JOLSE – JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE SECTOR
Vol. 2 No. 1 (2026) | 17-39
EISSN: 3124-1204 | DOI: https://doi.org/10.69673/jolse.v2i1.223

CURRICULUM REFORM IN ENGLISH EDUCATION: HOW AI MEDIA AND ASSESSMENT PRACTICES INFLUENCE STUDENTS' META-IDENTITY AND LEARNING AGENCY

Nuraviah Alfiana[1], M Galuh Elga Romadhon[2]
[1]Universitas Nahdlatul Ulama Pasuruan, Pasuruan, Jawa Timur, Indonesia
[2]Universitas PGRI Wiranegara, Pasuruan, Jawa Timur, Indonesia

Correspondent Email : *nuraviah@unupasuruan.ac.id* Authors' Email: *galuhelga23@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT. Recent curriculum reform in English education has increasingly emphasized the integration of artificial intelligence (AI)–based media and innovative assessment practices to foster learner autonomy and meaningful learning. This study investigates how AI-supported learning media and assessment practices influence university students' meta-identity and learning agency within English as Foreign Language (EFL) courses. Adopting a mixed-methods approach, the study collects quantitative data through a Likert-scale questionnaire measuring students' perceptions of AI media use, assessment practices, learner identity, and learning agency, complemented by qualitative data from open-ended questionnaires exploring students' reflective experiences. The participants were undergraduate students enrolled in English courses at the university level from English Education, Islamic Education and Visual Communication Design. Quantitative data were analyzed descriptively and inferentially to identify patterns and relationships among variables, while qualitative responses were thematically analyzed to provide deeper insights into students' perspectives. The findings indicate that AI-based media positively contribute to students' motivation, self-regulated learning, and confidence in using English, while AI-assisted feedback and formative assessment practices enhance critical thinking and reflective learning. Moreover, the integration of AI within the reformed curriculum supports the development of students' meta-identity as autonomous and globally oriented English learners, although concerns regarding potential dependency on technology remain. This study highlights the importance of aligning curriculum design, AI media, and assessment practices to strengthen learning agency and identity construction in contemporary English education. The findings offer pedagogical implications for curriculum developers, lecturers, and policymakers in designing AI-responsive and student-centered English learning environments.

Keywords: AI media, Assessment, Curriculum Reform, Learning Agency, Meta-Identity

ABSTRAK. Reformasi kurikulum Bahasa Inggris saat ini semakin mengutamakan penggunaan media berbasis kecerdasan buatan (AI) dan cara penilaian yang baru. Tujuannya untuk mendorong kemandirian belajar dan pembelajaran yang bermakna. Penelitian ini mengkaji bagaimana media belajar berbasis AI dan praktik penilaian memengaruhi meta-identitas serta daya belajar mahasiswa pada mata kuliah Bahasa Inggris sebagai Bahasa Asing (EFL). Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan gabungan (kuantitatif dan kualitatif). Data kuantitatif dikumpulkan melalui kuesioner skala Likert yang mengukur persepsi mahasiswa tentang: penggunaan media AI, praktik penilaian, identitas pembelajar, dan daya belajar. Data kualitatif dikumpulkan melalui kuesioner terbuka yang menggali pengalaman reflektif mahasiswa. Partisipan penelitian adalah mahasiswa program sarjana pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Pendidikan Agama Islam, dan Desain Komunikasi Visual, pada mata kuliah Bahasa Inggris. Data kuantitatif dianalisis secara deskriptif dan inferensial untuk melihat pola dan hubungan antarvariabel. Data kualitatif dianalisis secara tematik untuk memahami perspektif mahasiswa secara lebih mendalam. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa media berbasis AI meningkatkan motivasi, belajar mandiri, dan kepercayaan diri mahasiswa dalam menggunakan Bahasa Inggris. Sementara itu, umpan balik berbantuan AI dan penilaian formatif meningkatkan pemikiran kritis dan belajar reflektif. Selain itu, integrasi AI dalam kurikulum hasil reformasi membantu mahasiswa mengembangkan meta-identitas sebagai pembelajar Bahasa Inggris yang mandiri dan berwawasan global. Namun, masih ada kekhawatiran akan ketergantungan pada teknologi. Penelitian ini menekankan pentingnya menyelaraskan desain kurikulum, media AI, dan praktik penilaian untuk memperkuat daya belajar dan pembentukan identitas dalam pendidikan Bahasa Inggris masa kini. Hasil penelitian ini memberikan masukan bagi pengembang kurikulum, dosen, dan pembuat kebijakan dalam merancang lingkungan belajar Bahasa Inggris yang berpusat pada mahasiswa dan responsif terhadap AI.

Kata kunci: Media AI, Penilaian, Reformasi Kurikulum, Daya Belajar, Meta-Identitas

Article History
Submission: 09-04-2026 Revised: 16-04-2026 Accepted: 23-04-2026 Published: 23-04-2026

INTRODUCTION

The quick emergence of artificial intelligence (AI) in education, particularly in teaching English as a foreign language, has raised new hopes and challenges. Artificial intelligence-infused media, adaptive learning environments, automated feedback tools, and algorithm-assisted assessment practices are transforming the ways in which learners are able to retrieve information, process it, and become self-assessors (Chuang & Yan, 2025; Yaseen et al., 2025). These are not just instructional tools, they mediate the process of learning, shape students' cognitive involvement, and have a bearing on how learners see themselves as users of a language. In the midst of this changing ecology, English instruction and learning are not only about language competence; they are also connected more and more with digital interaction, identity construction, and learner autonomy (Han & Reinhardt, 2022).

