Knowledge producers or mere curators? A critical review of student learning and assignment dynamics in the era of artificial intelligence

Naning Ika Jayanti
Universitas Gadjah Mada
naningikajayanti@ugm.mail.ac.id

Volume: 4

Tahun: 2026

Halaman: 115–122

DOI:
https://doi.org/10.24071/usdb.v4.606

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Abstract: The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into the university landscape offers unprecedented efficiency and speed, radically transforming how students access information and fulfill their academic responsibilities. However, this instantaneous convenience gives rise to a critical shift: do contemporary students remain autonomous knowledge producers, or have they been reduced to mere curators who synthesize and rearrange content from digital repositories? This paper critically examines the dynamics of student learning and assignment completion amidst the expanding AI ecosystem. Employing a reflective-critical approach, the article highlights the paradox of digital efficiency—which accelerates academic processes on one hand, yet risks diminishing critical depth, intellectual autonomy, and student creativity on the other. The analysis reveals that the relationship between students and AI is not merely instrumental; rather, it actively reshapes structural study habits, demanding a profound pedagogical redefinition to ensure that university institutions preserve the fundamental essence of knowledge creation.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, critical review, knowledge curator, university

INTRODUCTION

The transformation of universities in the digital era has undergone a rapid paradigm shift, moving from basic technologies—such as textbooks and physical hardware—toward a heavy reliance on artificial intelligence ecosystems. Today, AI serves not merely as a tool but as a "thinking partner," providing students with instant access, operational efficiency, and unprecedented speed in information retrieval. This phenomenon offers a tempting convenience when completing academic assignments, undergraduate theses, and doctoral dissertations, as recent empirical literature highlights the extensive integration of large language models in accelerating academic writing workflows (Syaifulloh, 2024; Wahyudinarti et al., 2025). However, beneath this efficiency lies deep concern regarding the impact of AI usage on students' intellectual autonomy. The emergence of large language models like ChatGPT compels us to re-examine the core of the learning process: do today's students still act as autonomous knowledge producers, or have they been reduced to mere curators rearranging material from digital repositories?

Controversies surrounding AI development in recent years have sparked wide discussion within society and education. Suwahyu et al. (2024) note that education experts view the integration of AI—while balancing the traits of "digital natives" and "digital immigrants"—as making rigorous academic writing essential in preparing students for an AI-driven industrial world. University institutions play a

pivotal role here by strengthening curricula, offering targeted skills training, and emphasizing technology ethics.

To complement these pedagogical initiatives with institutional accountability, a regulatory framework serves as a foundational pillar. From a regulatory standpoint, Law Number 20 of 2003 on the National Education System, in Article 24(1) and (2), stipulates that universities possess institutional management autonomy, exercising academic freedom, freedom of the academic pulpit, and scientific autonomy. Furthermore, Article 38 (3) states that university curricula must be developed independently while referencing national education standards for each study program.

Existing literature has extensively mapped AI literacy among university students, generally revealing positive outcomes regarding awareness and usage frequency. Research by Tittahira and Usiono (2025) indicates that while AI offers efficiency, personalized learning, and critical thinking development, it also introduces risks such as dependency, privacy threats, and the digital divide; consequently, comprehensive institutional policies are required. Students' decisions to use AI—influenced by internal factors like personal motivation and external factors like internet ubiquity—typically span six stages, from initial problem identification to outcome evaluation (Syaifulloh, 2024). Additionally, Agusnaya and Nirmala (2024) demonstrate that AI literacy significantly influences learning achievement and student motivation, while Fatmadiwi et al. (2025) examine institutional AI policies, emphasizing the need for structured governance to maintain academic integrity.

However, those studies remain descriptive, focusing solely on how students operate AI. A significant research gap exists because no in-depth studies investigate changes in intellectual behavior once students possess critical awareness. The unanswered question is whether recognizing AI's limits empowers students to move beyond being "content curators" into producers of new knowledge, or if they remain trapped in pragmatic task-completion patterns.

