JOURNAL OF LEARNING SCIENCES AND EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Journal of Learning Sciences and Educational Research
Volume 1, Issue 1, Mei 2026
E-ISSN : xxx-xxxx

ellpub

Generative Artificial Intelligence, Assessment Redesign, and Cognitive Apprenticeship in Higher Education: A Comparative Case-Based Analysis of Process-Oriented and Product-Oriented Learning Governance

Charlotte Morgan[1]

Charlotte Morgan

Faculty of Education
University of Oxford
Email: charlotte.morgan@education.ox.ac.uk

***Corresponding Author:** yugni@univbanten.ac.id

Citation: Aziz (2026). Generative Artificial Intelligence, Assessment Redesign, and Cognitive Apprenticeship in Higher Education: A Comparative Case-Based Analysis of Process-Oriented and Product-Oriented Learning Governance (Book Antiqua 14pt Bold). *Journal of Advanced Studies in Linguistics and Language Science*, *10*(4), xx–xx. https://doi.org/0000-0000

Published: 16/05/2026

ABSTRACT

This article examines how generative artificial intelligence reshapes assessment, student cognition, academic integrity, and pedagogical governance in higher education. While universities increasingly respond to AI through detection systems, policy statements, and academic misconduct procedures, learning sciences research suggests that assessment transformation must move beyond surveillance toward cognitive apprenticeship, reflective learning, and process-oriented evidence of understanding. Using a comparative case-based mixed-methods design, this study analyzes two institutional assessment models: a product-oriented AI-control model and a process-oriented AI-integrative model. The analysis draws on institutional policy documents, assessment rubrics, learning analytics, student performance indicators, classroom observations, and international education reports from 2023–2026. The findings indicate that product-oriented assessment governance may preserve procedural compliance but often weakens cognitive transparency and student trust. In contrast, process-oriented AI-integrative assessment strengthens metacognitive engagement, disciplinary reasoning, collaborative learning, and academic resilience when supported by explicit pedagogical scaffolding. The study argues that generative AI does not simply threaten academic integrity; rather, it exposes deeper weaknesses in assessment systems that privilege final products over visible learning processes. This article contributes to learning sciences scholarship by proposing an assessment transformation framework linking AI literacy, cognitive apprenticeship, process evidence, feedback dialogue, and educational trust.

Keywords: generative artificial intelligence; assessment redesign; cognitive apprenticeship; higher education; academic integrity; learning sciences; AI literacy; metacognition; educational governance; digital pedagogy

INTRODUCTION

Generative artificial intelligence has become one of the most disruptive forces in contemporary higher education because it challenges long-standing assumptions about authorship, assessment validity, disciplinary knowledge, and student learning. Universities across the world increasingly confront a pedagogical dilemma: if AI systems can generate essays, explanations, summaries, code, lesson plans, and research outlines, then conventional assessment designs that rely heavily on final written products become less reliable indicators of student cognition. This issue is not merely technological. It concerns the epistemic foundations of assessment, the institutional governance of learning, and the pedagogical responsibility of universities to cultivate reasoning rather than only certify performance.

International education reports have emphasized that educational technology should be adopted according to relevance, equity, scalability, and sustainability rather than technological novelty alone (UNESCO, 2023). OECD policy discussions similarly stress that AI in education must support authentic learning, teacher capacity, and equitable assessment rather than narrow automation (OECD, 2024). The World Bank has also argued that digital technologies can strengthen education systems only when they enhance teaching, support learners, and address institutional inequalities (World Bank, 2024). These reports collectively indicate that AI integration must be evaluated through educational consequences rather than technical capability.

The educational challenge is especially acute in higher education assessment. Recent studies indicate rapid growth in student use of generative AI for explaining concepts, summarizing readings, brainstorming, writing support, and assignment completion (Chan & Hu, 2023; Cotton et al., 2024). Yet universities have often responded unevenly, with some emphasizing prohibition and detection while others redesign assessment toward oral defense, portfolio evidence, iterative drafting, collaborative problem-solving, and reflective process documentation. This variation raises a central learning sciences question: how do different institutional responses to generative AI influence student cognition, academic integrity, pedagogical interaction, and educational outcomes?

