reproducible products.

The study has limitations. Because it relies on secondary sources rather than empirical data, its claims about teachers' experience are inferences rather than observations, and the available Chinese literature on primary yuwen and AI is still small and weighted towards design proposals. Future research should test this framework through interviews and classroom observation with primary Chinese teachers across regions, examine pupils' and parents' perspectives, and follow how schools implement the 2025 national guides over time. Such work would help ensure that the integration of AI into primary Chinese education is shaped by those who teach it.

## References

- Akçin, A., Kurukafa, K., & Tarhan, A. (2026). Teachers' perceptions of generative AI in education: Opportunities, challenges, and classroom use. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 25(2), 148–157.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Chen, X. (2000). 质的研究方法与社会科学研究 [Qualitative research methods and social science research]. Educational Science Publishing House.
- Chen, Z., Shi, Y., & Wang, M. (2023). 人工智能助推教育变革的现实图景——教师对 ChatGPT 的应对策略分析 [The realistic picture of artificial intelligence promoting educational reform: An analysis of teachers' coping strategies towards ChatGPT]. *Journal of Guangxi Normal University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)*, 59(2), 75–85.

- Cheng, T. (2025, August 23). 北师大教授过常宝：语文教育若不重视 AI，可能会被时代拉下来 [BNU professor Guo Changbao: Chinese language education may fall behind the times if it neglects AI]. The Paper. [https://www.thepaper.cn/newsDetail\\_forward\\_31457520](https://www.thepaper.cn/newsDetail_forward_31457520)
- Dangol, A., Kotiyal, S., Wolfe, R., Bowers, A. J., Vigil, A., Yip, J., Kientz, J. A., Shahid, S., Yeh, T., Cho, V., & Davis, K. (2025). Relief or displacement? How teachers are negotiating generative AI's role in their professional practice (arXiv:2510.18296). arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2510.18296>
- Geng, H., & Tian, L. (2026). 生成式人工智能驱动下的小学语文阅读教学进阶路径 [Research on the advanced path of primary school Chinese reading teaching driven by GAI]. 教学研究 [Research in Teaching], 49(2), 12–19.
- Hastomo, T., Widiati, U., Ivone, F. M., & Zen, E. L. (2026). Integrating generative AI in primary English material design: Insights from Indonesian teachers' perceptions. *Revija za Elementarno Izobraževanje* [Journal of Elementary Education], 19(1). <https://doi.org/10.18690/rei5409>
- Jiao, J. (2023). ChatGPT：学校教育的朋友还是敌人？ [ChatGPT: Friend or foe of school education?]. *Modern Educational Technology*, 33(4), 5–15.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE.
- Miao, F. (2023). 生成式人工智能技术原理及其教育适用性考证 [Technical principles of generative artificial intelligence and an examination of its educational applicability]. *Modern Educational Technology*, 33(11), 5–18.
- Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000386693>
- Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China. (2022). 义务教育语文课程标准（2022 年版） [Compulsory education Chinese curriculum standards (2022 edition)]. Beijing Normal University Press.
- Ministry of Education Steering Committee on Basic Education and Instruction [MOE Steering Committee]. (2025a). 中小学生生成式人工智能使用指南（2025 年版） [Guide to using generative artificial intelligence in primary and secondary schools (2025 edition)]. Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China.
- Ministry of Education Steering Committee on Basic Education and Instruction [MOE Steering Committee]. (2025b). 中小学人工智能通识教育指南（2025 年版） [Guide to artificial intelligence general education in primary and secondary schools (2025 edition)]. Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China.
- Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, 108(6), 1017–1054. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00684.x>
- Peking University School of Education. (2025, November 10). 第六届未名语文教育论坛举行 [The Sixth Weiming Chinese Language Education Forum held]. <https://www.sinoss.net/c/2025-11-10/660709.shtml>

Verkade, I. (2025). Ethical reflections on generative AI: Insights from primary school teachers and school leaders [Master's thesis, Utrecht University].

<https://studenttheses.uu.nl/handle/20.500.12932/50105>

Wang, W. (2025, August 31). 以人文之光照亮数智时代的语文之路 [Illuminating the path of Chinese language education in the digital-intelligent era with the light of humanism]. Guangming Daily.

<https://www.chinawriter.com.cn/n1/2025/0831/c407521-40553617.html>

Zhang, J. (2026). 生成式人工智能赋能小学语文古诗的教学策略研究——以《望天门山》为例 [Research on the strategies of generative artificial intelligence empowering ancient poetry teaching in primary school Chinese language: A case study of Wang Tianmen Mountain]. *Advances in Education*, 16(7), 1676–1688. <https://doi.org/10.12677/ae.2026.1671547>

Zhou, L., & Wang, F. (2023). 生成式人工智能的教育启示：让每个人成为他自己 [Educational implications of generative artificial intelligence: Letting everyone become themselves]. *China Educational Technology*, (5), 9–14.