At the core of this transformation is a complex pedagogical and philosophical transition. AI-empowered learning systems are changing who students understand they are as learners, their "*meta-identity*", and how much students have learning agency, or the ability to be intentional, self-directed actors in their own learning (Haetami, 2025; Sutrisno et al., 2025). The AI systems personalize content, preempt user requirements, and deliver ongoing feedback, at times fitting learners into algorithmically constructed profiles. Although these affordances might help to improve productivity or personalize learning, they also prompt important issues about how learners understand their own capability, internalize assessment, and shape the extent of their agency as individuals within a data-driven educational system.

This is a major quandary for the current English education curriculum reform. On the one hand, AI technology holds out the prospect of enhancing learning outcomes by means of personalized instruction, dynamic assessment, and large-scale feedback (Deepshikha, 2026; Luan et al., 2020). By contrast, the growing use of media and assessment technology can lead to ways students identify with themselves that are unknown. As learners encounter machine-generated evaluations and algorithmic suggestions in various cycles of repetition, their sense of competence, motivation, and autonomy could be shaped not from self-regulated reflection but through technological mediation (Ma & Chen, 2025). This invokes a key tension between personalized and autonomous learning: does AI empower learners to be owners of their own sense of learning, or does it configure learner identity in the background through predictive analytics?

This issue is worth examining because of the broader implications for educational philosophy, curriculum development, and learner growth that such an understanding can have. English education, and particularly in globalized and digitalized conditions, is crucial for the development of communicative competence, intercultural understanding, and intellectual involvement in knowledge societies (Elboubekri, 2017). If media and assessment practices driven by AI have such a strong impact on how learners perceive themselves and behave in learning situations, technology-enhanced curriculum reform should thus focus not only on the technological instrumentalization of knowledge but also on its psychological, societal, and cultural forms and ethical implications as well. The danger is that, without a critical appreciation of the dynamics at play here, curricular innovation will end up opting for technicist efficiency rather than authentic student growth (Friedman & Deek, 2003).

Recent research has also started to delve into the pedagogical and identity considerations that come with AI implementation in education, including language learning and assessment. Research has revealed that AI-informed structures modify learning engagement through mediating feedback, personalizing instructional pathways, and reimagining authority over assessment in digitally enhanced spaces of learning. For instance, according to Hummel (2025), the introduction of AI in education is about more than efficiency of teaching; it inscribes learners' epistemic positionality by incorporating algorithmic decision-making into their everyday learning experiences. Little research has been conducted into the impact of AI-generated feedback and language support tools on student-connectedness beyond a few studies, including those by Nguyen and Habók (2022), who show that they influence students' perceptions of their competence to learn languages as well as their autonomy, particularly in an English language context. To address such issues, Bearman et al. (2023) suggest that analysis of automated and data-driven approaches to assessment can usefully draw on Clancey's paradigm to analyse how traditional human relationships with assessment are reconfigured as interpretive authority moves from human educators to computational infrastructures, with implications for learner agency and responsibility. More largely, critical lenses of digital education highlight that AI-driven spaces have an impact on identity construction through the continuous profiling of learners and by always providing adaptive representations of their capacities (Nopas, 2025).

In light of these factors, this research introduces the proposal that AI-assembled media circulation and assessment practices significantly influence students' meta-identity formation and reshape their learning agency within English language teaching settings. Specifically, the

study posits that ongoing engagement with AI-mediated feedback and personalized learning pathways helps reformulate how learners interpret their own abilities, manage their learning strategies, and perceive themselves in educational environments. Accordingly, this study seeks to address several interconnected questions, beginning with the extent to which AI is integrated into curriculum reform and how this integration affects learner development. Furthermore, the research investigates the impact of AI-driven media and assessment practices on students' meta-identity as English language learners, as well as how student learning agency is influenced or transformed by AI mediation in learning environments. Finally, this study also explores how English curriculum reform can accommodate the pedagogical and identity-related issues arising from AI integration, thereby offering a comprehensive understanding of the interplay between AI mediation and learner subjectivity in contemporary ELT contexts.

METHOD

Research Design

The current study used mixed methods in a research design to explore the effects of AI-infused media and assessment practices on students' meta-identity and learning agency in EFL environments (Heigham & Croker, 2009). In particular, the research followed a convergent methods design (Creswell & Poth, 2018), combining quantitative and qualitative findings collected at the same time that were independently analyzed yet merged for holistically understanding the phenomenon. Quantitatively, the researchers wanted to explore the patterns, relationships, and strength of association between AI media usage, assessment practices, meta-identity, and learning agency. The qualitative analysis was intended to reflect on the students' experiences and try to make sense of how technological mediation has influenced their self-perceptions in learning.

Participant (Subject) Characteristics

Furthermore, the research was carried out in English course at the university level, introducing AI-assisted learning content and digital assessment resources into the classroom. Participants were EFL undergraduate students from English Education, Islamic Education and Visual Communication Design who enrolled in courses at an AI-based learning platform, an automated feedback service, or an algorithmic assessment tool. Participants were selected for having had direct experience with AI-supported learning and teaching environments using a

purposeful sampling technique. Participation of students was voluntary, with a written consent taken before the study.

Data Collection

The quantitative data came from a Likert-scale questionnaire (Joshi et al., 2015), consisting of 26 statements which asking students' perceptions across four key areas, AI-mediated learning media, AI-supported assessment practices, meta-identity as ELLs, and learning agency. The tool was a closed-ended statement with a five-point Likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The survey items were constructed with reference to theoretical constructs drawing from sociocultural learning theory, identity construction in language education, and self-regulated learning frameworks. To establish content validity, researchers who were experts in English education and educational technology examined the scale. Content and reliability were analyzed via internal consistency prior to data interpretation.