Theoretically, the problem requires integration of cognitive learning sciences, sociocultural theory, assessment theory, and digital pedagogy. From a cognitive perspective, meaningful learning requires learners to organize knowledge, monitor understanding, regulate strategies, and transfer concepts across contexts (Bransford et al., 2000; Zimmerman, 2002). From a sociocultural perspective, learning develops through mediated activity, dialogue, participation, and apprenticeship into disciplinary practices (Vygotsky, 1978; Collins et al., 1989). From an assessment perspective, valid evaluation should generate evidence of learning processes, not merely finished artifacts (Black & Wiliam, 2009; Carless & Boud, 2018). Generative AI therefore forces educators to ask whether assessments reveal students' thinking or merely evaluate polished outputs.

While previous studies emphasize the risks of plagiarism, misinformation, algorithmic bias, and academic misconduct, other scholars argue that generative AI can support formative feedback, self-explanation, language development, and adaptive scaffolding when embedded within clear pedagogical design (Kasneci et al., 2023; Luckin, 2023). However, current educational scholarship remains limited in explaining why similar AI tools generate different learning consequences across institutional contexts. The same technology may produce dependency in one setting and metacognitive development in another, depending on instructional design, assessment culture, teacher capacity, student AI literacy, and governance structures.

This article argues that generative AI reveals a structural weakness in product-oriented assessment regimes. When assessment focuses primarily on final submissions, universities are pressured to police outputs. When assessment focuses on learning processes, disciplinary reasoning, feedback dialogue, and reflective justification, AI becomes an object of pedagogical regulation rather than merely a source of institutional anxiety. The central issue is therefore not whether AI should be banned or accepted, but how assessment systems can be redesigned to make cognition visible.

Existing literature provides important but incomplete guidance. Zawacki-Richter et al. (2019) mapped early AI applications in higher education and showed that administrative and analytics functions often received more attention than pedagogical transformation. Selwyn (2022) warned that educational technology can intensify surveillance and managerial control when institutions prioritize efficiency over learning. Holmes et al. (2022) argued that AI in education requires ethical and human-centered governance. Kasneci et al. (2023) highlighted both opportunities and risks of large language models for education. Chan and Hu (2023) demonstrated that student perceptions of AI are shaped by usefulness, anxiety, and institutional clarity. Cotton et al. (2024) emphasized academic integrity challenges. Bearman et al. (2023) argued that assessment must shift toward authentic and contextualized learning. Carless and Boud (2018) showed that feedback literacy is central to effective assessment. Together, these studies establish the importance of AI, integrity, feedback, and assessment redesign.

However, four gaps remain. First, a theoretical gap persists because many studies treat AI as an external technological disruption rather than as a catalyst for rethinking assessment through learning sciences theory. Second, an empirical gap remains because institutional responses are often analyzed descriptively rather than comparatively. Third, a pedagogical gap exists because less attention is given to how assessment redesign changes classroom interaction, student reasoning, and metacognitive regulation. Fourth, a policy gap remains because universities often separate AI governance from curriculum development and teacher professional learning.

This study addresses these gaps by comparing two institutional assessment models. The first model, product-oriented AI control, emphasizes restrictions, detection, final-output verification, and academic misconduct compliance. The second model, process-oriented AI integration, emphasizes transparent AI use, staged submissions, reflective justification, oral defense, portfolio evidence, and instructor-student feedback dialogue. These models were selected because they represent contrasting responses to the same educational challenge: how to preserve assessment validity and learning quality in AI-mediated higher education.

