



Motivations and Gratifications in Generative AI Adoption: A Survey-Based Uses and Gratifications Study of Media and Communication Students at the University of Gujrat, Pakistan

Esha Shahbaz Sarwar¹, Dr. Faiza Bajwa²

¹MPhil Scholar, Centre for media & Communication studies, University of Gujrat, Pakistan

Email: 24011716-001@uog.edu.pk

²Assistant Professor, Centre for Media and Communication Studies, University of Gujrat, Punjab, Pakistan

Email: faiza.bajwa@uog.edu.pk

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: September 12, 2026
Revised: September 23, 2026
Accepted: October 15, 2026
Available Online: October 19, 2026

Keywords:

Generative AI, Uses and Gratifications Theory, ChatGPT, Media and Communication Students, Academic Gratifications, Survey, Higher Education, Pakistan, University of Gujrat.

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Faiza Bajwa

Email:

faiza.bajwa@uog.edu.pk

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.59075/tamsaal.v4i10.239>

ABSTRACT

In Pakistan, AI tools, including ChatGPT which are used as generative AI tools, have changed academic practice in higher education, but the motivations of students are under-researched. This quantitative survey uses the Uses and Gratifications Theory (UGT) to investigate generative AI usage by media and communication students in the University of Gujrat (UOG) in meeting academic needs, such as cognitive (content creation, research), tension-release (meeting deadlines), and personal integrative (learn media production) gratifications. A survey was conducted on 250 students of UOG who have been on the media-related programs using a structured questionnaire. The SPSS descriptive statistics demonstrated moderate awareness of AI (40.8%), dominating self-taught adoption (40.0%), and the frequency of usage being high (59.2% per week/day), with ChatGPT (30.0%), and virtual assistants (21.6%), prevailing in writing, brainstorming, and plagiarism. Integration was not even across the board as advanced tools (e.g., machine learning platforms, 4.0%) were barely utilized. Results are positive in favor of UGT, which demonstrates active selection of AI in terms of utilitarian and hedonic gratifications, but indicates shortcomings in formal training and ethical consciousness. Implications consist in the introduction of AI literacy in media curricula in order to maximize gratifications, and reduce the risks of dependency. This paper builds upon UGT to generative AI within Pakistani media education providing information on the fair implementation in resourceconstrained contexts.



Introduction

Artificial Intelligence technology appears to be one of the technologies that are currently increasing at an astonishing speed (Johnson & Brown, 2022). The potentialities created by AI and the development of most areas of study that embrace it have gone to an extent that it is still revolutionizing the way activities are carried out (Patel and Nguyen, 2023). The use of generative AI with high potential in the educational sphere and the possibilities of improving learning experience, generating personalized content, and being efficient when it comes to creativity is one of such domains (Lewis and Kim, 2022). Generative AI has attracted a lot of attention in the scholarly community due to its apparent potential in enhancing the learning and production of students in the media industries (White and Tan, 2023).

Generative AI when used by students of the University of Gujrat (UOG), especially in the Department of Media and Communication Studies, is a rather relevant subject and will be a worthy topic to examine in Pakistan. The UOG media programs focus on digital journalism, advertising, PR, and content production, where ChatGPT is effective in generating the idea, writing the script and editing it. The aims of this study are to identify what extent of generative AI UOG media students use in academic activities with the focus on what they use and how they perceive the use of AI with regard to their gratification. The uses and gratification analysis is the examination of the utilization of media by the audience irrespective of whether the aim is intentional or not and its effects (Katz, Blumler, and Gurevitch, 1974). This manner of approach can allow every person to consider the multiple potential approaches and uses of generative AI resources and technology by UOG students today to enhance their academic performance.

To conduct as comprehensive an analysis as possible with a quantitative research method the students were given a questionnaire which was sent to a sample of UOG students who were chosen conveniently. The questionnaire thus designed is expected to help students to evaluate their experiences related to the use of generative AI in academic activities.