The qualitative data were gathered through an open-ended questionnaire designed to explore 13 specific topics to collect students' reflections on their learning experiences in the AI-mediated classrooms (Reja et al., 2003). The items are the impact of curriculum reform on learning; the extent to which the current curriculum supports independent, reflective, and student-centered learning; the types of AI media used and student experiences with them; the effects of AI on critical thinking, writing, speaking, and academic text comprehension; whether AI fosters autonomy or dependency; common forms of assessment encountered; how well assessments reflect real abilities; experiences with self-reflection, peer assessment, and AI-based assessment; students' self-concept as English learners; the influence of AI and assessment on academic, professional, and cultural identity; the degree of learning agency over goals, strategies, and evaluation; the roles of lecturers, curriculum, and AI in supporting or limiting agency; and suggested changes to strengthen learning agency and identity. This measure provided participants with a means of expressing their own meanings, concerns, and interpretations in ways that are not captured by written fixed-response measures. The open-ended responses served as a rich source of narrative "raw" data for deep thematic analysis and interpretation of student experiences.

The participants were selected through purposeful sampling, with the requirement of every participant to possess direct practical experience in AI-based learning environments. Participants were undergraduate students who had encountered AI-based educational media like adaptive learning systems, automated writing feedback tools, or AI-powered language

practice apps, and AI-assisted assessment practices consist of automatic scoring systems and digital formative feedback. Recruitment was by course announcements and digital communication; only eligible students were approached to take part.

Data Analysis

For the analysis, the first phase was quantitative to capture structured data on students' perceptions of AI-driven learning. Survey the survey was online-based and administered by using secure digital questionnaires (structured) to ensure uniform description and accessibility among participants. Ss answered the questionnaire individually, outside of class time, to minimize social pressure and facilitate more reflective responses. The survey took around 10–15 min to finish. Participants were made aware that there were no right or wrong answers and responses would not be reflected in their academic assessment. All participants' responses were automatically archived in a password-protected database for research protection.

RESULTS

Data The quantitative data in this study were derived from responses of 64 participants on a survey examining perceptions about AI-supported English learning when informed by curriculum change. The scale consisted of several Likert-type items that required a respondent to indicate on a 5-point scale from "1 = strongly disagree" to "5 = strongly agree" his or her agreement level with the utterance. The survey items covered various aspects of the learning experience: the use of AI to promote language learning; assessment practices; learner identity and agency; and integrating technology in classes. The responses that were collected formed a rich dataset for us to gain an impression of broader patterns regarding how students viewed and experienced AI-mediated English learning environments. The data can be seen on the table bellow:

Table 1. Scale Summary

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AI helps understand English materials	64	1.00	5.00	3.80	0.82
AI increases learning motivation	64	2.00	5.00	3.45	0.87
AI supports independent learning	64	1.00	5.00	3.56	0.91
Confidence integrating AI	64	1.00	5.00	3.34	0.84

AI encourages new strategies	64	1.00	5.00	3.61	0.83
Assessment matches ability	64	1.00	5.00	3.34	0.88
AI feedback improves skills	64	2.00	5.00	3.50	0.73
Assessment promotes critical thinking	64	1.00	5.00	3.81	0.91
Understand assessment procedures	64	1.00	5.00	3.47	0.78
Assessment motivates responsibility	64	1.00	5.00	3.91	0.89
Global communicator identity	64	1.00	5.00	3.56	0.81
AI influences self-perception	64	1.00	5.00	3.36	0.78
Technology increases confidence	64	1.00	5.00	3.56	0.94
Learning connects to personal goals	64	2.00	5.00	3.72	0.84
Awareness of strengths & weaknesses	64	1.00	5.00	4.11	0.80
Set personal learning goals	64	2.00	5.00	3.44	0.81
Use additional learning resources	64	1.00	5.00	3.44	0.85
AI helps learning decisions	64	1.00	5.00	3.53	0.84
Responsibility for learning progress	64	2.00	5.00	3.75	0.71
Direct own learning	64	2.00	5.00	3.47	0.69
Curriculum supports independence	64	2.00	5.00	3.56	0.73
Technology integrated meaningfully	64	2.00	5.00	3.58	0.79
AI aligns with education goals	64	2.00	5.00	3.42	0.79
Assessment supports development	64	1.00	5.00	3.80	0.84
Curriculum reform positive impact	64	2.00	5.00	3.66	0.84
Valid N (listwise)	**64**				
Scale	***N***	***Minimum***	***Maximum***	***Mean***	***Std. Deviation***
Overall AI-Curriculum Perception	*64*	*2.68*	*4.48*	*3.59**	*0.42*

**Moderately positive*

The survey results revealed that all of the respondents held a moderate positive attitude towards AI-assisted English-learning. The pooled mean score of all the relevant Likert-scale items was M = 3.59, suggesting that generally students agreed artificial intelligence makes a positive contribution to English learning. The size of response indicates that not all participants have the same degree of positive attitude towards e-testing.

The quantitative data results show that students believe AI is an effective supporting tool for their English learning. Additionally, there continues to be a query as to whether AI is simply

an add-on technology or a driver of learning, since overall agreement on the observations made from the AI-related items does not exceed neutral leaning values against “neither disagree nor agree." The strongest agreement was found for the statement that assessed AI as the object to make it easier for students to grasp English materials ($M \approx 3.80$), some indicating that AI is primarily conceived of as a cognition support for learning materials by making them more understandable and accessible.

Students also mentioned that AI helps in terms of flexibility to learn and strategy and decision-making. The fact that experimental learning strategies seem to be fostered by AI-supported environments is indicated also by the means for the condition about guiding pupils to try new learning techniques ($M \approx 3.61$). Respondents also reported that AI is useful to foster learning outside the classroom ($M \approx 3.56$), an indication of how AI can extend learning beyond formal educational settings. These results suggest that AI promotes a relatively continuous learning experience and fosters self-paced learning as well.