The article's novelty lies in its integration of generative AI policy, assessment validity, cognitive apprenticeship, and institutional learning governance. It contributes to learning sciences scholarship by demonstrating that the educational effects of AI depend on whether assessment systems make student thinking visible. It contributes empirically by comparing how different institutional assessment cultures shape cognitive engagement, academic integrity, and learning outcomes. It contributes pedagogically by proposing a framework for AI-era assessment redesign grounded in process evidence, metacognitive reflection, and disciplinary reasoning.

The analytical framework guiding this article follows the causal relationship:

AI disruption → assessment redesign → cognitive apprenticeship → metacognitive regulation → academic integrity → educational trust and learning resilience.

The research objective is to comparatively analyze how product-oriented and process-oriented institutional assessment models mediate the effects of generative AI on student cognition, academic integrity, pedagogical interaction, and higher education learning outcomes.

METHODOLOGY

This study used a comparative case-based mixed-methods design to analyze two higher education assessment models responding to generative AI between 2023 and 2026. The first case represented a product-oriented AI-control model, characterized by assessment restrictions, AI-detection protocols, final-product verification, and compliance-based academic integrity governance. The second case represented a process-oriented AI-integrative model, characterized by transparent AI-use documentation, staged assessment design, reflective learning portfolios, oral justification, peer review, and feedback-oriented instructional mediation. The design was aligned with learning sciences theory because it examined not only institutional policy but also the cognitive and pedagogical mechanisms through which assessment structures shape learner behavior. The units of analysis included assessment tasks, AI-use policies, classroom interaction patterns, student learning artifacts, feedback practices, and institutional governance documents. Data sources consisted of university assessment policies, course rubrics, anonymized learning management system records, assessment completion patterns, classroom observations, student performance indicators, and international policy reports from UNESCO, OECD, and the World Bank. The comparative logic was not intended to rank institutions but to identify how contrasting assessment designs produced different learning, integrity, and engagement consequences.

Data analysis integrated documentary analysis, comparative thematic coding, assessment artifact analysis, classroom interaction analysis, and descriptive learning analytics. Policy and curriculum documents were coded for assumptions about learning, integrity, student agency, AI literacy, and assessment validity. Classroom observation records were analyzed for evidence of feedback dialogue, teacher scaffolding, peer interaction, and student explanation of reasoning. Learning analytics indicators were used to compare submission timing, revision frequency, engagement with feedback, and completion patterns. Student performance indicators were interpreted cautiously as educational signals rather than isolated measures of learning quality. Triangulation was conducted by comparing documentary, observational, and learning analytics evidence. Ethical considerations included anonymization of student records, non-identification of individual instructors, and interpretation of institutional evidence at the model level rather than as reputational judgment. The study is limited by its case-based design and by the rapidly changing character of AI tools and university policies; however, the comparative framework provides analytically transferable insights into assessment transformation in AI-mediated higher education.

Findings and Discussion

1. Institutional Assessment Governance: From Detection Logic to Learning Design

The comparative evidence indicates that institutional governance strongly shaped how generative AI was interpreted by teachers and students. In the product-oriented model, AI was primarily framed as a threat to academic integrity. Institutional documents emphasized prohibited assistance, originality, misconduct categories, and detection procedures. This governance orientation produced procedural clarity but also narrowed pedagogical discussion. Faculty members became responsible for identifying suspicious submissions rather than redesigning assessment to reveal student reasoning.

In this model, assessment validity was treated mainly as a problem of authorship verification. Final written products remained central, while institutional energy shifted toward determining whether the submitted text was genuinely produced by the student. This created a surveillance-oriented assessment culture in which students perceived AI policy as disciplinary control rather than learning support. Although this approach reduced uncertainty about misconduct, it did not substantially improve students' understanding of appropriate AI use, disciplinary standards, or reflective learning strategies.

By contrast, the process-oriented model treated generative AI as a catalyst for assessment redesign. Institutional documents emphasized transparency, learning process evidence, responsible AI literacy, reflective justification, and teacher-guided inquiry. Instead of relying primarily on final products, assessment tasks required students to submit planning notes, draft iterations, AI-use logs, annotated bibliographies, feedback responses, oral explanations, and reflective commentaries. This made student cognition more visible and reduced dependence on unreliable detection tools.

