**EVALUATING THE IMPACT OF AI LITERACY PROMOTION AND REPLACEMENT ANXIETY ON WUHAN TEACHERS’ JOB SATISFACTION: THE MEDIATING ROLE OF AI SELF-EFFICACY**

**Abstract**

The following research is aimed at evaluating how AI literacy promotion and AI replacement work anxiety impact the job satisfaction of teachers in the Wuhan region of China, while investigating the mediating role of AI self-efficacy among them. For this purpose, 392 eligible teachers were surveyed. Since the education system of China is a major one worldwide and it constitutes a large number of teachers and students, researching some aspects of this field, when AI usage is thriving, is crucial.It has been found after analysing the survey findings that AI literacy promotion is significantly positively associated with job satisfaction and AI self-efficacy, while there is a connection between “AI replacement work anxiety” and “AI self-efficacy”. Subsequently, the assessment of AI self-efficacy has proved its mediating role in the relationships between these variables. The result also indicated that “AI literacy” and “AI replacement work anxiety” influence the factor of AI-self efficacy, which again influences job satisfaction level. However, future researchers are recommended the use of qualitative method as the use of a quantitative method does not provide a deep focus on the thinking process as it collects information based on certain options.
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**1. Introduction**

 As AI becomes increasingly prevalent in educational settings, it is of utmost importance to equip educators, learners, and leaders with the necessary knowledge and skills to navigate this phenomenon responsibly. In order to use such emerging technology in a safe and meaningful manner, AI literacy has emerged as a skill set for everyone. AI literacy includes the skills and knowledge that enable individuals to critically evaluate, understand, and use AI tools and systems and actively participate in an increasingly digital world (Yi, 2021). AI literacy is not about making everyone a specialist in AI, rather it is about equipping people with the knowledge to make informed decisions and AI technologies, know their implications, and assess the ethical considerations they present (Ng et al., 2021). It means AI literacy is not only about developing professional competence but also about critical thinking and understanding the surroundings. With time, AI is emerging as a revolutionary force in every aspect such as social, political, and cultural interactions. The work environment is also not an exception as AI is transforming the way work is executed. As per Chui et al. (2024), the impact of generative AI on productivity can add trillions of dollars in value to the world economy. Moreover, this estimate will likely be doubled if its impact on software-related tasks is also calculated besides its current used cases.

However, authors like Tschang and Almirall (2021) expressed their concerns by stating that the stiff rise in AI implementation has raised significant concerns regarding the replacement of human workers, resulting in mass unemployment and potential societal unrest around the world. The increasing use of AI fuels the chance of removing a worker from a situation that carries risk. This situation enhances the risk of job loss and increases stress levels among employees. For example, a report published by the BBC expressed that AI could replace 300 million job roles, which increases anxiety among full-time employees (Fox, 2023). This proves that when AI quietly takes over human roles, workers are left feeling devalued. For this purpose, this research seeks to explore how AI literacy promotion and AI replacement work anxiety impact the job satisfaction of teachers in the Wuhan region of China. China has the largest state-run education system worldwide, with nearly 19 million teachers and 293 million students in over 518,500 schools as of 2022 (Wu, 2024). Looking at this vast size of the sector, only a specific area of Wuhan is chosen for the current study.

 The research aims to determine the impact of AI literacy promotion and AI replacement work anxiety on the job satisfaction of Wuhan teachers in the era of AI with a mediating effect of AI self-efficacy. On its way towards achieving this aim, the research will try to fulfil the following objectives:

* To investigate how AI literacy promotion impacts the job satisfaction of teachers in Wuhan
* To evaluate the impact of AI replacement work anxiety on the job satisfaction of Wuhan teachers
* To examine the mediating role of AI self-efficacy in the relationship between AI literacy promotion, AI replacement work anxiety, and the job satisfaction of Wuhan teachers in the AI era

**2. Literature Review**

The proposed model, as shown in Figure 1, highlights the interplay between AI literacy promotion, AI replacement work anxiety, AI self-efficacy, and job satisfaction. It posits that initiatives aimed at promoting AI literacy can enhance employees' self-efficacy regarding AI, thereby positively influencing job satisfaction. Along with the developing use of Artificial technology (AI), individuals are also getting concerned about anxiety (Li and Huang, 2020). The presence of anxiety-related issues hampers the willingness of employees to stay connected with an organisation. AI can also be impacted in a different way, which may replace jobs; therefore, this issue also develops stress among employees. Conversely, Khair et al. (2024) have identified that employees are getting ambitious while they get support from an organisation. Therefore, getting proper support enhances the self-efficacy of an individual. Despite growing research on AI's impact on education, there is limited understanding of how AI literacy promotion and AI replacement work anxiety influence job satisfaction among teachers, particularly in specific contexts like Wuhan.