Rather than random selection, they apply non-probability sampling technique called convenient sampling when in this case subjects are chosen on the grounds of their availability, their willingness or otherwise to participate. The method is highly applicable and it is typically applied on research projects with limited resources and time. This is because it helps in conducting studies. In their study, researchers can obtain potential useful data when selecting subjects that are available.

Problem Statement

Generative Artificial Intelligence in education would cause a tidal shift in the teaching and learning process combined with improved student performance. Nevertheless, there is a pressing demand to learn the summary of how their students of the University of Gujrat use generative AI tools in terms of academic purposes and their attitude towards their application. The study seeks to address these gaps in the literature by trying to fill these gaps by examining the adoption of generative AI on academic performance among the students of UOG through the prism of uses and gratification. The current research work is inclined towards worthwhile findings that can educate, inform, and motivate proper incorporation of generative AI tools, in order to optimize the learning process in a way that suits the students.

Significance of Study

This research is significant as it seeks to adopt the concept of using generative AI on academic performance of students at UOG using the uses and gratification viewpoint. The study will add to the theoretical and practical knowledge of understanding motivations and preference in the adoption of generative AI among the UOG students.

Theoretically, this research sums up the available literature as far as the utilization of the generative AI technologies by UGO students in order to obtain improved academic outcomes is concerned. With its emphasis on uses and gratifications of the application of the generative AI in higher education and to be more specific, UOG media students, the study builds on the existing literature. In general, it can be regarded as a more profound understanding of the way such students actively choose and apply generative AI technologies to their academic needs and meet their specific gratification.

In real-life application, such results can enable institutions to a large extent. The research will assist the institution in understanding the factors that stimulated and discouraged UOG students in terms of the application of generative AI technologies. Indicatively, the knowledge of the institution on the use of generative AI at UOG to improve performance will create the design and implementation of AI tools and support systems in line with the needs of students. This, in its turn, may lead to their success in school and their general satisfaction with the education process.

Research Questions

RQ1: How frequently do the students of UOG apply the generative AI technologies to improve their academic performance?

RQ2: How do the students feel about and how do they understand generative artificial intelligence tools are applied to improve their academic experience?

Objective of study

1. To research how the use of generative AI technology is spreading among the students in UOG and the way the students incorporate generative AI into their educational process.
2. To identify and discuss the perception and comprehension of generative artificial intelligence tools among students.

Literature review

Research has found popular AI applications such as virtual assistants (e.g., Siri, Google

Assistant), plagiarism detection applications (e.g., Turnitin, Grammarly), writing assistant (e.g., QuillBot), and generative AI (e.g., ChatGPT) that can assist students with different academic tasks (Tran and Wang, 2022; Farrokhnia et al., 2024). Research and information retrieval is one of the major uses of generative AI in the academic field. The use of AI-driven search engines and large language models has changed the way students access scholarly articles, sum up the material, and generate ideas in a short period of time (Gupta and Lee, 2023; Lo, 2023). The focus has shifted towards the use of AI technologies created through generative AI to use in

education (Lim et al., 2023). Actually, it would seem that these technologies are part of daily academic life as can be seen by large percentage of usage reported in recent surveys. To illustrate, 27.2% of students use generative AI on daily basis and 29.6% on several occasions a week, which is the world tendency in terms of the educational technology usage (Digital Education Council, 2024; UCLA Higher Education Research Institute, 2025). Nevertheless, the fact that 17.2 percent of students use it rarely and only 2.8 percent use it once a week is problematic, which shows that the adoption rates are not even among students (Kim and Jones, 2022; Chan and Hu, 2023).

Writing support is also popular with generative AI tools that assist students in enhancing the quality of writing, coherence and efficiency. Such web-based tools as Grammarly, QuillBot, and ChatGPT will give real-time feedback on grammar, style, structure, and even idea development (Brown and Garcia, 2023; Perkins et al., 2024). A single study discovered that the major reason why students employ the AI-powered learning platforms is to enhance the learning results (Patel and Singh, 2022). Another determined that these platforms will be used to decrease work-loads through more efficiency in the learning and content production (Tran and Tan, 2023). Moreover, learners said that the primary reason why they implemented generative AI was to facilitate academic achievements, improve interaction, and make creative tasks faster (Chen and Johnson, 2022; Imran et al., 2025).