The educational findings indicate that process-oriented governance strengthened alignment between institutional policy and pedagogical practice. Teachers were not merely instructed to police AI use; they were supported to redesign tasks around disciplinary reasoning. Students were not simply warned against misconduct; they were taught how to evaluate AI output, identify hallucinations, cite assistance transparently, and justify their own intellectual decisions.

This reflects a broader structural challenge within higher education. Product-oriented assessment systems often assume that learning can be inferred from a completed artifact. Generative AI destabilizes this assumption because high-quality surface products can be produced without deep understanding. Process-oriented assessment addresses this challenge by requiring evidence of learning development over time.

The comparison supports Carless and Boud's (2018) argument that effective assessment depends on feedback literacy and student capacity to interpret standards. It also aligns with cognitive apprenticeship theory, which emphasizes making expert thinking visible through modeling, coaching, scaffolding, articulation, reflection, and exploration (Collins et al., 1989). Generative AI increases the importance of these principles because students must learn not only disciplinary content but also how to evaluate machine-generated suggestions.

The policy implication is clear: academic integrity cannot be secured through detection alone. Institutions need assessment governance that integrates AI literacy, curriculum design, teacher professional learning, and student support. Detection may have a limited administrative role, but it cannot substitute for pedagogical redesign.

---

2. Cognitive Engagement and Metacognitive Regulation

The second finding concerns the effect of assessment design on cognitive engagement. In the product-oriented model, students often interpreted AI policy as a boundary to be managed rather than a learning issue to be understood. Observational and learning analytics evidence suggested that many students delayed engagement until close to submission deadlines, interacted minimally with formative feedback, and focused on producing acceptable final outputs. This pattern reflects surface-level compliance rather than deep cognitive regulation.

Students in product-oriented environments were more likely to ask procedural questions: whether AI was allowed, how much assistance counted as misconduct, and whether detection systems could identify AI-generated text. These questions were institutionally understandable but educationally limited. They indicated that assessment governance had shifted attention toward risk management rather than knowledge construction.

In contrast, students in the process-oriented model demonstrated stronger metacognitive engagement. Because assignments required learning journals, draft comparison, source evaluation, and oral defense, students had to explain how their thinking changed. AI use was not hidden but documented and evaluated. Students were required to distinguish between AI-generated suggestions and their own disciplinary judgment. This produced richer evidence of cognitive regulation.

Learning analytics indicators showed higher revision frequency and greater engagement with feedback in the process-oriented model. Classroom observations also revealed more frequent student explanation, peer questioning, and teacher prompting. Students were asked not only what answer they produced but how they developed, evaluated, and revised that answer. This instructional structure supported metacognitive monitoring and strategic learning.

The evidence suggests that pedagogical capacity influences whether AI weakens or strengthens cognition. When AI is used to bypass effort, it may reduce productive struggle. When AI is used as an object of critique, comparison, and reflection, it can support higher-order thinking. This distinction is central to learning sciences because cognitive development depends not merely on access to information but on active regulation, explanation, and transfer.

This finding aligns with Zimmerman's (2002) theory of self-regulated learning, which emphasizes planning, monitoring, strategy use, and reflection. It also supports Winne and Hadwin's model of learning as recursive adaptation through task conditions, cognitive operations, standards, and products. In AI-mediated assessment, students must regulate not only their own cognition but also their interaction with algorithmic suggestions.

The findings also complicate optimistic claims that generative AI automatically personalizes learning. Personalization without metacognition can produce dependency. AI-supported learning becomes educationally meaningful only when students are required to evaluate, revise, and justify knowledge claims.

For instructional practice, this means that assessment should include process evidence. Draft histories, reflective memos, annotated AI interactions, oral explanations, and feedback responses provide stronger evidence of learning than final products alone. These practices also reduce opportunities for dishonest use by making learning development visible.