Similarly, the application of the “TAM model” helps to understand the importance of AI adoption, as it also helps to recognise the adoption intention of new technologies (Khan, 2024). The “ease to use” perception of this model helps to understand the adoption process of the AI-based system. The usefulness of AI technology is also represented through this model, which highlights the importance of AI adoption among teachers.



**Figure 1: Conceptual Framework**

(Source: Author)

 Figure 1 shows the connection between different variable factors related to AI self-efficacy. According to Poluektova et al. (2023) the application of Bandura’ theory helps to focus on the concept of self-efficacy. It is a problem-focused theory that explains the potential of a factor such as the adoption of AI technology among the teachers of Wuhan, China.

***Hypotheses:***

H1: AI Literacy Promotion positively impacts Job satisfaction

H2: AI Replacement Work Anxiety negatively impacts Job satisfaction

H3: AI Self-Efficacy mediates the relationship between AI literacy promotion and Job satisfaction

H4: AI Self-Efficacy mediates the relationship between AI replacement work anxiety and Job satisfaction

**2. Methodology**

 The research has been completed using a primary quantitative method, namely through an online survey. Since the study aims to evaluate the impact of AI literacy promotion, AI replacement work anxiety and the mediating role of AI self-efficacy in the context of job satisfaction of Wuhan teachers in the era of AI, selecting this method has proved immensely beneficial from collecting relevant insights about this social phenomenon from respondents. As per Islam and Aldaihani (2022), the quantitative research method helps researchers achieve the projected research outcome more easily from a vast amount of data, whereas a large sample selection helps the researcher generalise the gathered insights (Lakens, 2022). The selection of large number of respondents, such as 392 teachers from the Wuhan region of China, were recruited for the survey in this research, and also maintained the generalisability of the data set. The only selection criterion for teachers was that they had to be on social media platforms like Weibo and WeChat.

 Participants were selected following the convenience sampling technique, which involves recruiting people who are easily available to the researcher and getting in touch with them (Golzar et al., 2022). This sampling method helps in the collection of information based on the convenience and availability of respondents. This non-probability sampling method supports the collection of a large data set within a limited time with the help of platforms such as Weibo. On their agreement, they were invited to join a WeChat group. The researcher sent the consent form and the participant sheet to maintain the ethical value of the study. When they completed filling up those, the researcher shared the survey link with a one-week validity. The survey, comprising close-ended questions related to the demographic information of participants and certain ones related to the subject matter, was designed on WJX. The questions were developed on the 5-point Likert scale, in which ‘1’ meant ‘Strongly Disagree’ and ‘5’ denoted ‘Strongly Agree.’ The close ended questions shows the presence of, a 12-item scale related to AI Literacy Promotion, which has been adopted from Kong et al. (2024), out of which four items were finalised in the validity test. A 4-item scale of AI Replacement Work anxiety and Job Satisfaction has been adopted from the study by Rhee and Jin (2021). The scale of AI-Self efficacy has been undertaken from the study by Bewersdorff et al. (2025).

In this regard, the researcher followed the principle of a cross-sectional study as responses from participants were gathered only once at a single point in time (Chirico, 2023). The anonymity of participants was maintained by not collecting any personal details of respondents such as their name and contact details during the survey. Respondents also have the right to withdraw their responses at any point of time before submission as it was impossible to separate individual responses as the data collection was completed with the collection of personal insights. After the successful cleaning, the researcher used SmartPLS for statistical data analysis. In order to effectively achieve the analysis results, tests like descriptive statistics and structural equation modelling (SEM) analysis were conducted to evaluate the impacts of AI literacy promotion and AI replacement work anxiety on the job satisfaction of Wuhan teachers and the relationship of variables with each other.