The novelty of this article lies in shifting focus from technical literacy—defined as the practical proficiency in operating digital and AI tools to intellectual agency, which refers to a student's cognitive capacity for independent synthesis and critical knowledge creation. It unpacks the dialectic of student consciousness: is AI usage a pragmatic necessity driven by fast-paced academic demands, or a choice that stifles critical thinking? By examining the tension between "curator" and "producer," the article offers a reflective perspective on how technology reshapes academic identity.

Stemming from these concerns, this study addresses the extent to which generative AI alters students' epistemological positioning within the university ecosystem. Does AI convenience limit students' capacity to generate novel ideas, or can students maintain intellectual autonomy amidst algorithms? This article aims to critically analyze the dynamics of student learning within the evolving AI ecosystem, determining whether AI awareness can empower students to transform from digital curators into autonomous knowledge producers.

METHOD

This article employs a critical review writing design to explore the dynamics of student learning, task completion, and academic habits within the artificial intelligence ecosystem. Grounded in a subjectivist-idealist epistemological approach, the study utilizes a reflective-critical framework to examine literature and social phenomena as active objects of inquiry rather than neutral data (Barnett-Page & Thomas, 2009). This perspective deconstructs the dominant narrative of digital efficiency, revealing its hidden impacts on student creativity, cognitive structures, and intellectual autonomy.

Data were gathered through a targeted literature search focusing on peer-reviewed articles from Sinta-accredited national journals, books, and theses addressing AI ethics, digital pedagogy, and shifts in cognitive behavior. By integrating both qualitative and quantitative research findings, the study establishes a comprehensive empirical overview of AI adoption rates and usage patterns. A textual narrative synthesis approach was applied to group diverse studies into homogeneous categories, standardizing their characteristics, contexts, and findings to facilitate rigorous comparative analysis

(Barnett-Page & Thomas, 2009). The analysis then investigates the causal and dialectical relationships between AI tools, study habits, and intellectual autonomy. It critically evaluates whether technological convenience genuinely enriches the thinking process or diminishes students' analytical capacities. Ultimately, this framework bridges theoretical literature and empirical data to construct a robust critical reflection on AI integration in contemporary universities.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents in-depth findings derived from a systematic review and synthesis of 11 selected literature sources regarding the dynamics of Artificial Intelligence (AI) utilization within university environments. A critical analysis of theoretical and empirical literature reveals that the relationship between students and AI technology is not merely a passive, instrumental one; rather, it is a structural interaction that actively reshapes students' cognitive patterns, study habits, and intellectual autonomy.

The COVID-19 pandemic played a pivotal role as a primary catalyst for the "explosion" of the digital era, including within the realm of education. Physical distancing policies compelled university institutions to make a massive, abrupt transition to remote (online) learning ecosystems, thereby indirectly fostering a mental infrastructure and a profound reliance on digital tools among the academic community. The digital ecosystem readiness established in the wake of the pandemic subsequently paved the way for the rapid adoption of AI technology.

These dynamics are reflected in a bibliometric analysis covering the 2021–2024 period, which indicates that AI research in universities has shifted from a focus on public perception to the practical application of ChatGPT among students, with key thematic clusters centering on personalized learning and academic integrity (Putra et al., 2024). The following is an elaboration of the findings and discussion, organized into four main thematic subsections:

Speed vs. substance: The productivity paradox in academic work

In the modern university landscape, AI adoption has become an integral part of students' daily routines—ranging from brainstorming essays, searching for and summarizing literature to formulating writing outlines. From a functional perspective, this technology offers high efficiency by accelerating academic processes, saving time, and providing instant responses to information needs. This aligns with findings that artificial intelligence enhances learning effectiveness through personalized materials, accelerated comprehension, real-time feedback, and efficient study time management (Wahyudinarti et al., 2025). Research by Wahyudinarti et al. (2025) further indicates that integrating AI into education significantly improves the speed of accessing learning resources and study efficiency, though it also necessitates addressing potential privacy concerns and psychological impacts on students.