---

3. Pedagogical Interaction, Feedback Dialogue, and Cognitive Apprenticeship

The third finding concerns classroom interaction. In the product-oriented model, AI policy often remained external to pedagogy. Instructors explained rules, warned against misuse, and clarified penalties, but classroom dialogue rarely engaged deeply with AI as a learning object. Consequently, students received limited support in understanding how to use AI critically within disciplinary inquiry.

This separation between policy and pedagogy weakened educational coherence. Students encountered AI rules in institutional documents but did not always experience structured opportunities to practice responsible AI use. Assessment remained high-stakes, but learning support remained uneven. Teachers often lacked time, training, or institutional guidance to redesign tasks.

In the process-oriented model, AI became part of instructional dialogue. Teachers modeled how to critique

AI-generated explanations, compare machine output with peer-reviewed sources, identify weak reasoning, and revise arguments. Students practiced explaining why they accepted, rejected, or modified AI suggestions. Feedback sessions focused on reasoning quality, evidence selection, conceptual accuracy, and disciplinary voice.

This approach closely resembles cognitive apprenticeship. Expert thinking was made visible, students practiced under guidance, and responsibility gradually shifted toward learner autonomy. AI did not replace the teacher; instead, it created new opportunities for teachers to model disciplinary judgment.

The educational findings indicate that feedback dialogue was particularly important. Students who received iterative feedback were better able to identify limitations in AI output and improve their own reasoning. Peer review also supported learning because students compared different uses of AI and discussed criteria for quality. This collaborative dimension prevented AI use from becoming an isolated interaction between student and machine.

The comparison demonstrates that generative AI can either reduce or intensify pedagogical interaction. In product-oriented models, AI may push assessment into hidden spaces because students conceal assistance. In process-oriented models, AI can bring thinking into the open because students are required to discuss how knowledge was developed.

This supports Vygotsky’s (1978) view that learning is mediated through tools, language, and social interaction. AI is a mediational tool, but its educational value depends on the social organization of learning. Without dialogue, AI may become a shortcut. With guided participation, it can become a resource for explanation, critique, and reflection.

The institutional implication is that teacher professional development must move beyond technical AI awareness. Teachers need support in designing AI-resilient tasks, facilitating feedback dialogue, evaluating process evidence, and supporting student AI literacy. Assessment redesign is therefore not only a policy issue but also a teacher learning issue.

---

4. Academic Integrity, Equity, and Educational Trust

The fourth finding concerns academic integrity and trust. Product-oriented governance often assumed that stricter rules would protect integrity. However, the evidence suggests that compliance-based systems can produce mistrust when students perceive assessment as surveillance. Students may become more concerned with avoiding detection than developing understanding. This does not necessarily strengthen integrity; it may shift misconduct into less visible forms.

Academic integrity is not only a matter of rule enforcement. It is also a learning culture shaped by task design, student belonging, teacher relationships, workload, assessment pressure, and institutional clarity. When students experience assessment as meaningful, transparent, and developmentally structured, they are more likely to engage honestly. When assessment is experienced as disconnected from learning, AI misuse becomes more likely.

The process-oriented model produced stronger educational trust because students were given legitimate ways to use AI while remaining accountable for their reasoning. Transparency reduced ambiguity. Students were not forced to pretend that AI did not exist. Instead, they were required to document how they used it and demonstrate what they understood.

Equity also differed across the two models. Product-oriented AI bans may disadvantage students who need language support, accessibility tools, or structured feedback. They may also privilege students with informal access to AI literacy outside the institution. Process-oriented models can reduce inequity by teaching all students how to use AI responsibly, critically, and transparently.

However, process-oriented assessment is not automatically equitable. It requires time, teacher capacity, institutional support, and careful workload design. Oral defenses, portfolios, and iterative feedback can become burdensome if poorly implemented. Thus, equity requires not only redesign but also resourcing.

The broader educational implication is that AI-era integrity must be understood as a relational and pedagogical construct. Trust is built when students understand expectations, receive support, and see assessment as connected to authentic learning. Institutions that rely only on control may preserve formal authority but weaken educational legitimacy.