**3. Results**

**Table 1: Demographic characteristics of respondents**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Category | Frequency | Percent (%) | Cumulative Percent (%) |
| Gender | Male | 188 | 48.0 | 48.0 |
|  | Female | 200 | 51.0 | 99.0 |
|  | Prefer not to say | 4 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
|  | **Total** | **392** | **100.0** | **100.0** |
| Age | 21–30 | 148 | 37.8 | 37.8 |
|  | 31–40 | 62 | 15.8 | 53.6 |
|  | 41–50 | 97 | 24.7 | 78.3 |
|  | >50 | 85 | 21.7 | 100.0 |
|  | **Total** | **392** | **100.0** | **100.0** |
| Qualification | Bachelor’s degree | 148 | 37.8 | 37.8 |
|  | Master’s degree | 159 | 40.6 | 78.3 |
|  | Doctorate | 85 | 21.7 | 100.0 |
|  | **Total** | **392** | **100.0** | **100.0** |
| Experience | <5 Years | 104 | 26.5 | 26.5 |
|  | 5–10 Years | 156 | 39.8 | 66.3 |
|  | 11–15 Years | 88 | 22.4 | 88.8 |
|  | >15 Years | 44 | 11.2 | 100.0 |
|  | **Total** | **392** | **100.0** | **100.0** |
| Level | Primary Schools | 103 | 26.3 | 26.3 |
|  | Middle Schools | 214 | 54.6 | 80.9 |
|  | High Schools | 75 | 19.1 | 100.0 |
|  | **Total** | **392** | **100.0** | **100.0** |
| Field | Science | 159 | 40.6 | 40.6 |
|  | Arts | 151 | 38.5 | 79.1 |
|  | Social Science | 41 | 10.5 | 89.5 |
|  | Vocational and Technical Education | 41 | 10.5 | 100.0 |
|  | **Total** | **392** | **100.0** | **100.0** |
| Familiarity | Somewhat familiar | 159 | 40.6 | 40.6 |
|  | Moderately familiar | 116 | 29.6 | 70.2 |
|  | Very familiar | 117 | 29.8 | 100.0 |
|  | **Total** | **392** | **100.0** | **100.0** |

Table 1 showcases the demographic characteristics of those who participated in the survey. It can be seen that the sample represents diverse genders with 48% males, 51% females, and 1% not preferring to say. In terms of age, the majority of participants are aged between 21 and 30 years (37.8%), closely followed by those aged between 41 and 50 years (24.7%) and people above 50 years (21.7%). Therefore, young teachers were mainly connected with the concept of AI followed by people of other age groups. These varying age groups indicate that AI replacement anxiety can influence the job satisfaction level of some of them. Moreover, most participants have a master’s degree (40.6%), while those holding a bachelor’s degree (37.8%) and a doctorate (21.7%) are also not far behind, symbolising a highly educated sample. In terms of teaching experience, diversity can be observed as 39.8% of teachers have 5-10 years of experience and 26.5% have less than 5 years of experience in the teaching profession. The demographic data shows that most of the respondents have an experience of 5 to 10 years, which indicates that youths are mainly connected with this profession, as most of the respondents belonged from the age group of 21 to 30. Among all, the majority belong to the group of middle school teachers (54.6%), followed by primary (26.3%) and high schools (19.1%). It has been observed that teachers in science (40.6%) and arts (38.5%) mostly constitute the sample. This distribution indicates a potential difference in familiarity with AI. Most importantly, when asked about familiarity with AI technologies, the majority are somewhat familiar (40.6%) and the other 29.6% are moderately familiar. Only 29.7% are very familiar with AI. This distribution suggests varying levels of AI literacy among participants.

**Table 2: Reliability**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Cronbach's alpha  | Composite reliability (rho\_a)  | Composite reliability (rho\_c)  | Average variance extracted (AVE)  |
| AI Literacy Promotion  | 0.648  | 0.649  | 0.792  | 0.491  |
| AI Replacement Work anxiety  | 0.726  | 0.734  | 0.830  | 0.551  |
| AI-Self efficacy  | 0.824  | 0.837  | 0.882  | 0.653  |
| Job Satisfaction  | 0.699  | 0.713  | 0.836  | 0.633  |

As presented in Table 2, all constructs demonstrate acceptable reliability. With the values of Cronbach’s Alpha ranging from 0.648 to 0.824, reliable internal consistency is proved. With values exceeding the threshold of 0.7, composite reliability values confirm consistency across constructs. Apart from AI literacy promotion, the AVE for every construct has met or exceeded 0.5, suggesting slight improvement. Overall, the measurement model is reliable and valid in the context of this study.

**Table 3: HTMT**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | AI Literacy Promotion  | AI Replacement Work anxiety  | AI-Self efficacy  | Job Satisfaction  |
| AI Literacy Promotion  |  |  |  |  |
| AI Replacement Work anxiety  | 0.611  |  |  |  |
| AI-Self efficacy  | 0.545  | 0.776  |  |  |
| Job Satisfaction  | 0.690  | 0.619  | 0.780  |  |

The results of HTMT showcased in Table 3 present acceptable discriminant validity among all constructs as their values are seen to be below the standard value of 0.85. The highest value (0.780) is for AI self-efficacy and job satisfaction. It signifies a strong and acceptable relationship between them.