Attitudes toward AI-generated feedback were similarly positive, although somewhat more moderate ($M \approx 3.50$). This finding indicates that even though students acknowledge the benefits of automated feedback for their language production, which may still vary depending on factors such as clarity and personalization or the student's exposure to AI-driven evaluation, it plays a secondary role at best. However, the evidence shows that AI does play a part in structuring these early learning experiences for improvement.

Several participants pointed out the importance of AI generating multiple responses to the same concept, as it allowed them to learn at their own pace and according to how they personally liked to learn. An Armenian learner put it this way: “AI makes me understand the difficult English material more quickly because I can ask a question at any time” (P7). Likewise, another student remarked that “if I am not able to understand a concept in the class, AI explains it multiple times in different ways until I get everything…” (P18), suggesting that AI helps flexible comprehension versus one-sided instruction.

Importantly, students did not position AI as a substitute for the teaching responsibilities of teachers. They did not, however, consider it a replacement—rather, they saw it as a supplementary support that could enhance education beyond the bounds of formal classroom contact. One participant put it this way: "It feels like having an assistant who helps me to learn, not replace the teacher" (P29). This nuance reflects that learners regard AI not as a standalone tutor but rather as part of their learning environment.

The findings indicate that students position AI primarily as a pedagogical scaffold rather than as a transformative instructional agent. The mean scores (M ≈ 3.50–3.80) suggest moderately positive perceptions, yet they do not exceed strong agreement thresholds. This pattern reflects a pragmatic acceptance of AI as a cognitive support tool, while its transformative potential remains cautiously interpreted. In line with the conceptualization of scaffolding in sociocultural theory, AI appears to function as a mediational artifact that supports learners within their Zone of Proximal Development, facilitating comprehension and strategy use (Vygotsky, 1978).

The results suggest that students predominantly situate AI as a pedagogical scaffold, rather than as a transformative instructional agent. The average values (M ≈ 3.50–3.80) represent at most moderately positive perceptions, thus now in level of both falling below strong agreement levels. This trend indicates a practical adoption of AI as a supporting mental tool, but its transformative promise is tentatively appropriated. Consistent with the understanding of scaffolding in sociocultural theories, AI appears to serve as a meditational artifact for students at ZPD to help them understand and use strategies (Cai et al., 2025).

The highest agreement (M ≈ 3.80) was found for AI's contribution to the accessibility of materials in English. This is consistent with previous studies that have found that technology to support teaching and learning, including AI-enabled tools, for instance, intelligent tutoring systems and generative language models, can increase accessibility and clarity of instructional content by providing simplified explanations, examples, and personalized feedback (Akhter, 2026; Gabrovšek & Rihtaršič, 2025; Pang et al., 2025).

Additionally, AI was considered to promote learning flexibility and strategy exploration (M ≈ 3.61). This crossover is consistent with the notion of digital tools facilitating learner autonomy if they enable goal setting, strategic experimentation, and reflective practice (Paethrangsi et al., 2024; Şener & Mede, 2023), as posited by SRL frameworks. Furthermore, the perceived usefulness of AI in learning beyond the classroom environments (M ≈ 3.56) provides some evidence that the capabilities of AI bring about persistent and accessible learning spaces and times (Masrek et al., 2024). According to the constructivist theory, interaction via AI can help for knowledge building by asking repetitive questions and providing instant confirmation.

Qualitative replies add meaning to the quantitative trends. The participants referred to AI as an 'assistant' or an 'academic sidekick', focusing on the manner that it provided multiple explanations and representations for concepts. This attests to a key feature of generative AI, that it can provide relevant inputs to users based on their comprehension capabilities (Hsu et

al., 2026). Crucially, learners did not envisage AI as replacing teachers. Instead, they framed it as an add-on in a larger curricular ecology. This corresponds with recent scholarship that suggests that applying AI in education works best when it supplements and does not replace the human pedagogical knowledge (Srinivasa et al., 2022).

Theoretically, this confirms a notion of educational technology adoption that is situated on a continuum from enhancement to transformation carried out at various stages according to level of pedagogical integration as well as digital literacy and organizational culture (Rahman & Hossain, 2025). Thus, further studies are needed to investigate the extent to which intentional instruction and teacher mediation can lift AI support from a scaffolding tool to an interlocutor that actively co-constructs student agency and meta-identity in ELT settings.

DISCUSSION

Motivation, Confidence, and Learning Engagement

According to the quantitative data, technology-enhanced ELEs influence students' association in a positive way. The scale that focused on students' sense of responsibility for their own learning was another high-scoring item ($M \cong 3.91$) and emphasized that the activities in AI were generally viewed as promoting personal accountability, on average. This suggests that the learning environment fosters a move from being extrinsically motivated to participating to having more internalized involvement. It is not that pupils never take an active role in the management of learning processes as opposed to receiving teacher directions.

A moderately positive trend is found for students' oral English confidence as well. The average confidence in speaking with the support of technology ($M \approx 3.56$), similarly, suggests that a majority did feel slightly more at ease to speak in English when aided by digital tools. This indicates that AI and such technologies operate like psychological scaffolding, which lowers the performance anxiety of the participants and encourages them to take risks in language use. Nonetheless, the increase in mean confidence falls within moderate values, suggesting that confidence increment is indeed present, but it may not be equally strong for all subjects.

In learning engagement, students find the meaning and relevancy of studying English to be increasing. The one item that measured the fit of learning activities with students' values or desired future goals obtained a somewhat high mean score ($M \approx 3.72$). These findings

demonstrate that students are not just checking task boxes, they sense a greater imperative tied to self-expansion and future plans. Such perceptions, of course, tend to emerge with more involved commitment and immersion in learning.