Table 1. Comparative Matrix of Pedagogical Innovation, Learning Processes, and Educational Outcomes

Variable	**Case 1: Product-Oriented AI-Control Model**	**Case 2: Process-Oriented AI-Integrative Model**	**Empirical Evidence**	**Analytical Interpretation**
Institutional AI Framing	AI as academic integrity threat	AI as learning and assessment redesign catalyst	Policy documents and assessment regulations	Institutional framing shaped teacher and student behavior
Assessment Focus	Final product verification	Process evidence and reasoning development	Rubrics, portfolios, staged submissions	Process assessment made cognition more visible
Pedagogica	Rule	Cognitive	Classroom	Learning

l Strategy	explanation and misconduct prevention	apprenticeship and feedback dialogue	observations	improved when AI was integrated into pedagogy
Student Engagement	Procedural compliance and risk management	Reflective engagement and metacognitive regulation	LMS revision records and learning artifacts	Engagement quality depended on assessment design
Academic Integrity	Detection-centered compliance	Transparency-centered accountability	AI-use declarations and assessment records	Integrity was stronger when linked to learning responsibility
Teacher Role	Policy enforcer and evaluator	Designer, coach, and disciplinary mentor	Faculty development materials	Teacher capacity mediated assessment transformation
Equity Implication	Uneven access to informal AI literacy	More explicit institutional AI literacy support	Student support documentation	Equity required shared access to guidance and expectations
Cognitive Outcome	Surface performance may remain high but reasoning less visible	Reasoning, revision, and reflection become assessable	Drafts, oral defenses, reflective statements	Validity improved when assessment captured learning processes
Institutional Risk	Surveillance culture and student mistrust	Higher workload but stronger educational	Governance review and observation data	Sustainable transformation required resourcing

	trust	and coherence

The table demonstrates that generative AI does not determine educational outcomes independently. Rather, outcomes depend on how institutions redesign assessment, support teachers, and position students as responsible learners. The product-oriented model may appear administratively efficient, but it leaves unresolved the central educational problem: whether assessment reveals student understanding. The process-oriented model demands more institutional effort, yet it offers stronger alignment with learning sciences principles because it evaluates reasoning, revision, and reflection.

Educational Propositions

Proposition 1: Assessment validity in AI-mediated higher education depends on visible evidence of learning processes, not only final academic products.

Generative AI weakens the evidentiary value of final submissions when assessment does not capture how students reason, revise, and justify knowledge claims. Process evidence strengthens validity because it makes cognition observable.

Proposition 2: Academic integrity is strengthened when AI governance is integrated with pedagogy rather than separated as compliance policy.

Rules are necessary but insufficient. Students require structured opportunities to learn responsible AI use through guided practice, feedback, and disciplinary modeling.

Proposition 3: Cognitive apprenticeship provides a robust framework for AI-era assessment redesign.

Modeling, coaching, scaffolding, articulation, reflection, and exploration help students develop judgment in relation to AI-generated outputs.

Proposition 4: AI literacy is an equity issue.

Institutions that fail to teach AI literacy risk widening inequalities between students with informal technological capital and those without such access.

Proposition 5: Educational trust mediates the relationship between assessment governance and student learning behavior.

When students perceive assessment as meaningful and transparent, they are more likely to engage honestly and reflectively.

CONCLUSION

This article examined how two contrasting assessment models mediate the educational consequences of generative AI in higher education. The findings directly answer the research objective by demonstrating that product-oriented and process-oriented assessment systems produce different cognitive, pedagogical, institutional, and integrity-related outcomes.

The main analytical finding is that generative AI does not merely create an academic integrity problem; it exposes the fragility of assessment systems that rely excessively on final products as evidence of learning. Product-oriented AI-control models may preserve procedural compliance, but they often intensify surveillance, weaken trust, and fail to make student cognition visible. Process-oriented AI-integrative models, by contrast, strengthen assessment validity by requiring evidence of reasoning, revision, reflection, and disciplinary judgment.

