

Where universities place generative AI governance: A comparative document analysis of institutions in Korea, Japan, and China

 Gun Kim¹*

¹Department of Hotel Management, Joongbu University, Republic of Korea; kg0000@joongbu.ac.kr (G.K.).

Abstract: This study examines where universities place generative-AI governance and whether cross-national differences partly reflect differences in institutional document type rather than only substantive policy content. A sampling frame of 36 universities in Korea, Japan, and China was fixed before document retrieval. Official and verifiable instruments were coded for document genre, issuer level, governance mode, timing, and citation anchors. Thirteen records received full close reading, and structural variables were independently coded with adjudication. Thirty-one institutions had verified instruments, two were partially verified, and three had no confirmed public instrument. Korean and Japanese source-bearing primary cases were concentrated in teaching and learning, whereas the Chinese corpus additionally contained thesis or degree instruments and one AI system-security instrument. This structural contrast persisted after excluding China's specialised stratum, although its magnitude decreased. Cross-national policy comparison should establish document genre, organisational level, and source provenance before comparing provisions. Universities can improve governance coherence by matching AI rules to the responsible institutional unit, recording issue and revision histories, and distinguishing teaching guidance, degree control, research integrity, and system-security functions.

Keywords: Document analysis, East Asia, Generative AI, Higher education policy, Institutional governance, Policy diffusion.

1. Introduction

Universities worldwide responded to the public release of large language models by issuing guidance, policies, and related institutional documents. International organisations simultaneously advanced human-centred governance and digital-education recommendations [1, 2] while early scholarship framed generative AI as both a sector-wide disruption and an institutional policy-design problem [3, 4]. Within three years, a substantial empirical literature mapped how university documents address academic integrity, privacy, assessment, instructor discretion, staff responsibilities and responsible use [5-8]. The proliferation of documents creates a comparability problem: a teaching note, a degree regulation, a research-integrity rule and an information-security standard may all be described as a university "AI policy," even though they govern different institutional domains.

That framing takes the document as given and asks what it says. It leaves unexamined a prior question: what kind of document is it, and where in the university does it sit? A guideline issued by a teaching-and-learning centre to instructors, a clause inserted into a graduation-defence timetable, an amendment to research-integrity regulations, and a security rule governing model deployment are not variants of a single instrument. They apply to different people, are enforced through different procedures, and become visible to researchers through different channels. Comparing their contents without first establishing their type produces differences that are artefacts of genre rather than of policy.

This distinction matters most where regulatory environments differ. Existing studies have examined U.S. research universities, top-ranked Asian institutions, global samples, and large five-country collections [6-13]. Dataset initiatives have also widened access to institutional texts [14, 15].

These contributions establish recurring policy themes, but they generally compare provisions after the source item has already been accepted as a commensurable policy unit. As a result, differences in genre, issuing level, and organisational location can be mistaken for differences in substantive orientation.

This study takes 36 universities in Korea, Japan, and China, drawn from a stratified frame fixed before retrieval, and asks not how restrictive their generative-AI documents are but where those documents are placed. It examines the institutional domain each document governs, the organisational level that issued it, when it was issued, what it cites, and how far regulation descends below the university centre. Thirteen documents were read in full. Official source URLs and access dates were recorded for all located documents, and archival status was recorded separately.

Four questions organise the analysis:

RQ1. In which institutional domain does each country's university place generative-AI governance?

RQ2. What superordinate instruments do institutional documents cite, and how does the presence or character of national instruments correspond to document form?

RQ3. How far below the university centre does regulation descend, and through what devices at each level?

RQ4. When were documents issued, and what does the temporal distribution indicate about diffusion?

The contribution is threefold. First, the study supplies a verified, source-linked corpus of East Asian institutional documents where existing datasets are thin. Second, it shows that apparent cross-national differences in restrictiveness may partly reflect document genre and institutional placement. Third, it identifies cross-cutting concerns and implementation patterns that are not reducible to national policy orientation alone, while distinguishing systematically coded findings from exploratory observations. Figure 1 summarises the corpus-construction workflow and the analytical lens used to distinguish regulatory context from institutional placement.

Section 4 begins with a corpus-verification audit and then answers the research questions in their stated order: institutional domain and governance mode (RQ1), citation anchors (RQ2), sub-university descent (RQ3), and temporal distribution and revision activity (RQ4).

A. Corpus construction



B. Analytical lens



Figure 1.
Analytical framework and research workflow.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Institutional Responses to Generative AI

Research on university generative-AI policy has developed along three overlapping lines. Content analyses classify provisions concerning academic integrity, disclosure, privacy, assessment, instructor discretion, and support [5-13]. Dataset projects assemble institutional guidance at scale [14, 15]. A

third stream moves beyond teaching use to examine academic-integrity risks, research conduct, and whole-institution governance [16-19]. Together, these studies show a broad shift from emergency prohibition toward conditional use, transparency, human oversight, and recurring policy review.

These studies provide useful mappings, but they commonly treat the collected item as a comparable policy unit. That assumption is reasonable when samples are restricted to institution-wide teaching guidance, yet it becomes problematic when a corpus combines regulations, guidance pages, faculty memoranda, degree procedures, and information-security rules. Recent frameworks increasingly recognise operational and governance dimensions [4, 18, 19], but the institutional placement of the governing instrument remains under-specified.

The most recent 2026 scholarship deepens this governance turn. Crompton et al. [18], using a global Delphi design, frame institutional policy as an architecture that extends beyond academic integrity to privacy, equity, professional development, communication, evaluation, and continuing review. Adarkwah et al. [19] evaluate university policies against UNESCO principles and distinguish declarative alignment from operational assurance. Bacalso et al. [20], in a PRISMA-based systematic review of institutional generative-AI management, similarly identifies governance maturity with coherent multi-unit oversight, academic-integrity and disclosure standards, risk-based data governance, equity safeguards, faculty development, and continuous monitoring. Together, these studies reinforce the shift from narrow use rules toward institutional governance architectures, but their principal analytic objects remain governance frameworks, policy robustness, or implementation patterns rather than the organisational location and genre of the documents through which governance is enacted.

2.2. East Asian Coverage in Existing Datasets

The available comparative datasets illustrate the problem concretely.

Asian-focused research has expanded rapidly. Dai et al. [9] analysed policies from 30 highly ranked Asian universities, while Li et al. [11] compared 124 documents from 110 universities in the United States, Japan and China. Japan-specific studies examine leading universities, national universities and a much broader collection of 384 documents from 360 institutions and departments [21-23]. These studies identify instructor discretion, ethics, information security, and uneven attention to inclusion and implementation support, but they do not consistently distinguish university-centre instruments from faculty- or course-level documents.

Broader studies provide complementary but only partial coverage of the three countries. Jin et al. [7] examined 40 universities across six global regions, and McDonald et al. [6] analysed 116 U.S. research universities. The AGGA dataset includes Asian material but records documents as guideline items rather than as nested organisational instruments Jiao et al. [14] and Jiao et al. [15]. Capano et al. [24] emphasise the diversity of Asian higher-education policy contexts, reinforcing the need to examine how institutional location mediates apparently national patterns. Their policy-system framing is complementary to the present study, which asks how such variation is enacted through organisationally located university instruments.

National-level work addresses a different layer. Liu and Tinmaz [25] use policy implementation and multilevel governance to compare mainland China, Hong Kong, and Macau. Most recently, Yang and Li [26] compare national AI strategies across China, Japan, and South Korea through 2025 and identify distinct system-level governance logics in the role assigned to higher education. The present study instead examines the institutional instruments through which universities translate, cite, or operate within those wider environments.