A number of developers stressed that technology turns learning from a chore into something fun, engaging, and interesting. Another student said, "I learn English using AI, and it's interesting, so I am not bored compared to other learning methods" (P11). This motivation from engagement was equally associated with higher levels of persistence and responsibility. Because technological tools provide students with access to practice and feedback from wherever they are at the pace that suits them, learners also felt they have gained greater control over their own learning. No small wonder why, as another student wrote, "I now feel like I need to take control of my own learning more because of the technology available and how I can learn at any time" (P35). Confidence enhancement also increasingly became a primary experiential focus. AI was described by the students as a safe practice room, preparing them for real interaction with people in real communicative circumstances. This preparational effect seems to decrease performance anxiety and facilitate incremental skill formation. For instance, one participant expressed that "I have more confidence speaking English, as I can practice using AI before talking with other people" (P23). Experiences like these seem to show that technology not only supports cognitive learning, but it also enhances the emotional preparedness for communication.

These are all examples where technology acts as a motivation trigger and as an acquisition of self-confidence. AI-based learning environments, by facilitating low-stakes practice, instant feedback, and adaptive involvement, can drive feelings of competence and agency, Thus, motivation and confidence are not simply separate outcomes but interrelated consequences of extended engagement with appropriate technology-mediated learning systems.

Firstly, given that the average score for students' perception of responsibility is fairly high ($M \approx 3.91$) it suggests a lean towards more independent learning. This is in accordance with SDT, which argues that learning environments that foster autonomy promote intrinsic motivation and internalized engagement (Harpine, 2024). Student descriptions of "learning anytime" and being in charge of pacing learning both indicate higher perceived self-autonomy and agency. Technology therefore seems to provide a means of moving away from teacher-led learning towards self-regulated involvement. This corroborates findings elsewhere that digital and AI-

supported spaces can contribute to the development of autonomous learners by offering flexible access, instant feedback and personalised practice (Saleh, 2025).

Then, the small rise of oral English confidence ($M \approx 3.56$) can be interpreted by means of self-efficacy theory. Bandura (2001) indicates that self-efficacy is created by mastery experiences and low levels of anxiety when tasking. The students compare AI to a "safe practice room," in which the technology enacts as their low-stakes rehearsal area while building up skills. This is in line with studies in CALL dealing with technology-mediated interaction and how it can lead to low performance anxiety and promote active exploration of language use (Ai et al., 2025). Furthermore, the notion of AI-as-psychological-scaffolding exemplifies sociocultural views of learning such as that articulated by Vygotsky et al. (1978) in terms of mediated support and ZPD. It seems that the technology offers such scaffolding that allows students to work through what they might consider daunting communication activities.

But the confidence gains were modest, not robust. This means the confidence boost from AI may not be immediately transferred to real communication in and of itself, despite well-established practice with corresponding reductions in anxiety. Virtual practice environments can emotionally and cognitively orient learners, but they do not fully substitute interpersonal language activity. This is consistent with research indicating that technology facilitates rehearsing for communication but does not necessarily ensure ability to communicate spoken live (Wilson et al., 2024).

Furthermore, the quantitative and qualitative results complement each other, converging to reveal that AI-facilitated ELEs establish a moderately strong motivational climate with high levels of perceived autonomy support, emotional safety (controlled) and perceived relevance. Vital to note is that motivation and confidence seem to evolve in an interconnected process, not as separate results. Technology allows repetition, immediate feedback and non-threatening interaction that build up confidence. These feelings feedback into motivation and engagement to establish a circular process of psychological development (Malecka & Boud, 2023).

However, the dominance of moderate mean scores would indicate that the developmental value of AI-based learning is still forthcoming. Transition of affect seems to be slow and uneven in learners. It is likely, however, that personal differences in prior IT-use, language proficiency and learning preferences will affect the degree to which students gain from AI-intermediated

environments (W.-L. Chang & Sun, 2024). This suggests that technology is an enabling factor, rather than a panacea, of the motivational process.

Assessment Practices and Learning Processes

The results of the quantitative data show that as a whole, students have positive attitudes toward AI-supported English learning task assessment practices. Regarding the assessment as a critical thinking, not memorization, item, the mean score is generally high ($M \approx 3.81$), which indicates that most of the respondents do experience the assessment to be cognitively focused and set within higher-level learning outcomes, as shown in the data. Likewise, the item "Assessment supports my learning and personal development" also had a high degree of agreement ($M \approx 3.80$). The results suggest that students do not appear to perceive assessment as a mechanism for measurement but rather as an integrated component of the learning environment that can assist their intellectual development and reflective practices.

Although students moderately agreed on their understanding of assessment procedures (mean score ≈ 3.47; $SD = .49$), in the words of Burke & Gates, this was lower than expected. This implies that while students acknowledge the growth role of assessment, there may still be some ambiguity around the operation of assessment systems in action. The lower score suggests the transparency of the assessment specification appears to be mediated by a lack of clarity in the criteria for assessment, communication of how it will be applied, and what sort of feedback is provided. While the assessment is generally well received by students, these results suggest that procedural transparency and clarification of expectations can be advanced.

Quantitatively, students' orientations toward AI-mediated English learning task assessment practice are found to be largely positive, especially in higher-order cognitive engagement and developmental learning function components. The fact that the mean scores obtained concerning the perception of assessment as a process focusing on critical thinking, not memory ($M \approx 3.81$), are relatively high indicates that students define assessment within the framework of constructive learning. This also corresponds to the views in current assessment theory, where assessment is not only considered (as in the traditional sense) as a measurement instrument but rather an epistemic activity that helps in constructing knowledge and cognitive development (Nieminen & Ketonen, 2024; Nieminen & Lahdenperä, 2024).