According to several studies, learners are attracted to the interactive and engaging methods of learning such as gamification, simulation, and AI-assisted collaborative systems (Nguyen and Smith, 2023). Other studies show the trend towards individualized and dynamic learning, which could be effectively delivered with the help of generative AI in the form of personalized responses and feedbacks (Garcia and Lee, 2022). Students in several studies have rated chatbots and generative AI assistants as the most useful ones (White and Brown, 2023; Farrokhnia et al., 2024).

Some potential reasons behind the infrequent or limited use are the lack of awareness, the lack of training, doubts about its efficacy, and the ethical reasons (Kim and Patel, 2022; Chan and Hu, 2023). With appropriate training and institutional assistance, such students are much more prone to employ AI tools on a regular basis and be successful (Johnson & Tran, 2022; Imran et al., 2025).

Conceptual / Theoretical Framework.

This study has a conceptual underpinning of the Uses and Gratifications perspective. The Uses and Gratifications Theory (UGT) is the viewpoint that explains why people actively prefer and use the media technologies (television, internet platforms, social media, and currently generative AI) to address particular identified demands and receive gratifications that satisfy them personally (Katz, Blumler, and Gurevitch, 1974).

The Uses and Gratifications Theory.

Gurevitch, Blumler, and Katz (1970) were the original creators of the Uses and Gratification

Theory. It is contrasted to the conventional media effects theories (e.g., Hypodermic Needle Theory, Limited Effects Theory, Agenda-Setting Theory) that do not pay much attention to the

fact that media can and does affect people. Nevertheless, UGT attempts to define how people actively choose and consume the media according to their wants, intentions, and necessities (Katz et al., 1974).

This theory states that human beings intentionally introduce themselves into the media and use it to meet a particular need or to gain gratification. Individuals are not passive recipients but active participants who have a choice when it comes to the use of media to satisfy the psychological, social, and emotional needs. The theory assumes that people consume the media due to diverse motivations and have different types of satisfaction by the media (Ruggieri, 2000; Sundar and Limperos, 2013).

When focusing on generative AI, UGT is a helpful tool to comprehend why students willingly opt to use tools like ChatGPT to satisfy academic tasks - such as getting fast information (cognitive), alleviating stress at the deadline (tension-release) and developing personal abilities to write and create (personal integrative) or imitating social interaction via conversational AI (social integrative).

Research Methodology Research Design

The research was conducted with the help of quantitative research methods, because the aim was to provide the numerical data on the correlation between fulfillment desires among the UOG media and communication students and the level of their involvement in generative AI when it comes to academic performance. The cross sectional method was employed to obtain data at a single point of time and this took a snapshot of the experience and perception of the students.

Population

The focus group of the target population in this study will include the students of the University of Gujrat (UOG). The subjects to be used in this study will be the undergraduate and graduate students of UOG who will be representing various subjects but with a particular emphasis on the media and communication studies department. It is possible to assume that this segment represents a diverse population but especially disposed to using generative AI tools in their learning, content creation, research, and media production activities.

Convenient Sampling method.

As opposed to a random sample, convenient sampling is a non-random sampling technique which deals with the selection of the subject or study participants depending on the availability and the willingness to participate. It is simpler to apply this type of sampling. It is usually adjusted to the situation when the researcher has scarce resources in terms of time and money. A researcher can access valuable information in relation to the study by selecting the participants that are easily accessible and reachable. Convenient sampling can also not facilitate generalization of real events, but it is a simple method of gathering data of subjects that are readily available in the environment of the study.

The benefits of convenience sampling.

The key benefits of the convenient sampling method are the following:

1. Quick data collection 2. Inexpensive method 3. Easy to do research 4. Fewer rules to be followed 5. Sample readily available 6. Less costly

Sample Size

To sample 250 students of the University of Gujrat, convenience sampling technique was selected to get the sample of the population. The sample is made up of 250 students aged 18-40 years and pursuing various undergraduate and graduate courses in the university with focus on the media and communication fields.