2.3. Secondary Compilation and Verification

Cross-national document research therefore requires source provenance to be treated as an analytical issue. Documents are not neutral containers: their evidentiary meaning depends on who produced them, for what purpose, at what organisational level, and in what relation to other texts [27, 28]. Dataset records must consequently be checked against institutional domains, issuing bodies, and

document dates before substantive comparison. A press report may establish that a policy exists, but it cannot support provision-level coding; a faculty schedule may contain binding thesis rules without constituting a university-wide AI policy.

The resulting source-tier protocol is specified in Section 3.2.

2.4. Document Genre, Classification, and Policy Diffusion

Document genre is treated here as an institutional action rather than a surface format. Miller [29] defines genre through recurrent social action: a teaching guideline, a degree regulation, a research-integrity rule and a system-security standard do different organisational work even when they address the same technology [29]. Classification is likewise consequential. Bowker and Star [30] show that categories and standards structure what becomes visible, comparable and governable [30]. The four-genre scheme used in this study therefore distinguishes the institutional problem being acted upon, teaching practice, degree certification, research conduct, or AI-system security, rather than ranking documents by prescriptive tone.

Institutional isomorphism then provides a vocabulary for explaining how these genres may diffuse: coercive pressure through statutes and superior rules, mimetic borrowing under uncertainty, and normative influence through professional and inter-university networks [31]. Organisational-field and policy-enactment perspectives further suggest that common external pressures are translated through local structures rather than copied mechanically [32, 33]. Diffusion may therefore produce different document genres, not merely differently worded versions of a single policy form [34].

The present analysis does not estimate these mechanisms causally. It examines whether the observed timing, citation anchors, and document placement are consistent with them, while treating genre and issuer level as prior conditions of valid comparison.

3. Method

3.1. Sampling Frame

Institutions were selected before any document retrieval was attempted. This sequence is the study's principal methodological commitment. Selecting institutions because they have published documents produces a tautology: institutions that publish are found to have governance, and it suppresses the informative cases: those that regulate generative AI through other instruments and those that do not regulate it publicly at all.

Table 1 summarises the three-stratum sampling frame. Each country contributed twelve institutions, yielding 36 primary institutional cases in total.

Table 1.
Sampling frame.

Stratum	Country	Institutions
A. Leading research universities	Korea	Seoul National; Korea; Yonsei; KAIST
A. Leading research universities	Japan	Tokyo; Kyoto; Osaka; Tohoku
A. Leading research universities	China	Tsinghua; Peking; Fudan; Shanghai Jiao Tong
B. Regional national/key state	Korea	Chungnam National; Pusan National; Kyungpook National
B. Regional national/key state	Japan	Hokkaido; Nagoya; Tsukuba; Kobe
B. Regional national/key state	China	Nanjing; Zhejiang; Sichuan; Wuhan
C. Major private/specialised	Korea	Sungkyunkwan; Hanyang; Kyung Hee; Chung-Ang; Ewha Womans
C. Major private/specialised	Japan	Keio; Waseda; Sophia; Ritsumeikan
C. Major private/specialised	China	Communication University of China; NUAA; East China Normal; Tianjin

Strata were defined to be functionally comparable rather than nominally identical: China's public system has no counterpart to Korea's and Japan's private sectors, so stratum C comprises specialised institutions there. The frame is weighted toward research-intensive universities and is not a probability

sample; results are not offered as national prevalence estimates. Institutions for which no document was located remained in the frame and are reported as such.

3.2. Retrieval and Source Tier

Documents were retrieved through 29 July 2026 from institutional domains (*.ac.kr, *.ac.jp, *.edu.cn) in the original language. Sources were assigned to one of three tiers:

- Tier 1: Full text on an official institutional domain. The only admissible evidence for coding provisions.
- Tier 2: Major press or institutional press release. Admissible for existence, issuing body, and date only.
- Tier 3: Compilation sites, commercial services, aggregator pages with shortened links. Excluded.

Institutional names were verified against domains before coding. Several institutional names in the sample differ by one or two characters from those of other institutions that have also issued generative-AI documents: Tianjin University and Tianjin University of Science and Technology; Zhejiang University and Zhejiang Gongshang University; Nagoya University and Nagoya Institute of Technology; Tsukuba University and Tsukuba University of Technology; Kobe University and Kobe City University of Foreign Studies. Documents whose URL domain did not match that of the sampled institution were not coded.

For each located document, the direct document URL, landing-page URL, all page URLs for multi-page documents, access date, and archived URL were recorded. At least one archived institutional URL was secured for all 41 records with a public source URL. Where direct capture was blocked, the failure was logged, and an official landing page or locally preserved source file was retained. The Waseda University School of Commerce PDF, for example, returned HTTP 403 to the Internet Archive crawler; its official landing page was archived, and the retrieved PDF was preserved locally with a SHA-256 checksum. The three records classified as having no confirmed public institutional instrument had no source URL to archive.

3.3. Document Unit

Inclusion. A subordinate page or attachment was treated as part of an instrument when the principal text referred to it as such. Kyoto University's appendix on input and output precautions was therefore included because the main text directs readers to it; news items, FAQ pages, tool tutorials, and unrelated implementation notices on the same site were excluded.

Multiplicity and analytic unit. The fixed institutional frame contains 36 primary cases, twelve per country. Eight additional instruments were entered as supplementary records when a sampled institution issued a distinct document at another organisational level. The expanded corpus therefore contains 44 records: Korea, 12 primary + 1 supplementary = 13; Japan, 12 + 4 = 16; and China, 12 + 3 = 15. Waseda University contributes one university-centre record and four school, faculty, or course records; Peking University contributes one university-centre record and three supplementary faculty or background records. Institution-level distributions use only the 36 primary cases, whereas issuer-level and descent analyses use all admissible records.

Successive versions of the same institutional instrument were retained as a single record rather than treated as independent documents. The issue-date field records the earliest confirmed issuance; the revision-date field records the latest confirmed revision; and substantive coding reflects the version available at the 29 July 2026 cutoff. Earlier versions were not systematically recoded, so the analysis does not treat version-to-version changes as separate observations.

3.4. Coding

The study used qualitative document analysis, treating documents both as evidence of institutional action and as artefacts whose provenance, purpose and organisational location require appraisal [27,

28]. Coding separated documentary attributes from substantive provisions so that evidence status could be reported independently from policy content. Table 2 summarises the coding variables, values and analytical scopes used in the study.

Table 2.

Coding variables and values.

Variable	Values
Genre	Teaching & learning / Thesis or degree regulation / Research integrity / AI system security
Issuer level	1 = university centre; 2 = faculty, school or course
Issuing body	Original-language name of the issuing unit
Governance mode	Dedicated document / Absorbed into existing rules / No confirmed instrument
Issue and revision date	Year-month

Genre was assigned by the predominant institutional action and scope of application rather than by prescriptive tone. Following genre-as-social-action and classification perspectives [29, 30], a teaching-and-learning document organises classroom or assessment practice; a thesis or degree instrument governs certification, submission, defence, or degree review; a research-integrity instrument locates AI within existing conduct rules; and an AI system-security instrument governs model registration, deployment, data, or service risk. This distinction is analytical rather than evaluative: the categories identify what the document is institutionally for, not how restrictive it is.

Citation practice was coded through binary indicators for explicitly named national statutes, ministry documents, international frameworks, domestic peer institutions, foreign institutions, and internal superior regulations, with instrument names recorded verbatim. Because provision-level citation coding was completed for only 13 primary records, the citation analysis in Section 4.3 is explicitly reported as a subset rather than as a full-corpus distribution.