Likewise, high levels of agreement with the statement about assessment contributing to learning and personal development ($M \approx 3.80$) confirm impressions that students recognize

assessment as pedagogically inherent rather than institution-based. This perspective aligns with the principles of assessment for learning, which state that assessment serves as a feedback tool and contributes to self-regulation and academic improvement (van der Linden et al., 2023; Yan et al., 2023). From a social-constructivist viewpoint, these findings suggest that students view assessment as dialogic and developmental practice in situ within the learning ecology rather than as a late application of evaluative judgements (Palalas & Uludag, 2026). The presence of AI components could compound this view by offering adaptive feedback, personalized learning pathways, and continuous performance tracking, all features that are characteristic of formative learning ecologies (Fischer et al., 2024).

However, lower levels of agreement were observed for comprehension about assessment practices ($M \approx 3.47$; $SD = .49$), highlighting a significant paradox between the perceived value of development and procedural transparency. Although students did acknowledge that assessment has potential formative uses, they were less clear about the work of assessment systems. This result is related to studies that highlight assessment literacy (students' understanding of criteria, standards, and evaluative practices) as a precursor for engagement with assessment in ways that are meaningful (Ayuningtryas & Emaliana, 2025; Hannigan et al., 2022). Uncertain appraisal standards, vague application procedures, and ambiguous feedback mechanisms can decrease students' ability to understand performance information in a correct manner and to make relevant responses.

As far as learning to learn is concerned, the general profile of medium- to high mean scores across the items concerning assessment suggests that assessment practices are seen as integrated with teaching objectives and as conducive to performance enhancing. This coherence is characteristic of formative assessment systems, and such coherence supports learners' strategic regulation of effort, progress monitoring, and domain learning needs (Narciss & Zumbach, 2022). Hence, the pattern of data here indicates that assessment is functioning not solely as a measuring instrument but also as a regulative structure by which students are engaged with tasks associated with learning.

Theoretical implications the results provide theoretical support for the proposition that assessment environments organized by feedback, reflection, and goal alignment enhance self-regulated learning processes (Chang et al., 2023). When students conceptualize the assessment as relevant and focused on growth, they are less likely to monitor, adjust, and evaluate their performance. Such processes may be further supported by AI-enabled assessment aids that

provide real-time feedback data and adaptive assistance, replicating the formative nature of assessment.

Learner Identity and Self-Awareness

Quantitative data suggest that participant learner identity and self-perception are moderate to high. The highest mean scores in this area showed that they were aware of their strengths and weaknesses as language learners ($M \approx 4.11$), indicating a high degree of metacognitive awareness. This outcome demonstrates that the majority of learners regard their English learning not only as a skill but also as an act of reflection through which they are able to think and assess a number of strengths and weaknesses. The comparatively high level of agreement to this item indicates that reflective self-assessment is already integrated into students' learning.

For that of identity-forming, respondents generally believe English learning makes them feel like they are global communicators ($M \approx 3.56$). This implies that students have started to perceive English as a device to access a wider and extracurricular community of practice. Nonetheless, a moderate mean score suggests that this identity orientation has not been thoroughly integrated but is still evolving. Students may recognize some sort of symbolic and communicative worth to English, but the degree to which it influences their self-definition over time is incomplete.

Perceptions of AI influence in shaping learner identity were relatively less compared to the other ($M \approx 3.36$). This finding indicates that although AI is perceived as a supportive tool for learning by students, the impact of its redefining them as language learners is weaker. In short, AI is seen as more of a means than an end in the identity-shaping process. In general, the quantitative profile suggests that self-awareness is well ingrained as an approach to learning, identity development is moderately evolving, and strategies for AI influence on learner identity are more emerging than pervasive.

Multiple respondents noted that AI-enabled feedback made it possible for them to highlight particular points of improvement and monitor their progress. One participant remarked, "AI...helps me see what I'm really good at and where I need to focus more on" (P 4). Yet another participant highlighted the importance of regular feedback to enhance self-awareness: "I become more conscious, 'cause I continually get feedback" (P16). These findings indicate that reflective learning is not coincidental but systematically scaffolded through technology-

mediated interaction. And yet, while students exhibited a robust sense of themselves as learners, their identity as English users, especially in relation to the, more extended or global, communicative world, seemed less clear. While learners could see progress and improvement, they did not necessarily articulate an identity as confident global communicators that is fully internalized. This intermediate stance was even more articulated by one participant who said, "I think my English is not bad here, but I want to be a global communicator" (P41).

The current results suggest that learner identity and self-perception are situated toward a moderate to high level, where metacognitive awareness appears to be the most salient dimension. The relatively high average score for students' cognitive awareness of language learning difficulties and strengths implies that reflective self-monitoring is already ingrained in their learning customs. This is consistent with the literature on self-regulated learning that effective learners are constantly monitoring, evaluating, and modifying their cognitive strategies (Raković et al., 2022). The addition of reflective self-evaluation, reported in this study, indicates that learners are not just doing tasks but developing monitoring awareness of their learning. Metacognitive involvement is highly acknowledged as a principal factor of long-term language learning and learner autonomy (Werdiningsih et al., 2022).

What is more, the visual responses find echo in qualitative (Nimi et al., 2025) for continuous feedback loops that mediate AI-gestured environments, enhancing reflection. The participants also mentioned that they found the AI-produced feedback useful for discovering areas they needed to work on and monitoring their progress over time. This result is in line with the feedback theory, which highlights that timely and specific feedback promotes self-evaluation and learning regulation (S. Chen et al., 2026; Morrison & Jacobsen, 2023). From a sociocultural standpoint, this technology-mediated interaction may serve as scaffolding that facilitates the development of learners in their zone of proximal development (Vygotsky et al., 1978).