**Table 4: Outer loadings**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | AI Literacy Promotion  | AI Replacement Work anxiety  | AI-Self efficacy  | Job Satisfaction  |
| AILP1  | 0.714  |  |  |  |
| AILP2  | 0.772  |  |  |  |
| AILP3  | 0.715  |  |  |  |
| AILP4  | 0.587  |  |  |  |
| AIRW1  |  | 0.725  |  |  |
| AIRW2  |  | 0.798  |  |  |
| AIRW3  |  | 0.665  |  |  |
| AIRW4  |  | 0.773  |  |  |
| AISE1  |  |  | 0.727  |  |
| AISE2  |  |  | 0.808  |  |
| AISE3  |  |  | 0.870  |  |
| AISE4  |  |  | 0.822  |  |
| JS1  |  |  |  | 0.879  |
| JS2  |  |  |  | 0.833  |
| JS3  |  |  |  | 0.657  |

Table 4 consisting of the results of outer loadings indicates that most items have acceptable loadings with values above the threshold of 0.7, symbolising adequate indicator reliability. With 0.587, 0.665, and 0.657, Only APL4, AIRW, and JS3 fall below the threshold respectively, suggesting further examination. Still, the indicators are properly aligned with their respective constructs and support the reliability of the measurement model.

**Table 5: Direct effects**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Original sample (O)  | Sample mean (M)  | Standard deviation (STDEV)  | T statistics (|O/STDEV|)  | P values  |
| AI Literacy Promotion -> AI-Self efficacy  | 0.190  | 0.195  | 0.070  | 2.718  | 0.007  |
| AI Literacy Promotion -> Job Satisfaction  | 0.248  | 0.247  | 0.077  | 3.235  | 0.001  |
| AI Replacement Work anxiety -> AI-Self efficacy  | 0.520  | 0.521  | 0.063  | 8.264  | 0.000  |
| AI Replacement Work anxiety -> Job Satisfaction  | 0.045  | 0.041  | 0.090  | 0.496  | 0.620  |
| AI-Self efficacy -> Job Satisfaction  | 0.482  | 0.491  | 0.106  | 4.566  | 0.000  |

**Table 6: Indirect effects**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Original sample (O)  | Sample mean (M)  | Standard deviation (STDEV)  | T statistics (|O/STDEV|)  | P values  |
| AI Literacy Promotion -> AI-Self efficacy -> Job Satisfaction  | 0.092  | 0.096  | 0.041  | 2.227  | 0.026  |
| AI Replacement Work anxiety -> AI-Self efficacy -> Job Satisfaction  | 0.251  | 0.255  | 0.063  | 3.993  | 0.000  |

Direct and indirect effects presented in Table 5 and Table 6 respectively highlight some notable findings. In the direct table, it can be seen that with an O value of 0.190 and a *p-value* of 0.007, AI literacy promotion (AILP) positively influences AI self-efficacy (AISE). With a value of 0.248 and a *p-value* of 0.001, it also positively influences job satisfaction (JS). Similar findings are also there for the influence of AI replacement work anxiety (AIRW) on AI self-efficacy and the influence of AI self-efficacy on job satisfaction. However, AI replacement work anxiety fails to influence job satisfaction like this. Indirectly, with O values and *p-values* of 0.092, 0.251 and 0.026, 0.000, AI self-efficacy is seen to have successfully mediated the relationship of job satisfaction with both AI literacy promotion and AI replacement work anxiety respectively, signifying its strength as a mediator in the research.



**Figure 2: Structural model**

The structural model of the data in Figure 2 demonstrates the relationships among latent constructs and their respective indicators. Overall, it focuses on establishing the mediating role of AI self-efficacy, supported by strong construct reliability and validity.

**4. Discussion**

 The findings of this research as presented in Table 7 in the form of hypotheses results suggest that the positive association of AI literacy promotion with job satisfaction and AI self-efficacy is accepted, whereas although the negative association between AI replacement work anxiety and job satisfaction is rejected, the positive association between AI replacement work anxiety and AI self-efficacy is accepted. In terms of the mediating role of AI-self efficacy, it is seen to have mediated the relationship between all variables. Regarding the first research hypothesis related to the significant positive association between AI literacy promotion and job satisfaction, it has been found in the past literature that teachers with high levels of AI readiness perceive low threats from AI and demonstrate high job satisfaction (Wang et al., 2023). This means when teachers have adequate knowledge of AI in teaching, they are likely to be satisfied in their profession, which also signifies the importance of AI literary promotion for teachers considering their significance as crucial stakeholders in AI-enhanced education. Thus, similar findings in the earlier studies and the current research have led to the acceptance of the first hypothesis.