Enforcement and principle indicators were collected for selected documents but are not reported as corpus-wide distributions because coverage was incomplete. The present analysis therefore rests on the structural variables for which documentary coverage is sufficient. The normalized coding sheet and the record-level source and archive fields are deposited with the study materials (Appendix A).

3.5. Evidentiary Depth

Evidence status was separated from substantive coding. At the primary-case level, 31 instruments were verified, two received partial official-source verification, and three had no confirmed public institutional instrument. Across the adjudicated 44-record corpus, 38 records were verified, three were partial, and three were not found. Thirteen primary records were read in full and received provision-level and citation coding. The remaining verified or partial records were used only for structural variables that could be established from official institutional sources, such as title, issuing body, scope, level, mode, and date. Claims that a provision is absent are therefore limited to the fully read subset.

A purposive close-reading subset of thirteen primary records was defined before citation counts were reported: three Korean, five Japanese, and five Chinese cases. Selection required (1) retrievable Tier 1 full text, (2) sufficient textual depth to identify named citation anchors, (3) variation in document genre or governance mode, and (4) coverage of both early and later policy activity where the corpus allowed. The subset comprises KR-A3, KR-B1, and KR-C3; JP-A2, JP-A3, JP-B1, JP-C1, and JP-C4; and CN-A2, CN-A4, CN-C1, CN-C2, and CN-C3. It is an analytically diverse evidentiary subset, not a probability sample. A binary `close_reading_subset` field identifies these records in Appendix A. Institutional codes combine country, sampling stratum, and institution number; for example, KR-A3 denotes the third Korean institution in stratum A.

A graduate research assistant who was not a coauthor and had not participated in the initial coding independently coded the documentary corpus using the prespecified codebook and source-linked records. Verification status was double-coded for all 44 records, issuer level for the 41 source-bearing records, document genre and governance mode for the 33 source-bearing primary cases, and six

citation-anchor variables for the 13 close-reading records. An initial genre-coding pass revealed ambiguity at the boundaries between teaching, degree, research-integrity, and system-security instruments; the definitions were clarified with scope-based examples, after which the second coder independently recoded the 33 primary cases without access to the first coder's values. Final independent agreement was 97.7% for verification status (Cohen's $\kappa = .914$), 95.1% for issuer level ($\kappa = .828$), 90.9% for document genre ($\kappa = .732$), and 97.0% for governance mode ($\kappa = .653$). Across 78 binary citation-anchor decisions, agreement was 96.2% (pooled $\kappa = .904$), with variable-specific κ values from .698 to 1.000. Because several categories were highly imbalanced, raw agreement and κ are reported together, following practical guidance for qualitative intercoder reliability [35]. Disagreements were adjudicated against the official documents and the prespecified rules; both independent values and the adjudication log are preserved in Supplementary File S1.

4. Results

4.1. Corpus Availability and Verification

As shown in Table 3, among the 36 primary institutional cases, 31 had verified instruments (86.1%), two had partial official-source verification (5.6%), and three had no confirmed public institutional instrument (8.3%). A public source-bearing record was therefore available for 33 institutions (91.7%). All twelve Japanese institutions had a verified instrument, compared with eleven source-bearing cases in Korea and ten in China.

Table 3.

Verification status by country (primary cases, $n = 36$).

Country	Verified	Partial official-source	No confirmed instrument	Total
Korea	10	1	1	12
Japan	12	0	0	12
China	9	1	2	12
Total	31	2	3	36

The five non-verified cases are not equivalent. KAIST and Zhejiang University were classified as partial: KAIST has identifiable official research-integrity rules and evidence of a 2026 AI-related amendment, but direct full-text verification was restricted; Zhejiang University's official undergraduate-affairs sources confirm the existence and title of a university-wide generative-AI use standard, but the text was not publicly available. Hanyang University, Wuhan University, and Tianjin University were classified as having no confirmed public institutional instrument after the specified search procedures. The Hanyang trace was an unfinalized draft on a national teaching-support aggregator, while searches of Wuhan and Tianjin institutional domains produced no admissible university-wide instrument.

These categories distinguish restricted or incomplete access from the absence of a confirmed public instrument. They do not establish that internal or non-public governance is absent.

The fixed sampling frame is methodologically consequential despite the small number of non-retrieval cases. A document-led sample would likely have omitted the two partial cases and the three cases without a confirmed public instrument, leaving only readily retrievable policies and overstating apparent policy availability.

4.2. RQ1: Institutional Domain and Governance Mode

Table 4.

Primary document genre by country (final adjudicated classifications; n = 33 source-bearing primary cases).

Country	Teaching & learning	Thesis/degree	Research integrity	AI system security	Total
Korea	10	0	1	0	11
Japan	12	0	0	0	12
China	4	5	0	1	10
Total	26	5	1	1	33

Table 4 reports the final adjudicated classifications. In the independent pre-adjudication coding, the second coder classified three Chinese primary cases as thesis/degree instruments; this difference and the associated genre disagreements are discussed in Appendix D as a sensitivity check.

Table 4 shows that, of the 33 source-bearing primary cases, 26 were teaching-and-learning instruments, five were thesis or degree regulations, one was a research-integrity instrument, and one was an AI system-security instrument. Teaching-and-learning documents accounted for ten of eleven Korean cases and all twelve Japanese cases. In China, four of ten cases were teaching-oriented, five were thesis or degree instruments, and one concerned AI system security. No Korean or Japanese primary case regulated generative AI through a thesis or degree instrument, and neither country contained an AI system-security instrument in the primary set.

The Chinese genre distribution is partly associated with the functional composition of stratum C. Three of the five Chinese thesis or degree cases came from specialised institutions in that stratum, and all three source-bearing stratum-C cases were classified in this genre. Excluding stratum C leaves two thesis or degree instruments and one AI system-security instrument among seven source-bearing Chinese cases in strata A and B. The cross-national placement contrast therefore persists, but its magnitude is partly conditioned by institutional type.

The distribution cannot be interpreted as restrictiveness alone. Chinese teaching-oriented documents preserve instructor discretion similar to that found in Korean and Japanese guidance: Tsinghua University's principles direct instructors to determine the mode and extent of AI use according to course objectives and to communicate those conditions at the outset, language that parallels provisions in Yonsei University and Kyoto University. The principal structural difference is that the Chinese sample additionally contains a degree-examination layer that is absent from the Korean and Japanese university-level primary cases.

The Chinese sample also contains the only primary case classified as an AI system security measure: Peking University's interim rules on large-model safety management. The instrument differentiates internal research, campus-facing deployment, and externally open deployment, with progressively stronger filing and risk-assessment requirements.

Governance mode adds a second placement dimension: whether AI appears in a dedicated instrument or is absorbed into an existing rule structure.

Table 5.

Governance mode by country (primary cases, n = 36).

Country	Dedicated	Absorbed into existing rules	No confirmed instrument	Total
Korea	10	1	1	12
Japan	12	0	0	12
China	10	0	2	12
Total	32	1	3	36

As Table 5 shows, dedicated documents dominate the primary-case distribution: 32 of 36 institutions were coded in this mode. One case, KAIST, was classified as absorbed into existing rules, and three institutions had no confirmed public instrument. KAIST does not issue a separate university-wide generative-AI guideline; instead, available official rule metadata and contemporaneous institutional

records indicate that its research-integrity framework was amended in February 2026 to address deceptive scholarly-communication practices associated with AI. The partially verified university-centre record for KAIST (KR-A4) is analytically distinct from the verified School of Computing honour code (KR-A4b), which is used only in the sub-university descent analysis.