However, beneath these practical benefits lies a digital efficiency paradox. The pragmatic drive to complete assignments quickly often diminishes the space for deep thinking, contemplation, and the trial-and-error processes essential for developing intellectual maturity. When instant convenience dominates study habits, students become susceptible to cognitive dependency. Despite its advantages, AI usage in learning presents critical challenges, including data privacy issues and the risk of declining learning motivation due to over-reliance (Wahyudinarti et al., 2025). While university students demonstrate positive AI literacy, awareness, and usage skills, aspects such as privacy, data security, and adaptation to new technological products still require special attention (Suwahyu et al., 2024). To clarify the contrast between the instrumental benefits and cognitive risks of AI adoption in the academic environment, the following table maps out the study findings:

Table 1. Mapping of instrumental benefits and cognitive risks of AI adoption in the academic environment

Usage	Instrumental Benefits	Cognitive Risks
Information Access	High speed, broad source reach, and ease of initial literature navigation.	Lack of deep verification regarding the validity and bias of external data.
Assignment Workflow	Helping overcome initial writing blocks and summarizing texts.	Decreased perseverance in reading long and complex texts in full.
Cognitive Processes	Time management efficiency amid deadline pressure.	Reduction of space for contemplation, trial-and-error, and independent problem analysis.

The shifting role of students: From knowledge producers to knowledge curators

The evolving dynamics of student learning in the digital era have triggered a fundamental epistemological shift regarding student agency in knowledge production. Traditionally, universities have positioned students as knowledge producers—autonomous agents tasked with constructing independent arguments through empirical investigation, deep critical reading, and careful synthesis of literature.

However, the widespread use of generative AI risks eroding this academic agency, transforming the student role into that of a mere curator of digital repositories. In practice, the assignment workflow is often reduced to a mechanical process: issuing targeted instructions (prompts) to an AI system, retrieving instant text drafts or conceptual frameworks from digital databases, performing superficial paraphrasing via automated tools without delving into underlying theoretical concepts, and re-synthesizing these outputs into a final academic work.

This structural transformation gives rise to critical cognitive and pedagogical vulnerabilities, such as the offloading of excessive cognitive burdens. While delegating routine administrative tasks can optimize productivity, offloading core analytical processes—such as evaluating conflicting data and mapping concepts—eliminates the essential process of intellectual struggle. True learning relies on "desirable difficulties"; bypassing these obstacles strips education of its transformative depth.

A further vulnerability is the illusion of competence. The polished and seemingly authoritative output generated by AI often fosters a false sense of mastery. Students mistakenly equate the ease of generating structured text with a genuine understanding of underlying principles; they become proficient in prompt engineering rather than internalizing discipline-specific theories.

Finally, there is the risk of eroding epistemic friction. The intellectual friction that arises when grappling with ambiguous information sources and content-dense texts is precisely where critical thinking is forged. AI eliminates this friction, transforming research into a seamless transaction and reducing scholarly inquiry to a merely superficial interaction.

While some students strive to maintain ethical boundaries through secondary verification, many become trapped in a cycle of instant content reproduction, leading to a profound loss of intellectual autonomy. Consequently, the core essence of original scholarly work degrades into the mere curation of external data. Although the integration of generative AI in academic institutions offers undeniable advantages regarding information efficiency, uncritical or undisciplined use severely undermines academic integrity—underscoring the need for robust institutional policies and regulatory frameworks (Fatmadiwi et al., 2025).

Impact on study habits and creativity

Massive reliance on AI is demonstrably altering students' study habits at a structural level. When essential cognitive functions are fully delegated to machines, significant negative impacts on academic quality ensue, including a decline in critical and creative thinking. Dependence on instant answers hinders the development of independent analytical skills, cognitive flexibility, and the ability to formulate authentic arguments.