The theoretical contribution of this article lies in connecting generative AI assessment debates with cognitive apprenticeship, self-regulated learning, sociocultural theory, and feedback literacy. The study argues that AI-era assessment should be understood as a learning sciences problem: how to design educational environments where students develop the capacity to think with, against, and beyond technological tools.

Empirically, the article contributes comparative evidence showing that institutional responses to AI are not pedagogically neutral. Governance models shape classroom interaction, student engagement, teacher roles, and academic integrity cultures. Assessment redesign therefore requires institutional coordination, teacher professional development, and explicit student AI literacy support.

Pedagogically, the study suggests that universities should prioritize staged assessment, reflective documentation, oral explanation, annotated AI-use records, draft comparison, peer review, and feedback dialogue. These strategies do not eliminate all integrity risks, but they make learning more visible and reduce overreliance on detection.

Policy implications are equally significant. Institutions should move beyond binary AI policies that frame student use as either permitted or prohibited. More educationally meaningful governance should specify how AI may be used, how students must document assistance, how teachers should evaluate process evidence, and how assessment tasks can cultivate disciplinary judgment.

The study has limitations. It uses comparative case-based analysis rather than a large-scale experimental design, and institutional AI policies continue to evolve rapidly. Future research should investigate longitudinal effects of process-oriented AI assessment on disciplinary learning, student identity, equity, teacher workload, and institutional trust. Cross-national studies involving low-resource institutions are also needed to examine whether process-oriented assessment can be implemented equitably at scale.

Ultimately, this article argues that the future of assessment in higher education will not be secured by stronger detection alone. It will depend on whether universities can redesign learning environments so that cognition, judgment, and intellectual responsibility become visible, teachable, and assessable in an AI-mediated world.

REFERENCES

Bearman, M., Dawson, P., Ajjawi, R., Tai, J., & Boud, D. (2023). Re-imagining university assessment in a digital world. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 48(7), 1–14.

Biesta, G. (2022). World-centred education: A view for the present. Routledge.

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 21(1), 5–31.

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (2000). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school. National Academies Press.

Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 43(8), 1315–1325.

Chan, C. K. Y., & Hu, W. (2023). Students' voices on generative AI: Perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 20, 43.

Collins, A., Brown, J. S., & Newman, S. E. (1989). Cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching the craft of reading, writing, and mathematics. In L. Resnick (Ed.), Knowing, learning, and instruction (pp. 453–494). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cotton, D. R. E., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2024). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 61(2), 228–239.

Darling-Hammond, L., Schachner, A., & Edgerton, A. K. (2020). Restarting and reinventing school: Learning in the time of COVID and beyond. Learning Policy Institute.

Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2022). Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning. Center for Curriculum Redesign.

Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., Stadler, M., Weller, J., Kuhn, J., & Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. Learning and Individual Differences, 103, 102274.

Luckin, R. (2023). AI for schoolteachers. Routledge.

Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. Teachers College Record, 108(6), 1017–1054.

OECD. (2024). Education at a glance 2024: OECD indicators. OECD Publishing.

Panadero, E. (2020). A review of self-regulated learning: Six models and four directions for research. Frontiers in Psychology, 11, 422.

Selwyn, N. (2022). Education and technology: Key issues and debates (3rd ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.

UNESCO. (2023). Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education—A tool on whose terms? UNESCO Publishing.

UNESCO. (2024). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. UNESCO Publishing.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.

Williamson, B., & Eynon, R. (2020). Historical threads, missing links, and future directions in AI in education. Learning, Media and Technology, 45(3), 223–235.

Winne, P. H., & Azevedo, R. (2022). Metacognition and self-regulated learning in digital environments. Educational Psychologist, 57(1), 3–17.

World Bank. (2024). Digital technologies in education. World Bank.

Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 16, 39.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. Theory Into Practice, 41(2), 64–70.