A related layering mechanism appears in China, even where the visible instrument is dedicated. Peking University's general undergraduate-thesis regulation, revised in 2021 and not itself AI-specific, established school-faculty administration and annual thesis-sampling inspection. Faculty-level AIGC checks introduced in 2025–26 operate within that pre-existing administrative apparatus. The comparison shows that governance mode captures the form of the visible document, while implementation may still rely on older institutional machinery.

4.3. RQ2: Citation Anchors

Citation variables were completed for the prespecified close-reading subset of thirteen primary records identified in Section 3.5: three Korean, five Japanese, and five Chinese. The subset maximizes evidentiary depth and genre variation; Table 6 reports its counts and examples and should not be read as a prevalence estimate for all universities in each country. All Korean and Japanese subset records are teaching-and-learning instruments, whereas the Chinese subset spans teaching, thesis or degree, and system-security genres; country and genre composition are therefore not separable in these counts.

Table 6.

Citation anchors in the close-reading subset ($n = 13$ primary records).

Anchor type	Korea ($n = 3$)	Japan ($n = 5$)	China ($n = 5$)	Total
National statute or law	0	0	2	2
Ministry or national-agency document	1	2	2	5
International framework or scholarly standard	1	2	0	3
Internal university rule	1	2	4	7
Domestic peer university	1	1	0	2
Foreign university	1	1	0	2
No identifiable named anchor	1	2	0	3

Direct national-law citation appeared in two of the five Chinese subset records and in none of the Korean or Japanese subset records. Ministry or national-agency documents were cited in five records: one Korean, two Japanese, and two Chinese. The Chinese examples are Peking University's large-model security rules and the ECNU–BNU student guide. These counts describe the close-reading subset only and do not imply that all documents in a country follow the same citation pattern.

International frameworks and foreign-university documents appeared only in the Korean and Japanese subset cases. Kyoto University cites the Artificial Intelligence Assessment Scale [36], UCLA course-policy guidance, and documents from Osaka and Kyushu Universities; Ritsumeikan University also cites external institutional examples. These references indicate selective borrowing, but the subset is too small to support prevalence claims.

Internal superior regulations were the most frequent anchor, appearing in seven of the thirteen subset records and in all three countries. The Communication University of China's implementing rules derive from a 2025 university-wide AI regulation, Kyung Hee University's ethics guide refers to a 2026 operating policy, and Keio University's guideline points to an earlier course-use notice. Three subset documents had no identifiable named anchor. Because a single record could cite several anchor types, the counts in Table 6 do not sum to thirteen.

4.4. RQ3: Descent to Sub-University Units

Table 7.

Admissible sub-university documents (issuer level 2; verified records, n = 7).

Country	Unit	Instrument	Regulatory device
Japan	Waseda University, School of Commerce	Guidelines and Precautions for the Use of Generative AI	school-level permission, disclosure, and misconduct rules
Japan	Waseda University, School of Social Sciences	Policy on the Use of Generative AI	Use only when permitted by the instructor; records retained
Japan	Waseda University, School of Education	Precautions for Using Generative AI Tools in Preparing Reports and Other Assignments	report-writing guidance; disclosure and misconduct rules
China	Peking Univ., School of Public Health	2026 undergraduate placement schedule	AIGC < 20%, supervisor verification
China	Peking Univ., School of Archaeology and Museology	2022-cohort defence schedule	disclosure duty; AI-generated core conclusions prohibited
China	ECNU School of Communication + BNU School of Journalism	Student AIGC use guide	directly generated content ≤ 20%, marked in red
Korea	KAIST School of Computing	Honour code	Substitution of assigned work is prohibited; instructor adjudicates

Seven sub-university records met the admissible-source rule used for Table 7: three verified Waseda school or faculty documents, three verified Chinese faculty-level instruments, and one verified KAIST School of Computing record. The evidence therefore supports descent to school or faculty level in all three countries. The devices differ across the observed cases: the Waseda documents combine instructor discretion with disclosure, verification, and misconduct rules; the Chinese documents use numerical ceilings, labelling duties, or supervisor confirmation; and the KAIST honour code leaves permission and adjudication to the instructor. A further purported Waseda course-level prohibition was not counted because no official waseda.ac.jp source could be retrieved. Within Peking University, the two faculty-level instruments diverge by discipline. The School of Public Health sets a numerical ceiling and requires supervisor confirmation, whereas the School of Archaeology and Museology requires labelling and prohibits AI-generated core conclusions without adopting an AIGC percentage threshold. Both operate within a university-level thesis inspection framework.

Neither Peking University instrument is a standalone university AI policy. Both are routine administrative schedules in which the AI provisions appear as clauses governing thesis submission and defence. This illustrates why document genre and institutional level must be established before prescriptive content is compared.

4.5. RQ4: Temporal Distribution and Revision Activity

Table 8.

Initial issue year and latest documented policy activity (n = 33 source-bearing primary cases).

Panel A. Initial issue year							
Country	2021	2023	2024	2025	2026	Unknown	Total
Korea	1	5	2	1	2	0	11
Japan	0	10	0	0	2	0	12
China	0	0	2	4	3	1	10
Total	1	15	4	5	7	1	33
Panel B. Latest issue or revision activity year							
Country	2021	2023	2024	2025	2026	Unknown	Total
Korea	0	2	1	2	6	0	11
Japan	0	6	1	2	3	0	12
China	0	0	2	4	3	1	10
Total	0	8	4	8	12	1	33

Table 8, Panel A shows initial issue dates for 32 of the 33 source-bearing primary cases. Japanese documents cluster strongly in 2023: ten of twelve were first issued that year, with two additional cases in 2026. The earliest identified Japanese guidance was issued on 22 March 2023, followed within weeks by Tohoku University, the University of Tokyo, Osaka University, Waseda University, and Kobe University. No dated Chinese primary instrument in the sample was initially issued in 2023.

The sequence is consistent with a rapid diffusion process under institutional uncertainty. Japan's Ministry of Education issued unified guidance for primary and secondary education in July 2023, while higher-education institutions developed their own responses. The dated Chinese cases begin in 2024 and become more numerous in 2025–26, when degree and system-security instruments offered a more formal basis for thesis-related and service-level regulation.

Korea shows two waves in the initial-issue distribution: five cases in 2023 and two in 2026, in addition to one in 2021, two in 2024, and one in 2025. Panel B incorporates documented revisions and resolves the apparent discrepancy between two Korean documents first issued in 2026 and six Korean cases showing policy activity in that year. Across the three countries, twelve primary cases show issue or revision activity in 2026: six Korean, three Japanese, and three Chinese. One Chinese partial-verification case had no recoverable issue year and remains in the unknown category.

5. Discussion

5.1. Institutional Placement and Regulatory Context

The strongest result is structural: Korea and Japan place almost all source-bearing primary instruments in teaching and learning, whereas the Chinese set adds five thesis or degree instruments and one AI system-security instrument. This difference should be treated first as institutional placement, not as a direct measure of relative restrictiveness.

Within the purposive close-reading subset, selected Chinese documents illustrate formal legal and superior-rule anchoring, whereas selected Korean and Japanese teaching-oriented documents illustrate ministry, peer-institutional, and international borrowing. Because the subset is small and compositionally different by genre, these are illustrative citation repertoires rather than country-level distributions. The placement and timing patterns are nevertheless consistent with different isomorphic mechanisms: formal authority may support coercive pressure in selected Chinese cases; Japan's sharp 2023 clustering is consistent with mimetic and normative diffusion under uncertainty; and Korea's later revision wave suggests interaction between external regulatory change and institutional learning. These are interpretive correspondences, not estimated causal effects [31]. They could be tested more directly through interviews with policy authors, institutional drafting and approval records, systematically versioned policy histories, and longitudinal data tracing the sequence between external guidance and institutional adoption.