Another impact is the depersonalization of learning; a reduction in deep intellectual interaction—specifically with other humans—weakens the reflective and moral guidance dimensions of university. Furthermore, academic integrity is threatened, as AI's ability to generate text mimicking human language patterns complicates conventional plagiarism detection and fosters new, covert forms of academic dishonesty. Students themselves may experience impacts on their mental resilience. They become more susceptible to a decline in mental stamina when confronted with complex research problems that require methodological patience.

While AI holds great potential to enhance the personalization, efficiency, and accessibility of learning, its implementation in university faces significant challenges regarding ethics, data privacy, algorithmic transparency, and institutional readiness (Fatmadiwi et al., 2025). Moreover, despite offering numerous potential benefits, the integration of artificial intelligence in universities presents critical threats—ranging from discriminatory algorithmic bias and academic integrity issues (such as plagiarism) to concerns regarding privacy and data security (Rahman et al., 2024). Research by Rahman et al. (2024) further indicates that AI usage risks diminishing the value of human interaction through the depersonalization of learning and the potential displacement of educators, while also fostering an over-reliance that could undermine the very essence of university. To counterbalance the cognitive disruptions of the modern era, developing the intellect or merely transferring theoretical knowledge is insufficient; learners require a profound space to process their learning experiences. This approach necessitates the recognition that education is not merely a routine classroom activity or the passive reception of information, but rather an endeavor to fully internalize values. Within the framework of Ignatian Pedagogy, reflective values are crucial; reflection is understood as the process of carefully re-examining study materials, experiences, or ideas—engaging memory, understanding, and feelings—to grasp their essential meaning and stimulate concrete action (Hartana et al., 2016).

More than just a method of thinking, reflection serves as the core of the learning cycle; it must not stop at the student's affective reaction. The process must culminate in decisions, firm resolve, and new experiences within concrete reality (Hartana et al., 2016). Through this transformative step, learning shifts from a standard academic routine into a foundation for meaningful and applicable action. This underscores the fact that experience and reflection are inseparable elements. Transformative learning requires a bridge connecting concrete action with critical thinking, wherein reflection presupposes both intellectual and affective experiences, enabling the learning process to comprehensively shape the student's consciousness (Hartana et al., 2016).

The urgency of pedagogical redefinition in universities

Faced with the massive disruption caused by the artificial intelligence ecosystem, university institutions can no longer rely on traditional assessment methods—such as conventional essay assignments, short papers, or unsupervised take-home exams—as these are highly vulnerable to AI-enabled shortcuts. To mitigate these risks, institutions require a holistic AI policy and governance framework, human resource capacity building, and comprehensive AI literacy (Rahman et al., 2024).

Consequently, a comprehensive pedagogical redefinition is required, centered on three key pillars. The first is the transformation of assessment systems. This involves shifting from purely output-oriented evaluation toward process-based assessment, oral presentations, personal reflections, and contextual case studies—methods that cannot easily be completed through simple AI text copy-pasting. The second pillar is the development of critical AI literacy. This aims to position AI appropriately as a productivity tool, training students to recognize ethical boundaries and algorithmic biases, as well as how to critically verify information. AI literacy has been shown to have a significant positive impact on academic achievement, fostering high levels of comfort and motivation among students, alongside increased engagement and social interaction (Agusnaya & Nirmala, 2024). AI literacy is not merely an additional skill but a vital component of the university curriculum, serving to enhance learning

effectiveness and prepare students for the demands of the modern workforce (Agusnaya & Nirmala, 2024).

Finally, there is a need to strengthen institutional regulations. Universities must formulate clear ethical guidelines for technology use, reinforce the enforcement of academic integrity, and protect the data privacy of the academic community to ensure intellectual autonomy is preserved amidst the wave of digitalization.

The influx of artificial intelligence (AI) into university environments has brought about significant cultural shifts in the learning process, presenting both opportunities and tangible risks of disruption. Amidst the massive digital innovation transforming how people learn and work, university institutions—particularly Islamic Religious University Institutions (PTKI) in Indonesia—face a critical challenge regarding human resource readiness; the proficiency and preparedness levels of PTKI lecturers remain relatively low, averaging three on a scale of one to five—with lecturers aged 42 and older demonstrating significantly lower readiness levels, according to empirical findings by Mubarok et al. (2024). This situation indicates that university institutions can no longer sustain themselves using conventional models.