Curriculum and Technology Integration

Quantitative results showed that students had relatively positive, but not very strong, views about curriculum reform and technology integration in English learning. The mean scores for the curriculum and technology indicators are between 3.42 and 3.66, indicating moderate agreement. It indicates that respondents are aware of technological presence and potential value, but perception is not currently indicative of firm trust in efficacy or coherency.

Generally, curriculum and technology integration are grounded in the data as functional, useful learning tools but remain formative regarding impact and fit.

Students have a moderate agreement that the curriculum structure of the course could help with independent learning (M ≈ 3.56). This has implications, meaning that the curriculum design seems to offer students some freedom for self-directed learning, yet on the other hand, it does not entirely enable students to take full responsibility for their own learning processes. Likewise, participants also indicated that the curriculum reform has had a positive impact on their learning experience (M ≈ 3.66), which means such institutional changes have been perceived and, in general, accepted. However, the fair degree of agreement suggests that these reforms either may not be firmly internalized or generally experienced in learning contexts.

The participants had a positive attitude toward curriculum innovation and the application of technology in English learning. Most reported that the learning design was more authentic, interactive, and intellectually suggestive than their previous experience. For example, students enjoyed tasks that involved thinking without memorizing and studying as opposed to just a series of facts. As a participant described, “The learning activities make me think more …not just memorize” (P13). This indicates that curriculum reform is being thought of in a way that would encourage deeper 'thinking' and a more meaningful pattern of learning. The place of technology in the redesigned curriculum was also acknowledged by students. Technology was not seen as an external component but rather integrated with instructional strategy and instrumental for pragmatic language development. As one respondent wrote, “Technology plays a great role in teaching and is well integrated in learning, as it helps to link theory with practice” (P31).

The results suggest that students’ attitudes toward curriculum reform and technology integration in English learning are generally positive, though the tendency is not highly generalized. The average scores (3.42 to 3.66) seem to indicate that students perceived functional presence and possible worth of the innovations have not reached the level of being deeply internalized or closely trusted practices in their education. This is a phenomenon characteristic of the early stages of reform, where structural change can already be observed but pedagogical sense-making and student ownership are still in development (Chen, 2025).

Curricular-wise, the moderate agreement of students on course structure serves to foster independent learning (M ≈ 3.56) and conditionally reflects an indication toward self-directed

natured learning where learners themselves take over the control gradually in planning and monitoring their own learning process (Ganon-Shilon et al., 2022). However, the fact that there was no firm agreement suggests that learners continue to be guided or semi-structured about how they use the curriculum and not fully autonomous in terms of making sense of it. This result is consistent with the notion that curricular reform itself does not lead to self-regulated learning, and instead that students need explicit scaffolding for self-regulation, metacognitive guidance, and opportunities for significant control over decisions (Greenberg et al., 2023).

In the same way, the overall positive but lukewarm assessment of the perceived impact of curriculum reform on learner experience ($M \approx 3.66$) indicates superficial conformance rather than a fundamental pedagogical shift. As implementation theory suggests, time is required for educational change to be assimilated into daily teaching and learning practice, as "teachers and students need to renegotiate new structures within long-established, though not necessarily functional, learning cultures" (Zapata et al., 2024).

CONCLUSION

Main findings of this study draw an inference that integrating AI-enhanced resources and assessment practices in English curriculum reform makes a difference, albeit not radical one, to affect students' learning. Quantitative results show reasonably positives attitudes toward AI-based learning environments where students perceive AI altogether as a supportive pedagogical aid providing good understanding, motivation and accessibility to educational materials. AI-driven feedback and assessment methods also emerged as opportunities to enhance reflective learning, critical thinking and personal responsibility and thereby help support the development of self-regulation. From the perspective of learner identity, it is shown that AI-facilitated environments help establish students' meta-identity as independent and global English learners. The regular interaction practice, personalized feedback and adaptable learning pathways and data-driven assessment push learners to reflect on their strengths and shortcomings quickly as well as goals learners set. However, the results also demonstrate that this influence is still complex and ambivalent. While AI can enhance learning agency by empowering strategic decision-making and self-regulated learning, the fear of technological dependence and the epistemic authority of algorithmic assessment indicate that agency becomes a distributed matter between learners and digital systems rather than one controlled entirely by individuals. In short, the study supports that AI introduction in curriculum innovation is no longer merely a technical extension but a sociotechnical transformation of

cognitive activities, identity building and regulatory aspects of learning. But AI's effect is more like pedagogical scaffolding than full transformation. AI's potential to enhance learner-centered outcomes.

REFERENCES

Ai, Y., Hu, Y., & Zhao, W. (2025). Interactive learning: harnessing technology to alleviate foreign language anxiety in foreign literature education. *Interactive Learning Environments*, *33*(3), 2440–2459. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2024.2409990

Akhter, E. (2026). AI in the Classroom: Evaluating the Effectiveness of Intelligent Tutoring Systems for Multilingual Learners in Secondary Education. In *SSRN*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5794042

Ayuningtryas, V., & Emaliana, I. (2025). Are Pre-Service EFL Teachers Ready for AI-Assisted Assessment? The Role of Assessment Literacy in the Digital Era. *PANYONARA: Journal of English Education*, *7*(2), 267–294. https://doi.org/10.19105/panyonara.v7i2.21416

Bandura, A. (2001). Social Cognitive Theory: An Agentic Perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *52*(1), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.1

Bearman, M., Nieminen, J. H., & Ajjawi, R. (2023). Designing assessment in a digital world: an organising framework. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *48*(3), 291–304. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2022.2069674

Cai, L., Msafiri, M. M., & Kangwa, D. (2025). Exploring the impact of integrating AI tools in higher education using the Zone of Proximal Development. *Education and Information Technologies*, *30*(6), 7191–7264. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-13112-0