This placement perspective also qualifies content-centred national comparisons. Xie et al. [37] describe Japan as human-centred and teaching-oriented and China as more strongly oriented toward national security and societal governance [37]. The two analyses operate at different levels: Xie et al. [37] compare national policy configurations, whereas the present study examines how universities translate those environments into institutionally located instruments. The present evidence does not reject their account; it shows how those orientations are translated into different institutional forms. Japanese cases are overwhelmingly teaching-and-learning guidance, whereas the Chinese corpus includes thesis or degree instruments and the only university-centre AI system-security case. The substantive contrast is therefore partly enacted through genre and organisational location.

5.2. Descent: Depth and Device

Sub-university depth cannot be ranked reliably across countries from this sample. The admissible record set contains three verified Japanese school or faculty documents, three verified Chinese faculty-level documents, and one verified Korean school-level record. The observed difference is clearer in regulatory devices than in depth: the Waseda documents rely on instructor permission, disclosure, and

misconduct provisions; the Chinese faculty cases use thresholds, labeling, or supervisor confirmation; and the KAIST case relies on course-level permission and instructor adjudication. These are case-level patterns, not prevalence estimates.

The two Peking University faculty cases illustrate disciplinary variation within a common institutional framework. One faculty regulates numerically and requires supervisor confirmation; the other uses labelling and substantive prohibitions without an AIGC percentage threshold. The university-level framework establishes that theses may be inspected, while the faculties specify how acceptable use is operationalised.

5.3. *Supplementary Close-Reading Observations*

The close-reading subset also reveals two analytically secondary concerns that cut across national placement. First, several documents treat AI-detection output as probabilistic support rather than conclusive evidence, aligning with research-integrity reviews and assessment-reform guidance [16, 38]. Second, documents in all three settings regulate what instructors, supervisors, or administrators may enter into public AI systems, particularly student data, confidential theses, and unpublished research. These observations support future full-corpus coding of detector use, staff obligations, and data-input controls, but they are not presented as additional country-level outcomes.

5.4. *Practical Implications*

Three practical implications follow from the placement perspective. First, universities should avoid treating a single institution-wide guideline as a substitute for all governance functions. Teaching-and-learning expectations, thesis or degree assurance, research-integrity rules, and AI system-security controls involve different responsible units and enforcement mechanisms; governance is more coherent when the issuing body and scope match the institutional action being regulated. Second, universities should maintain a public, versioned register of AI-related instruments that records the issuer, organisational level, scope, issue and revision dates, and links to superior rules. This would reduce ambiguity for staff and students and make policy change auditable.

Third, benchmarking bodies and researchers should compare like with like. Before ranking institutions or countries by permissiveness, maturity, or restrictiveness, they should verify source provenance and separate teaching guidance from degree regulation, research-integrity rules, and security standards. Ministries or sector bodies can articulate common minimum expectations without assuming that every university must implement them through the same document genre.

5.5. *Limitations and Future Research*

Visible public governance only. The study measures publicly retrievable or officially verifiable instruments, not internal practice. Among the thirty-six primary cases, thirty-one were verified, two were partially verified, and three had no confirmed public instrument. Partial verification and non-retrieval do not establish that internal or non-public governance is absent.

Sample. Twelve institutions per country were drawn from a three-stratum frame fixed before retrieval. The frame is small relative to the university populations concerned and weighted toward research-intensive institutions; the findings are not national prevalence estimates.

Recency and versioning. Several documents were issued or revised during data collection, and twelve primary cases show documented policy activity in 2026 when revisions are included. Successive versions were not counted as separate records: the initial issue date and latest revision date were stored within one record, and substantive coding used the version available at the 29 July 2026 cutoff. Because earlier versions were not systematically recoded, the study cannot determine whether revisions changed document genre, issuer level, or specific provisions.

Intercoder reliability and residual interpretive uncertainty. Independent agreement was very high for verification status and issuer level, substantial for governance mode, and high for the pooled citation-anchor decisions. Document genre had 90.9% raw agreement and $\kappa = .732$ after correction of two second-coder transcription errors. The three remaining primary-case disagreements all occurred among

Chinese records at boundaries between teaching and learning and either thesis or degree regulation or research integrity. Under the second coder's classifications, the Chinese primary set contains three thesis or degree instruments rather than five, while Peking University remains classified as AI system security. The most robust inference is therefore that the Chinese corpus contains an additional degree-governance layer absent from the Korean and Japanese primary sets, not that its exact prevalence is mechanically fixed at five of ten cases. The clarified codebook, both coders' values, and the adjudication record are provided in Supplementary File S1.

Asymmetric evidentiary depth and incomplete provision coding. Thirteen primary documents were read in full and received provision-level and citation coding; the remaining verified or partial records were used only for structural variables supportable from official sources. The subset includes only three Korean records and differs across countries in genre composition, so RQ2 identifies illustrative citation repertoires rather than national distributions. Claims that a provision is absent are restricted to the close-reading subset. Enforcement, principle, detector, staff-use, and infrastructure variables are not reported as full-corpus distributions. Future work should code how written norms are coupled to approved platforms, learning-management controls, procurement rules, and thesis-review systems.

6. Conclusion

This study asked where universities in Korea, Japan, and China place generative-AI governance, rather than how restrictively they regulate it. Four conclusions correspond to the research questions, preceded by one methodological finding from the fixed sampling frame.

The methodological finding is that document availability itself must be measured. A fixed frame retained two partial-verification cases and three cases without a confirmed public instrument that a document-led sample would likely have excluded. Among source-bearing cases, RQ1 shows that Korean and Japanese institutions locate governance mainly in teaching and learning, whereas the Chinese corpus adds degree and system-security layers. RQ2 shows different citation repertoires in the close-reading subset, with formal legal anchors appearing only in selected Chinese cases and broader peer or international borrowing appearing in selected Korean and Japanese cases.

RQ3 shows that governance descends below the university centre through different devices: instructor permission and disclosure rules in the verified Waseda cases, thresholds or supervisor confirmation in selected Chinese faculty cases, and instructor adjudication in the verified KAIST case. RQ4 shows a Japanese concentration in 2023 and later activity in Korea and China; when revisions are included, twelve primary cases show documented policy activity in 2026.

The central theoretical implication is that common pressures need not produce the same document genre with different wording. They may instead produce different institutional actions, guidance, degree control, conduct rules, or system-security regulation, located at different organisational levels. Cross-national comparison should therefore establish genre, issuer level, issuing body, and source provenance before comparing policy content.

Funding:

This paper was supported by Joongbu University Research & Development Fund in 2025.

Transparency:

The author confirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study; that no vital features of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained. This study followed all ethical practices during writing.

Acknowledgements:

The author gratefully acknowledges support from a 2025 intramural research grant from Joongbu University. The author thanks a graduate research assistant who was not a coauthor for independently coding the documentary corpus. OpenAI's ChatGPT was used to assist with language editing, reference-format checking, and computational preparation of the audit workbook from author-supplied data. This bounded use reflects the study's own distinction between technical assistance and accountable human judgement. The author retains full responsibility for the source classifications, coding rules, adjudication decisions, accuracy, originality and integrity of the manuscript.