To address these complexities, university institutions are required to take proactive steps in formulating comprehensive transformation strategies. In light of the urgency of this change and the need to navigate AI-era disruptions, universities and their academic communities must devise comprehensive adaptation strategies. These strategies include overcoming lecturer conservatism to foster a transition toward becoming lifelong learners, adjusting curricula to be more adaptive, and formulating clear regulations and ethical-legal frameworks regarding AI usage (Mubarok et al., 2024). Through these integrated strategic measures, university institutions are expected to maintain scholarly relevance while safeguarding academic integrity amidst the wave of digital transformation.

Today, the university sector faces demand to continuously boost scholarly productivity and global recognition amidst the wave of digitalization. Such productivity gains do not emerge in a vacuum; rather, they require a conducive institutional ecosystem. In line with this, university policies favoring the enhancement of knowledge outputs—through budgetary support, incentives, and rewards for the academic community—have proven to contribute significantly to the high volume of scholarly publications produced (Niam & Huda, 2024). This structural support serves as a primary driver, motivating academics to actively produce a substantial and competitive body of written work.

However, this surge in publication volume must be balanced with methodological sensitivity regarding the increasingly digitized landscape of contemporary research. Within a datafied research ecosystem, the process of datafication has shifted the position of social researchers from passive observers to active participants in the data ecosystem; here, every algorithm carries specific social and ideological assumptions that demand critical awareness (Putra, 2025). This shifting landscape implies that researchers can no longer view data and technology merely as neutral instruments, but rather as value-laden social artifacts.

Consequently, amidst the expansion of big data and artificial intelligence (AI), researcher reflexivity stands as a fundamental pillar for upholding the validity of scientific knowledge, helping to bridge the gap created by algorithmic analyses that often overlook social and cultural contexts (Putra, 2025). Without such reflective awareness, data interpretation risks losing its depth of human meaning. This is particularly crucial in communication research, where reflexivity serves as a strategic tool to address global biases and the dominance of Global North perspectives over the Global South, thereby ensuring that scientific knowledge remains relevant to local socio-cultural realities (Putra, 2025). Through this approach, the dominance of a singular worldview can be academically deconstructed. Synthesizing these various dynamics—and based on findings from a systematic literature review of relevant scholarly articles—it is evident that knowledge production in the digital era cannot be divorced from the reflective, ethical, and contextual roles played by humans; scientific validity is determined by the acuity of interpretation, extending beyond the mere technical accuracy of algorithms (Putra, 2025).

Consequently, the success of future research hinges on the synergy between supportive institutional policies and critical, humanist reflexivity.

CONCLUSION

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in the university environment provides efficiency and speed in information access, yet triggers critical debates regarding students' intellectual autonomy. This article examines whether students still act as autonomous knowledge producers or have been reduced to mere curators who rearrange content from digital repositories. The use of AI creates a productivity paradox: on one hand, it accelerates academic processes, but on the other hand, it reduces room for contemplation, diminishes reading perseverance, and triggers cognitive dependency. The instant workflow of task completion through prompts and superficial paraphrasing eliminates the epistemic friction crucial for developing students' critical thinking and creativity. To address these disruptive challenges, universities are urged to undertake a comprehensive pedagogical redefinition. This includes transforming assessment systems from final-output-oriented to process-based, developing critical AI literacy to understand ethical boundaries and algorithmic biases, and strengthening institutional regulations to enforce academic integrity.

DECLARATION OF GENERATIVE AI AND AI-ASSISTED TECHNOLOGIES IN THE WRITING PROCESS

During the preparation of this work, the authors used Google Scholar for literature search, DeepL Translator and Google Translate for language translation assistance, and Gemini for brainstorming ideas. After using these tools, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and took full responsibility for the content of the publication.