Subsequently, with an O value of 0.045 and a *p-value* of 0.620, AI replacement work is found to have no significant negative association with job satisfaction, leading to the non-acceptance of the second research hypothesis related to this. Though the second hypothesis shows the negative connection between “AI replacement work anxiety” and “job satisfaction”, this was not supported based on the results of the study. Conversely, Rhee and Jin (2021) found in their study that the negative aspect of AI potentially replacing the jobs of organisational members can increase the level of negative perception regarding AI and lead to a sense of anxiety. Particularly, those who perceive job uncertainty highly, their job satisfaction level is likely to be lower than others. This suggests that the work anxiety created by replacing human jobs with AI may have a significant positive association with job satisfaction. In terms of the third hypothesis related to the association between AI literacy promotion and AI self-efficacy, which has been accepted as per the findings, the research conducted by Kristin Mah and Groß (2024) revealed that technological self-efficacy has a positive impact on technology acceptance and utilisation. The authors reached this conclusion after finding how the optimistic profile of teachers moderated the relationship between self-efficacy and the usage of AI for teaching, which indicates the significance of AI literacy promotion for AI self-efficacy.

While exploring the area of self-efficacy in the realm of AI, Jik Kim et al. (2024) emphasized the need for organizations to invest in AI self-efficacy training in their study so that the adverse effects of workload can be mitigated. In other words, it can be decoded that the enhancement in self-efficacy regarding AI can reduce the effects of workload on mental health which, in turn, can also help eliminate the anxiety of AI replacing human jobs in the long term. Since these findings align with the findings of the current research, the fourth hypothesis associated with AI replacement work anxiety and AI self-efficacy is accepted. In addition, AI self-efficacy is seen to have presented as a mediator in this research. Similar to this, Montag et al. (2023), in their study, mentioned a robust positive correlation between the propensity of trust in automated technology and technology AI self-efficacy, which expands to the contribution of self-efficacy in mediating the connection between work anxiety and job satisfaction. Thus, these similar findings in past studies and the current research have led to the acceptance of the fifth and sixth hypotheses.

**Table 7: Hypotheses testing**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Hypotheses | Description  | Summary  |
| 1 | “AI literacy promotion” is significantly positively associated “job satisfaction” | Accepted |
| 2 | “AI replacement work anxiety” is significantly negatively associated “job satisfaction” | Not accepted |
| 3 | “AI literacy promotion” is significantly positively associated with “AI self-efficacy”  | Accepted |
| 4 | “AI replacement work anxiety” is significantly positively associated with “AI self-efficacy”  | Accepted |
| 5 | “AI self-efficacy” mediates the relationship between “AI literacy promotion” and “job satisfaction” | Accepted |
| 6 | “AI self-efficacy” mediates the relationship between “AI replacement work anxiety” and “job satisfaction” | Accepted |

**5. Conclusion**

 It has been observed that while evaluating the impact of AI literacy promotion and AI replacement work anxiety on the job satisfaction of teachers in the era of AI in the context of Wuhan, China and the mediating role of AI self-efficacy, the current research surveyed 392 eligible teachers and analysed the findings with the help of SmartPLS. The findings suggest that when teachers possess adequate literacy regarding AI, they are bound to have lower work anxiety and their job satisfaction is also going to be hampered less. Their self-efficacy regarding AI further mediates the connection between these factors.

 Theoretically, these findings contribute to the field of knowledge of those areas where AI has taken or is going to take a crucial part in development and the contribution of workers is in danger. The findings will develop understanding about AI implementation, which can be done in a way that does not lead to anxiety among the current workforce. Managerially, authorities in educational institutions can understand the importance of making teachers literate about AI and reducing their anxiety while trying to enhance job satisfaction through proper training. In this context, policymakers can play a major role by implementing policies regarding AI literacy and making adherence to them mandatory for all institutions.

 Moreover, the adoption of the primary quantitative method has been a key limitation as it does not allow respondents to express their thoughts out of the provided options. The inclusion of other variable factors related to AI-implication can be analysed in future studies. Similarly, future researchers are advised to follow a qualitative research method for their studies. Moreover, they can conduct research in other contexts, such as other geographical regions across China, to gain different insights in a similar domain.
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