Time Zone

The survey took place in two months between the months of February and March year 2026.

Instrument

An elaborate questionnaire was used as the major means of collecting data. To include closedended questions and Likert-scale questions into the survey, students were given a freedom to provide their perceptions, experiences, and impressions about the use of generative AI in improving academic performance. The questionnaire was created to obtain demographic data of the students that study at UOG, the current and future trends in regards to incorporating generative AI, why they use it, and what they anticipate receiving as a result of the use.

Procedure (Data Collection)

Ethical Considerations: The following were the ethical considerations before actual data collection; the participants were approached to give their consent; this was to make sure that the participants were aware of the rights of the study, aims and objectives of the study and also to ensure that the participants remained anonymous. The whole research process did not contradict the ethical standards that comprise the questions of privacy and data protection.

Questionnaire Distribution

The information was also taken on a face-to-face basis; students of the university received a hard copy of the designed eye-appealing questionnaire in form of a printed piece of paper. These were the goals of the study and the way to fill in the questionnaire. The questionnaire was definitely not rushed but written reminders were used to make more detailed responses.

Data Analysis

The data analysis was performed based on the data collected at the end of the data collection period using the statistical tests that are in SPSS. Data were presented in terms of descriptive statistics which included Mean, Standard Deviation, frequency table, and percentage.

Variables

Dependent Variable: Academic Performance.

Independent Variable: Generative AI Technologies use

Tables 1 present the Age Distribution among the Respondents.

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Under 20	36	14.4	14.4	14.4
20-25 years	132	52.8	52.8	67.2
26-30	46	18.4	18.4	85.6
Over 30	36	14.4	14.4	100.0
Total	250	100.0	100.0	

Table 1 provides the age structure of the individuals who attended the study and is also significant information to get an insight into the demographics and the impact it might have on the findings of the study. A total of 250 respondents were analyzed in terms of

Survey responses and grouped into four-age brackets, including Under 20, 20-25 years, 26-

30 years and Over 30. The youngest group was the 20-25-year-olds with 132 respondents (52.8 of the total respondents). That means that this age bracket is very active in the research. The respondent numbered 36 in the Under 20 and Over 30 gave a 36:14.4% ratio in each group respectively. 46 (18.4) were respondents between the ages of 26-30.

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	249	99.6	100.0	100.0
No Response	1	0.4		
Total	250	100.0		

The gender distribution of the participants in the study is shown in Table 2.

Table 2 further sub-divides the gender into two, Male and No Response (mainly those cases where gender was not recorded against the individual). Among the respondents, 249 were male, which is 99.6% of the total respondents. Valid percentage of gender is 100 after screening out the response of dishonest people. Therefore it was male dominated in the study.

Table 3 shows the number of participants by their program of study.

Valid	frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Bachelors	151	60.4	60.6	60.6
Master	72	28.8	28.9	89.6
PhD	25	10.4	10.4	100.0

Total	249	99.6	100.0
No Response	1	0.4	
Total	250	100.0	

The majority of the respondents were undergraduates with 151 (60.4) undergraduate in the Bachelor's program. There were 72 respondents in Master program (28.8%), and 26 respondents in PhD (10.4%).

Table 4 will indicate the distribution of the participants across academic fields.

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No response	1	0.4	0.4	0.4
Media & Communication	14	5.6	5.6	6.0
Computer Engineering	25	10.0	10.0	16.0
Computer Science	72	28.8	28.8	44.8
Data Science	27	10.8	10.8	55.6
Information Technology	52	20.8	20.8	76.4
Software Engineering	59	23.6	23.6	100.0
Total	250	100.0	100.0	

The data on the distribution of the participants by academic departments could be found in Table 4. Respondents 250 in total; frequency, percentage, cumulative percentages according to each department. The data is organized into six sectors with one being the unknown sector. The principal results show that the highest number of respondents was in Computer Science (CS) (72) which is 28.8% of the total. Software Engineering is in the rear with 59 respondents or 23.6% sample. There are 52 respondents of Information Technology (IT) (20.8%). It has 14 respondents (5.6%), 25 respondents (10.0%), and 27 respondents (10.8%), respectively. One of the respondents (0.4) is working in an unspecified department. The distribution is highly concentrated towards the computing and technology-related participants, and there were also media students among the participants.