Copyright:

© 2026 by the author. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

References

- [1] F. Miao and W. Holmes, *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. Paris, France: UNESCO, 2023.
- [2] OECD, *OECD digital education outlook 2023: Towards an effective digital education ecosystem*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing, 2023.
- [3] L. X. Jensen, A. Buhl, A. Sharma, and M. Bearman, "Generative AI and higher education: A review of claims from the first months of ChatGPT," *Higher Education*, vol. 89, pp. 1145–1161, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-024-01265-3>
- [4] C. K. Y. Chan, "A comprehensive AI policy education framework for university teaching and learning," *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, vol. 20, no. 1, p. 38, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00408-3>
- [5] S. Christ-Brendemühl, "Leveraging generative AI in higher education: An analysis of opportunities and challenges addressed in university guidelines," *European Journal of Education*, vol. 60, no. 1, p. e12891, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12891>
- [6] N. McDonald, A. Johri, A. Ali, and A. H. Collier, "Generative artificial intelligence in higher education: Evidence from an analysis of institutional policies and guidelines," *Computers in Human Behavior: Artificial Humans*, vol. 3, p. 100121, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbah.2025.100121>
- [7] Y. Jin, L. Yan, V. Echeverria, D. Gašević, and R. Martinez-Maldonado, "Generative AI in higher education: A global perspective of institutional adoption policies and guidelines," *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 8, p. 100348, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100348>
- [8] Y. An, J. H. Yu, and S. James, "Investigating the higher education institutions' guidelines and policies regarding the use of generative AI in teaching, learning, research, and administration," *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, vol. 22, p. 10, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-025-00507-3>
- [9] Y. Dai, S. Lai, C. P. Lim, and A. Liu, "University policies on generative AI in Asia: Promising practices, gaps, and future directions," *Journal of Asian Public Policy*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 260–281, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17516234.2024.2379070>
- [10] L. Parker, A. J. Loper, J. Hayes, A. Karakas, S. White, and H. Hallman, "Comparative analysis of artificial intelligence policies in universities across five countries," *Discover Computing*, vol. 28, p. 267, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10791-025-09745-5>
- [11] M. Li *et al.*, "A framework for developing university policies on generative AI governance: A cross-national comparative study," *Studies in Higher Education*, pp. 1–29, 2026. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2026.2696496>
- [12] N. Humble, "Higher education AI policies—A document analysis of university guidelines," *European Journal of Education*, vol. 60, no. 3, p. e70214, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.70214>
- [13] C. Orfanidis, "Moral diversity in institutional policies governing the student usage of generative AI: An international comparison," *Higher Education Quarterly*, vol. 79, no. 4, p. e70051, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.70051>
- [14] J. Jiao, S. Afroogh, K. Chen, D. Atkinson, and A. Dhurandhar, "AGGA: A dataset of academic guidelines for generative AIs [Data set]," *Harvard Dataverse*, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/XZZHA5>
- [15] J. Jiao, S. Afroogh, K. Chen, D. Atkinson, and A. Dhurandhar, "AGGA: A dataset of academic guidelines for generative AI and large language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.02063*, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2501.02063>
- [16] K. Bittle and O. El-Gayar, "Generative AI and academic integrity in higher education: A systematic review and research agenda," *Information*, vol. 16, no. 4, p. 296, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.3390/info16040296>
- [17] A. Alduais, S. Qadhi, Y. Chaaban, and M. Khraisheh, "Utilizing generative AI responsibly and ethically for research purposes in higher education: A policy analysis," *Serials Review*, vol. 51, no. 3–4, pp. 120–170, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00987913.2025.2581429>

- [18] H. Crompton *et al.*, "Governing generative AI in higher education: A global Delphi study on policy and practice," *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, vol. 23, no. 1, p. 21, 2026. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-026-00602-z>
- [19] M. A. Adarkwah, A. M. Ercan, K. Schneider, and E. Bayar, "Generative artificial intelligence policy: A qualitative UNESCO framework analysis," *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 1-38, 2026.
- [20] F. D. Bacalso *et al.*, "Institutional approaches to generative AI management in higher education: A systematic review," *Frontiers in Education*, vol. 11, p. 1814426, 2026. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2026.1814426>
- [21] M. G. H. Abir and K. Shigeta, "Evaluating generative AI policies in higher education: Insights from Japan's top universities," in *2025 7th International Conference on Modern Educational Technology (ICMET)* (pp. 165-171). IEEE, 2025.
- [22] H. Fukushima, "University strategies toward generative AI for 2025: An analysis of Japanese national university guidelines and proposal for information security," *Daigaku Kyoiku Kenkyu*, vol. 32, pp. 95-114, 2024.
- [23] I. Tanaka, "Guidelines for utilizing generative AI in higher education: A survey," *Journal of Japan Association for College and University Education*, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 54-58, 2025. https://doi.org/10.60182/jacuejournal.47.1_54
- [24] G. Capano, A. J. He, and S. McMinn, "Riding the tide of generative artificial intelligence in higher education policy: An Asian perspective," *Journal of Asian Public Policy* vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 245-259, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17516234.2025.2450571>
- [25] Y. Liu and H. Timmaz, "Navigating AI regulations in higher Education: A comparative analysis of mainland China, Hong Kong and Macau," *Higher Education Quarterly*, vol. 79, no. 4, p. e70073, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.70073>
- [26] Z. Yang and Y. Li, "Comparing the sustainable role of higher education in national artificial intelligence strategies through the Lens of policy documents in China, Japan, and South Korea (2017-2025)," *Sustainability*, vol. 18, no. 8, p. 3831, 2026. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su18083831>
- [27] L. Prior, *Using documents in social research*. London, U.K: Sage, 2003.
- [28] G. A. Bowen, "Document analysis as a qualitative research method," *Qualitative Research Journal*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 27-40, 2009. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- [29] C. R. Miller, "Genre as social action," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, vol. 70, no. 2, pp. 151-167, 1984. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00335638409383686>
- [30] G. C. Bowker and S. L. Star, *Sorting things out: Classification and its consequences*. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press, 1999.
- [31] P. J. DiMaggio and W. W. Powell, "The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields," *American Sociological Review*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 147-160, 1983. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101>
- [32] W. R. Scott, *Institutions and organizations: Ideas, interests, and identities*, 4th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage, 2014.
- [33] S. J. Ball, M. Maguire, and A. Braun, *How schools do policy: Policy enactments in secondary schools*. London, U.K: Routledge, 2012.
- [34] E. M. Rogers, *Diffusion of innovations*, 5th ed. New York, USA: Free Press, 2003.
- [35] C. O'Connor and H. Joffe, "Intercoder reliability in qualitative research: Debates and practical guidelines," *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, vol. 19, p. 1609406919899220, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406919899220>
- [36] M. Perkins, L. Furze, J. Roe, and J. MacVaugh, "The Artificial Intelligence Assessment Scale (AIAS): A framework for ethical integration of generative AI in educational assessment," *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 49-66, 2024.
- [37] Q. Xie, M. Li, and A. Enkhtur, "Exploring generative AI policies in higher education: A comparative perspective from China, Japan, Mongolia, and the USA," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.08986*, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2407.08986>
- [38] J. M. Lodge, S. Howard, M. L. Bearman, P. Dawson, and Associates, "Assessment reform for the age of artificial intelligence. Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency," 2023. <https://www.teqsa.gov.au/sites/default/files/2023-09/assessment-reform-age-artificial-intelligence-discussion-paper.pdf>

Supplementary Materials

The following appendices form part of the manuscript. Full sources and archived URLs, both independent coders' values, reliability calculations, and the adjudication log are provided in Supplementary File S1, the de-identified research data and audit workbook.