REFERENCE

Agusnaya, N., & Nirmala, P. (2024). Skala literasi AI terhadap prestasi belajar mahasiswa dalam konteks pendidikan level perguruan tinggi di era digital. *Journal of Vocational, Informatics and Computer Education*, *2*(2), 103–106. https://doi.org/10.61220/voice.v2i2.20243

Syaifulloh, A. (2024). *Proses pengambilan keputusan mahasiswa dalam menggunakan artificial intelligence (AI) untuk tugas akademik di perguruan tinggi* (Skripsi, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim). Etheses. http://etheses.uin-malang.ac.id/68318/

Barnett-Page, E., & Thomas, J. (2009). Methods for the synthesis of qualitative research: A critical review. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, *9*(1), Article 59. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-9-59

Fatmadiwi, A., Hartoyo, A., & Erlina, E. (2025). Kebijakan artificial intelligence (AI) dalam pembelajaran di perguruan tinggi. *Jurnal Alwatzikhoebillah: Kajian Islam, Pendidikan, Ekonomi, Humaniora*, *11*(1), 284–291. https://doi.org/10.37567/alwatzikhoebillah.v11i1.3633

Hartana, A., Setyosari, P., & Kuswandi, D. (2016). Penerapan strategi pembelajaran paradigma pedagogi ignatian (reflektif) terhadap peningkatan hasil belajar dan motivasi berprestasi belajar ilmu pengetahuan alam (IPA) siswa kelas V sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Pendidikan: Teori, Penelitian, dan Pengembangan*, *1*(4), 765–779. https://doi.org/10.17977/jp.v1i4.6555

Indonesia. (2003). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional*. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2003 Nomor 78, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 4301.

Mubarok, N., Susanti, E., & Lestari, E. (2024). Strategi pembelajaran perguruan tinggi di era artificial intelligence (AI). *Jurnal Manajemen dan Budaya*, *4*(2), 124–137. https://doi.org/10.51700/manajemen.v4i2.720

Niam, K., & Huda, M. N. (2024). *Produksi pengetahuan di PTKIN*. Pustaka Idea.

Putra, E. B. E., Siregar, F., Pradipta, I. G. N. A., & Rakhmawati, N. A. (2024). Pengaruh AI terhadap perguruan tinggi: Analisis bibliometrik. *JATI (Jurnal Mahasiswa Teknik Informatika)*, *8*(4), 6000–6008. https://doi.org/10.36040/jati.v8i4.10157

Putra, R. P. (2025). Big data dan artificial intelligence dalam produksi pengetahuan ilmiah atas tantangan metodologis. *Jurnal Riset Manajemen Komunikasi*, *5*(2), 113–120. https://doi.org/10.29313/jrmk.v5i2.8721

Rahman, P., Ningsih, N., & Rahim, A. (2024). Potensi ancaman kecerdasan buatan bagi perguruan tinggi. *El-Idarah: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, *10*(1), 63–72. https://journal.inass.ac.id/index.php/el-idarah/article/view/522

Suwahyu, I., Waratman, A. A., & Pratama, A. A. (2024). Analisis literasi AI mahasiswa pada perguruan tinggi. *INTEC Journal: Information Technology Education Journal*, *3*(1), 81–85. https://journal.unm.ac.id/index.php/INTEC/article/view/2912

Tittahira, A., & Usiono. (2025). Dampak kecerdasan buatan pada mahasiswa: Analisis penggunaan AI dalam pembelajaran di perguruan tinggi. *Jurnal Ilmiah Penelitian Mahasiswa*, *3*(1), 16–20. https://ejurnal.kampusakademik.my.id/index.php/jipm/article/view/627

Wahyudinarti, E., Rachmatika, P. A., & Ain, R. N. (2025). Meningkatkan efektivitas pembelajaran mahasiswa dengan AI: Tinjauan literatur di era digital. *JATI (Jurnal Mahasiswa Teknik Informatika)*, *9*(1), 488–491. https://doi.org/10.36040/jati.v9i1.12279