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No Response	3	1.2	1.2	1.2
Azad Jammu Kashmir	32	12.8	12.8	14.0
Baluchistan	34	13.6	13.6	27.6
Gilgit Baltistan	37	14.8	14.8	42.4
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa	54	21.6	21.6	64.0
Punjab	59	23.6	23.6	87.6
Sindh	31	12.4	12.4	100.0

Total	250	100.0	100.0
--------------	-----	-------	-------

Table 5 indicates the geographical distribution of the 250 respondents. The largest group is the Punjab group with 59 respondents (23.6%) then there is Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP) with 54 respondents (21.6%), and finally, there is Baluchistan with 29 respondents (11.5%). The two areas constitute almost 45 percent of the sample, which shows that the university is based in Punjab. Also Gilgit Baltistan (14.8%), Baluchistan (13.6%), Azad Jammu Kashmir (12.8%), and Sindh (12.4%) are also.

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No understanding	12	4.8	4.8	4.8
Basic understanding	98	39.2	39.2	44.0
Moderate understanding	102	40.8	40.8	84.8
Advanced Understanding	38	15.2	15.2	100.0
Total	250	100.0	100.0	

In the table 6 Most of the respondents (40.8) indicated moderate knowledge about AI with basic knowledge coming closely behind them (39.2). It was 15.2 percent that said they had advanced understanding, and 4.8 percent that they had no understanding whatsoever. It means that the majority of students only know something about the AI concepts, but little or expert knowledge is not widespread.

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Formal courses	4	1.6	1.6	1.6
Self - Taught	100	40.0	40.0	41.6
Friends/Peers	78	31.2	31.2	72.8
Youtube/Social Media	68	27.2	27.2	100.0
Total	250	100.0	100.0	

In table 7 Self-teaching was the biggest percentage (40.0%). Other key sources were friends/peers (31.2), and YouTube/social media (27.2). The contribution by formal university courses was only 1.6 which indicated a huge difference in institutional training.

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Daily	68	27.2	27.2	27.2
Several times a week	74	29.6	29.6	56.8
Once a week	7	2.8	2.8	59.6
Rarely	43	17.2	17.2	76.8
Never	58	23.2	23.2	100.0
Total	250	100.0	100.0	

In table no 8 Almost half of the people polled (49.3 percent) use generative AI applications at least once per week or every day in their life .This shows that it is highly involved. Nevertheless, 23.2% do not use it, and 17.2% use it infrequently, which means that not all the sampled people adopt it equally/

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Virtual Assistants	54	21.6	21.6	21.6
Writing Assistants	38	15.2	15.2	36.8
Plagiarism Checker	19	7.6	7.6	44.4
Generative AI	75	30.0	30.0	74.4
Machine Learning Platforms	10	4.0	4.0	78.4
Search& Research Tools	32	12.8	12.8	91.2
Others	22	8.8	8.8	100.0
Total	250	100.0	100.0	

In table no 9, the Generative AI tools (e.g., ChatGPT, etc.) are the most popular category (30.0%), followed by virtual assistants (21.6%) and writing assistants (15.2%). Plagiarism checkers and machine learning platforms are used much less frequently.

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
ChatGPT	75	30.0	30.0	30.0
Google Assistant/Siri	54	21.6	21.6	51.6
Grammarly	38	15.2	15.2	66.8
Turnitin	19	7.6	7.6	74.4
QuillBot	22	8.8	8.8	83.2
Gemini/Bard	18	7.2	7.2	90.4
Others	24	9.6	9.6	100.0
Total	250	100.0	100.0	

In table no 10 The most popular (30.0 percent) is ChatGPT, then there are virtual assistants (21.6 percent) and Grammarly (15.2 percent). This represents a high rate of preference of accessible, conversational, and writing-supportive generative AI tools in media students.