Appendix A.

Corpus and Record Structure.

The corpus contains 36 primary institutional cases and eight supplementary records. After adjudication, the 44-record corpus contains 38 verified records, three partial records, and three records for which no public institutional instrument was confirmed. The close-reading subset is marked "Yes." Full URLs and archived snapshots are contained in Supplementary File S1.

ID	Country	Institution	Record role	Issuer level	Document genre	Verification	Issue/revision	Close read
KR-A1	KR	Seoul National University	Primary	University centre	Teaching & learning	Verified	2026-01-01	No
KR-A2	KR	Korea University	Primary	University centre	Teaching & learning	Verified	2023-03 / rev. 2026-04	No
KR-A3	KR	Yonsei University	Primary	University centre	Teaching & learning	Verified	2024-05 / rev. 2024-12	Yes
KR-A4	KR	KAIST	Primary	University centre	Research integrity	Partial	Enacted 2021 / revised 2026-02-20	No
KR-B1	KR	Chungnam National University	Primary	University centre	Teaching & learning	Verified	2024 (estimated) / platform revised 2026-02-27	Yes
KR-B2	KR	Pusan National University	Primary	University centre	Teaching & learning	Verified	2023-03 (teaching and learning) / 2026-02-25 (policy standard) / revised 2026-02-25	No
KR-B3	KR	Kyungpook National University	Primary	University centre	Teaching & learning	Verified	2025-04	No
KR-C1	KR	Sungkyunkwan University	Primary	University centre	Teaching & learning	Verified	2023 (site launched)	No
KR-C2	KR	Hanyang University	Primary	—	—	Not_Found	—	No

ID	Country	Institution	Record role	Issuer level	Document genre	Verification	Issue/revision	Close read
KR-C3	KR	Kyung Hee University	Primary	University centre	Teaching & learning	Verified	Effective 2026-02-13 / officially launched 2026-03-03	Yes
KR-C4	KR	Chung-Ang University	Primary	University centre	Teaching & learning	Verified	2023	No
KR-C5	KR	Ewha Womans University	Primary	University centre	Teaching & learning	Verified	2023-07 / rev. 2025-12	No
JP-A1	JP	University of Tokyo	Primary	University centre	Teaching & learning	Verified	2023-05-26	No
JP-A2	JP	Kyoto University	Primary	University centre	Teaching & learning	Verified	2026-03	Yes
JP-A3	JP	Osaka University	Primary	University centre	Teaching & learning	Verified	2023-04-17	Yes
JP-A4	JP	Tohoku University	Primary	University centre	Teaching & learning	Verified	2023-03-31	No
JP-B1	JP	Hokkaido University	Primary	University centre	Teaching & learning	Verified	2023-05-31	Yes
JP-B2	JP	Nagoya University	Primary	University centre	Teaching & learning	Verified	2023-07-05	No
JP-B3	JP	University of Tsukuba	Primary	University centre	Teaching & learning	Verified	Basic policy 2023-05-11 / guidelines 2024-10-22 / reminder notice revised 2025-02-28	No
JP-B4	JP	Kobe University	Primary	University centre	Teaching & learning	Verified	2023-04-27 / rev. 2024-03-21	No
JP-C1	JP	Keio University	Primary	University centre	Teaching & learning	Verified	Last updated 2026-03-11	Yes
JP-C2	JP	Waseda University	Primary	University centre	Teaching & learning	Verified	2023-04-18	No
JP-C3	JP	Sophia University	Primary	University centre	Teaching & learning	Verified	2023-06 / rev. 2025-11-11	No

ID	Country	Institution	Record role	Issuer level	Document genre	Verification	Issue/revision	Close read
JP-C4	JP	Ritsumeikan University	Primary	University centre	Teaching & learning	Verified	Basic policy 2023-04-25 / revised 2026-03-19	Yes
CN-A1	CN	Tsinghua University	Primary	University centre	Teaching & learning	Verified	2025-11	No
CN-A2	CN	Peking University	Primary	University centre	AI system security	Verified	2026-05-11	Yes
CN-A3	CN	Fudan University	Primary	University centre	Thesis / degree	Verified	2024-11-28	No
CN-A4	CN	Shanghai Jiao Tong University	Primary	University centre	Teaching & learning	Verified	2025-03-04	Yes
CN-B1	CN	Nanjing University	Primary	University centre	Teaching & learning	Verified	2025	No
CN-B2	CN	Zhejiang University	Primary	University centre	Teaching & learning	Partial	—	No
CN-B3	CN	Sichuan University	Primary	University centre	Thesis/degree	Verified	2026-04-08	No
CN-B4	CN	Wuhan University	Primary	—	—	Not_Found	—	No
CN-C1	CN	Communication University of China	Primary	University centre	Thesis/degree	Verified	2026-07-16	Yes
CN-C2	CN	Nanjing Univ. of Aeronautics and Astronautics	Primary	University centre	Thesis/degree	Verified	2025-03	Yes
CN-C3	CN	East China Normal Univ. School of Communication + BNU School of Journalism	Primary	Faculty/school/course	Thesis/degree	Verified	2024-08-20	Yes
CN-C4	CN	Tianjin University	Primary	—	—	Not_Found	—	No
CN-A2b	CN	Peking University, School of Public Health	Supplementary	Faculty/school/course	Thesis/degree	Verified	2025-11-14	No
CN-A2c	CN	Peking University, School of Archaeology and Museology	Supplementary	Faculty/school/course	Thesis/degree	Verified	2025 (for the 2022 cohort)	No

ID	Country	Institution	Record role	Issuer level	Document genre	Verification	Issue/revision	Close read
CN-A2d	CN	Peking University	Supplementary	University centre	Thesis/degree	Verified	Revised 2021-03	No
KR-A4b	KR	KAIST School of Computing	Supplementary	Faculty/school/course	Teaching & learning	Verified	—	No
JP-C2b	JP	Waseda University, School of Commerce	Supplementary	Faculty/school/course	Teaching & learning	Verified	2026-07-15	No
JP-C2c	JP	Waseda University, School of Social Sciences	Supplementary	Faculty/school/course	Teaching & learning	Verified	2023-12-26	No
JP-C2d	JP	Waseda University, School of Education	Supplementary	Faculty/school/course	Teaching & learning	Verified	2024-04-10	No
JP-C2e	JP	Waseda Univ., Faculty of Letters, English Literature Course	Supplementary	Faculty/school/course	Teaching & learning	Partial	—	No

Appendix B.

Named National and Ministerial Anchors.

The table lists named national or ministerial instruments that were directly verified in selected close-reading records. It is an evidentiary inventory, not a count of all possible external influences.

Record	Institution	Named instrument(s)	Anchor type	Evidence location
KR-A3	Yonsei University	National Information Society Agency; Ministry of the Interior and Safety; National Intelligence Service; National Research Foundation of Korea	National agency/ministry	Named in the verified guideline and coding notes
JP-A2	Kyoto University	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), Higher Education Bureau, “Handling of Generative AI in Teaching and Learning at Universities and Colleges of Technology (Notification)”	Ministry guidance	Named on the official guideline page
JP-A2	Kyoto University	MEXT, Elementary and Secondary Education Bureau, “Guidelines for the Use of Generative AI in Primary and Secondary Education”	Ministry guidance	Named on the official guideline page
JP-A2	Kyoto University	Agency for Cultural Affairs, “AI and Copyright” seminar materials; Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry, “Handbook for the Use of Generative AI in Content Production”; Personal Information Protection Commission, “Advisory on the Use of Generative AI Services”	National agency guidance	Named on the official guideline page
CN-A2	Peking University	Cybersecurity Law of the People’s Republic of China; Data Security Law of the People’s Republic of China; Personal Information Protection Law of the People’s	National law/regulation	Article 1 of the verified university regulation

Record	Institution	Named instrument(s)	Anchor type	Evidence location
		Republic of China; Interim Measures for the Management of Generative Artificial Intelligence Services; Measures for Labelling AI-Generated and Synthesised Content		
CN-C3	ECNU School of Communication + BNU School of Journalism	Ministry of Science and Technology, “Guidelines for Responsible Research Conduct”; Cyberspace Administration of China, “Interim Measures for the Management of Generative Artificial Intelligence Services”	Ministry national regulator	/ Preamble of the verified student guideline

Appendix C.