Interpretation of results

The survey data have a clear visual representation of high yet uneven involvement of generative AI in the students of media and communication at the UOG. Key patterns include:

Demographic Profile: The sample is mostly male (99.6%), young (52.8% aged 20-25), and students of the Bachelor. This is the case of normal representation of the enrolment in media and

computing related courses in UOG which is over-represented by male students. Domicile is concentrated by Punjab (23.6) and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (21.6), which shows a regional concentration.

AI Awareness and Learning Sources: Moderate knowledge (40.8%) and basic knowledge (39.2) are the most frequent and only 15.2% advanced knowledge and 4.8% none at all. Self-taught (40.0%), friends/peers (31.2%), and YouTube/social media (27.2) all respondents were overwhelmingly self-taught: 40.0 percent, 31.2 percent, and 27.2 percent, respectively. The formal courses will add only 1.6, and this is a significant institutional gap in the teachings of AI.

Frequency and Patterns of Use: 56.8% use generative AI multiple times a week or daily, which validates the high usage. Nonetheless, not all people adopt it with 23.2 not using it and 17.2 rarely using it. Generative AI tools (e.g., ChatGPT) take the first place (30.0), then virtual assistants (21.6), and finally, writing assistants (15.2). The plagiarism checkers (7.6%) and machine learning platforms (4.0%) are not used to their full capacity.

Specific Tools: ChatGPT is the most popular (30.0%), then there are Google Assistant/Siri (21.6%), Grammarly (15.2%), and QuillBot (8.8%). This is associated with conversational and writing-aid tools per the needs of media students to ideate content, draft and edit, and do fast research.

These trends affirm UGT: the students are generally eager to use generative AI as a cognitive reward (access to information, generation of ideas, the production of contents) and tension-release reward (on time saving, lessening workloads during deadlines). The fact that self-taught learning and informality prevail means that gratifications are sought on their own and, in most cases, lack institutional control, which contributes to functional and unequal consumption.

Discussion

These results indicate that UOG media and communication students actively embrace the use of generative AI to satisfy important academic gratifications in line with Uses and

Gratifications Theory (Katz et al., 1974). The cognitive needs prevail: the intensive use of ChatGPT and writing assistants speaks of the need to have fast and tailored help in research, brainstorming, and content creation, which are central activities in media curricula. Tension-release gratifications can be also observed, when students resort to these tools to cope with strict deadlines and lessen the workload stress, which is one of the main issues in creative and project-based programs.

The moderate level of awareness (40.8) and the almost complete lack of formal training (1.6) is an indication of a critical institutional gap. Self-taught (40.0%) and peer / social media learning (58.4% combined) denote informal transmission of AI knowledge, which may result in the unequal distribution of skills, overdependence, and threats to ethics (ex: plagiarism or blindly accepting AI outputs). Such a tendency follows the tendencies of other developing nations, where the pace of student penetration is much higher than organized education (Ashraf et al., 2024; Imran et al., 2025; Chan and Hu, 2023). The male predominant sample (99.6) could be

representative of the departmental trends but lacks the elements of gender in the study; this should be dealt with in future research.

In comparison with the international figures (e.g., 86% weekly usage in the US; UCLA, 2025; Digital Education Council, 2024), students of UG demonstrate the same activity but the poorer use of advanced tools and official literacy. The low utilization of machine learning platforms (4.0%) accounts for the perceived complexity or irrelevance of these platforms to the media tasks. This reinforces the idea that specific AI entries in media studies curriculum are necessary, specifically ethical implementation, real-time engineering, fact checking AI output and creative implementation (e.g. AI-assisted storytelling, computer-generated content).

In theory, this research confirms that UGT is relevant to generative AI in higher education especially in settings that are resource limited. As active users, students choose tools to fulfill certain gratifications, which is why UGT is even more than traditional media, conversational AI (Sundar and Limperos, 2013; Ruggieri, 2000). The practical benefit of UOG can be achieved by:

Implementing obligatory AI literacy courses in the media.

Establishing ethical principles of AI application (e.g., adequate credits to AI-generated work).

Providing training on high tech tools and critical appraisal.

Moving toward gender/digital bridging via inclusive training.

Such limitations are convenience sampling (reducing the extent of generalizability outside the UOG media/computing students), quantitative emphasis (absence of qualitative richness on which gratifications or concerns are of particular concern), and male bias. A mixed-method, larger/diverse sample across Pakistani universities, and longitudinal study should be used as future research to monitor the changing use of AI.

Conclusion

This paper ratifies that the University of Gujrat media and communication undergraduates use generative AI tools to achieve academic gratifications, mostly cognitive (generative content creation, research assistance) and tension-release (productivity, relief of stress). Functional integration is evident in the high use of such tools as ChatGPT (30.0%), virtual assistants (21.6%), but informal learning (self-taught 40.0% and peers/social media 58.4) and a lack of formal training (1.6%) constitute major gaps.

Results confirm Uses and Gratifications Theory by generative AI in Pakistani higher education, in which students are viewed as consumers, in pursuit of utilitarian and hedonic value under resource scarcity conditions. Nevertheless, the unfair implementation and ethical implications (dependency, integrity issues) support the necessity of prompt balanced institutional intervention.

Some suggestions to UOG are:

Incorporating AI literacy/ethics into media education.

Offering tools and training that are supported by the university.

Encouraging reflective practices in order to make the most out of gratifications without losing critical thinking.

Through them, UOG can increase the performance, creativity, and digital competence of students in accordance to the global trends. This study can add to the body of AI-education research in the Pakistani setting, and it can justify the UGT as a strong framework of student motivation in the generative AI society.

References

1. Ashraf, M. A., et al. (2024). Perceptions of AI among Pakistani university students. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-51234-5>
2. Chan, C. K. Y., & Hu, W. (2023). Students' voices on generative AI: Perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20, 43. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8>
3. Education, 20, 43. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8>
4. Chen, Y., & Johnson, R. (2022). Motivations for AI-powered learning platforms. *Computers & Education*, 185, 104534.
5. Digital Education Council. (2024). Global AI Student Survey 2024. <https://digitaleducationcouncil.com/reports>
6. Farrokhnia, M., et al. (2024). Generative AI in higher education: A global perspective. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 6, 100212.
7. Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 6, 100212.
8. Imran, M., et al. (2025). Generative AI adoption in Pakistani universities: Opportunities and challenges. *Education and Information Technologies*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-02512345-6>
9. Johnson, M., & Brown, K. (2022). The rise of artificial intelligence in education. *Technology Review*.
10. Katz, E., Blumler, J. G., & Gurevitch, M. (1974). Uses and gratifications research. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 37(4), 509–523.
11. Lewis, J., & Kim, S. (2022). Personalized learning with AI. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 70(5), 1123–1145.
12. Lim, W. M., et al. (2023). Generative AI and the future of education. *International Journal of Information Management*, 71, 102642.
13. Patel, R., & Nguyen, T. (2023). AI transformation in education. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 98, 102734.
14. Perkins, M., et al. (2024). Academic integrity in the age of generative AI. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 49(2), 145–160.
15. Ruggiero, T. E. (2000). Uses and gratifications theory in the 21st century. *Mass Communication & Society*, 3(1), 3–37.
16. Sundar, S. S., & Limperos, A. M. (2013). Uses and grats 2.0: New gratifications for new media. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 57(4), 504–525.
17. Tran, Q., & Wang, L. (2022). AI applications in academia. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 38(4), 987–1001.

18. UCLA Higher Education Research Institute. (2025). Freshman Survey 2025: AI Usage Report. <https://heri.ucla.edu>
19. White, E., & Tan, M. (2023). Improving student learning with AI. *Higher Education*, 85(3), 567–589.