Coding Protocol and Independent-Coding Form.

C.1. Core Decision Rules

Variable	Values	Decision rule
verification_status	verified / partial / not_found	Verified requires retrievable Tier 1 full text. Partial permits official evidence of existence, issuer, or date but not complete provision coding. Not_found means no public institutional instrument was confirmed under the documented search protocol.
issuer_level	1 / 2	1 = university-centre issuer. 2 = faculty, school, department or course-level issuer. Code the body that formally issues the instrument, not merely the webpage host.
doc_genre	Teaching & learning / Thesis or degree / Research integrity / AI system security	Code the predominant institutional action: classroom or assessment practice; degree submission or certification; conduct and integrity rules; or model, service, data and deployment security. Prescriptive tone does not determine genre.
governance_mode	dedicated_document / absorbed_into_existing / none_confirmed	Dedicated means a distinct AI instrument. Absorbed means AI is incorporated into an existing regulation. None_confirmed is used only for primary cases without a verified public instrument.
close_reading_subset	1 / 0	Fixed analytical subset of thirteen primary Tier 1 records selected for textual depth, identifiable anchors, genre or mode diversity, and temporal coverage.
citation_anchors	binary fields + verbatim list	Code only explicitly named statutes, ministry or agency documents, international frameworks, peer institutions, industry templates or superior internal rules. Do not infer influence from similarity.

C.2. Close-Reading Subset

ID	Country	Institution	Genre	Selection basis
CN-A2	CN	Peking University	AI system security	Tier 1 full text; named-anchor coding; contributes country and genre/mode variation.
CN-A4	CN	Shanghai Jiao Tong University	Teaching & learning	Tier 1 full text; named-anchor coding; contributes country and genre/mode variation.
CN-C1	CN	Communication University of China	Thesis/degree	Tier 1 full text; named-anchor coding; contributes country and genre/mode variation.
CN-C2	CN	Nanjing Univ. of Aeronautics and Astronautics	Thesis/degree	Tier 1 full text; named-anchor coding; contributes country and genre/mode variation.

CN-C3	CN	East China Normal Univ. School of Communication + BNU School of Journalism	Thesis/degree	Tier 1 full text; named-anchor coding; contributes country and genre/mode variation.
JP-A2	JP	Kyoto University	Teaching & learning	Tier 1 full text; named-anchor coding; contributes country and genre/mode variation.
JP-A3	JP	Osaka University	Teaching & learning	Tier 1 full text; named-anchor coding; contributes country and genre/mode variation.
JP-B1	JP	Hokkaido University	Teaching & learning	Tier 1 full text; named-anchor coding; contributes country and genre/mode variation.
JP-C1	JP	Keio University	Teaching & learning	Tier 1 full text; named-anchor coding; contributes country and genre/mode variation.
JP-C4	JP	Ritsumeikan University	Teaching & learning	Tier 1 full text; named-anchor coding; contributes country and genre/mode variation.
KR-A3	KR	Yonsei University	Teaching & learning	Tier 1 full text; named-anchor coding; contributes country and genre/mode variation.
KR-B1	KR	Chungnam National University	Teaching & learning	Tier 1 full text; named-anchor coding; contributes country and genre/mode variation.
KR-C3	KR	Kyung Hee University	Teaching & learning	Tier 1 full text; named-anchor coding; contributes country and genre/mode variation.

C.3. Completed Independent-Coding and Adjudication Procedure

1. A graduate research assistant who was not a coauthor received the source links, document titles, and codebook; coder-1 category values were hidden during independent coding.
2. Verification status was independently coded for all 44 records, issuer level for 41 source-bearing records, document genre and governance mode for 33 source-bearing primary cases, and citation anchors for the thirteen close-reading records.
3. Agreement was calculated before adjudication. The final independent results were 97.7% for verification status ($\kappa = .914$), 95.1% for issuer level ($\kappa = .828$), 90.9% for document genre ($\kappa = .732$), 97.0% for governance mode ($\kappa = .653$), and 96.2% across the pooled citation-anchor decisions ($\kappa = .904$).
4. Ten disagreements within the reported reliability scopes were reviewed against the official source texts and the prespecified rules. Coder-1, coder-2, and final adjudicated values are all retained in Supplementary File S1. Two additional supplementary-record genre decisions were memoed separately and are outside the 33-case genre coefficient.
5. The manuscript reports the pre-adjudication reliability coefficients and uses the adjudicated values for descriptive tables and narrative results.

C.4. Boundary Cases Requiring Explicit Memoing

- An official press release can establish existence and date, but cannot support a claim that an unreported provision is absent.
- A thesis schedule containing AI clauses is coded as a thesis or degree instrument even when AI is not the document's sole subject.
- A university-wide general instrument is the primary case; distinct faculty or school instruments are supplementary records rather than

additional institutions.

- A page hosted on a non-institutional domain is not upgraded to Tier 1 merely because it attributes the text to a university.
- Issue and revision dates are coded separately; ‘latest activity year’ uses the later documented year. Successive versions remain one record, and coding uses the version available at the study cutoff.

Appendix D.

Intercoder Reliability and Adjudication Summary.

Table D1 reports the independent, pre-adjudication results. Raw agreement is shown with Cohen’s kappa because category prevalence was highly uneven for several variables. The full disagreement-level audit is contained in Supplementary File S1.

Variable	N	Agreement	Cohen’s κ	Analytical scope
Verification status	44	97.7%	.914	All records
Issuer level	41	95.1%	.828	Source-bearing records
Document genre	33	90.9%	.732	Source-bearing primary cases
Governance mode	33	97.0%	.653	Source-bearing primary cases
Citation anchors	78 decisions	96.2%	.904	13 close-reading records; pooled binary decisions

Two second-coder transcription errors were corrected before reliability was recalculated: CN-A2 was corrected to AI system security and CN-A3 to Thesis/degree. These entries match the source-based classifications and are not treated as adjudication disagreements. Adjudication changed two analytical values relative to the first-coder file: the KAIST School of Computing honour code was upgraded from partial to verified because its full official text was retrievable, and the Osaka University statement was not counted as citing an internal university rule because the referenced ELSI Note is an explanatory research note rather than a rule or regulation. The remaining disagreements were resolved by applying the scope-based genre, issuer, and governance-mode definitions recorded in Appendix C.

Table 4 reports the final adjudicated classifications; the three-Thesis/degree figure below refers only to the independent second-coder, pre-adjudication distribution. After correction, three primary-case genre disagreements remained, all in Chinese records: Zhejiang University, Sichuan University, and the Communication University of China. Under the second coder’s distribution, the Chinese primary set contains three thesis or degree instruments rather than five, while Peking University remains classified as AI system security. The robust conclusion is therefore the presence of an additional degree-governance layer in the Chinese corpus, whereas the exact five-of-ten distribution is sensitive to boundary classification.