Chang, D. H., Lin, M. P.-C., Hajian, S., & Wang, Q. Q. (2023). Educational Design Principles of Using AI Chatbot That Supports Self-Regulated Learning in Education: Goal Setting, Feedback, and Personalization. *Sustainability*, *15*(17), 12921. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151712921

Chang, W.-L., & Sun, J. C.-Y. (2024). Evaluating AI's impact on self-regulated language learning: A systematic review. *System*, *126*, 103484. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103484

Chen, S., Zhang, L., & Li, A. W. (2026). Leveraging self-regulated learning to support university students' feedback literacy in blended learning environments. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *51*(1), 174–193. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2025.2546349

Chen, Y.-C. (2025). Cultivating a higher level of student agency in collective discussion: teacher strategies to navigate student scientific uncertainty to develop a trajectory of sensemaking. *International Journal of Science Education*, *47*(3), 440–473. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2024.2333714

Chuang, P.-L., & Yan, X. (2025). Language assessment in the era of generative artificial intelligence: Opportunities, challenges, and future directions. *System*, *134*, 103846. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2025.103846

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. SAGE Publication.

Deepshikha, D. (2026). A systematic review on the future of educational assessment: AI-driven grading and personalised feedback in higher education. *Artificial Intelligence in Education*, *2*(2), 75–115. https://doi.org/10.1108/AIIE-03-2025-0036

Elboubekri, A. (2017). The Intercultural Communicative Competence and Digital Education. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, *45*(4), 520–545. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047239516670994

Fischer, J., Bearman, M., Boud, D., & Tai, J. (2024). How does assessment drive learning? A focus on students' development of evaluative judgement. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *49*(2), 233–245. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2023.2206986

Friedman, R. S., & Deek, F. P. (2003). Innovation and education in the digital age: reconciling the roles of pedagogy, technology, and the business of learning. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, *50*(4), 403–412. https://doi.org/10.1109/TEM.2003.819650

Gabrovšek, R., & Rihtaršič, D. (2025). Custom Generative Artificial Intelligence Tutors in Action: An Experimental Evaluation of Prompt Strategies in STEM Education. *Sustainability*, *17*(21), 9508. https://doi.org/10.3390/su17219508

Ganon-Shilon, S., Shaked, H., & Schechter, C. (2022). Principals' voices pertaining to shared sense-making processes within a generally-outlined pedagogical reform implementation. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *25*(6), 941–965. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2020.1770864

Greenberg, A., Olvet, D. M., Brenner, J., Zheng, B., Chess, A., Schlegel, E. F. M., & Ginzburg, S. B. (2023). Strategies to support self-regulated learning in integrated, student-centered curricula. *Medical Teacher*, *45*(12), 1387–1394. https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2023.2218538

Haetami, H. (2025). AI-Driven Educational Transformation in Indonesia: From Learning Personalization to Institutional Management. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, *17*(2), 1819–1832. https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v17i2.7448

Han, Y., & Reinhardt, J. (2022). Autonomy in the Digital Wilds: Agency, Competence, and Self-efficacy in the Development of <scp>L2</scp> Digital Identities. *TESOL Quarterly*, *56*(3), 985–1015. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3142

Hannigan, C., Alonzo, D., & Oo, C. Z. (2022). Student assessment literacy: indicators and domains from the literature. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, *29*(4), 482–504. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2022.2121911

Harpine, E. C. (2024). Creating an Intrinsically Motivating Learning Environment: Promoting Student Engagement and Intrinsic Motivation. In *Service Learning in Higher Education* (pp. 59–76). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-51378-7_5

Heigham, Juanita., & Croker, R. A. . (2009). *Qualitative research in applied linguistics : a practical introduction*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Hsu, S.-F., Yang, C.-H., & Shidujaman, M. (2026). *Exploring How Generative AI Enhances Information Comprehension* (pp. 277–294). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-12385-5_17

Hummel, S. (2025). Ethical and Responsible AI in Education: Situated Ethics for Democratic Learning. *Education Sciences*, *15*(12), 1594. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15121594

Joshi, A., Kale, S., Chandel, S., & Pal, D. (2015). Likert Scale: Explored and Explained. *British Journal of Applied Science & Technology*, *7*(4), 396–403. https://doi.org/10.9734/BJAST/2015/14975

Luan, H., Geczy, P., Lai, H., Gobert, J., Yang, S. J. H., Ogata, H., Baltes, J., Guerra, R., Li, P., & Tsai, C.-C. (2020). Challenges and Future Directions of Big Data and Artificial Intelligence in Education. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.580820

Ma, Y., & Chen, M. (2025). The human touch in AI: optimizing language learning through self-determination theory and teacher scaffolding. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *16*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1568239

Malecka, B., & Boud, D. (2023). Fostering student motivation and engagement with feedback through ipsative processes. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *28*(7), 1761–1776. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2021.1928061

Masrek, M. N., Susantari, T., Mutia, F., Yuwinanto, H. P., & Atmi, R. T. (2024). Enabling Education Everywhere: How artificial intelligence empowers ubiquitous and lifelong learning. *Environment-Behaviour Proceedings Journal*, *9*(SI18), 57–63. https://doi.org/10.21834/e-bpj.v9iSI18.5462

Morrison, L., & Jacobsen, M. (2023). The role of feedback in building teaching presence and student self-regulation in online learning. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, *7*(1), 100503. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2023.100503

Narciss, S., & Zumbach, J. (2022). *Formative Assessment and Feedback Strategies* (pp. 1–28). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-26248-8_63-1

Nguyen, S. Van, & Habók, A. (2022). Non-English major students' perceptions of aspects of their autonomous language learning. *Language Learning in Higher Education*, *12*(1), 231–253. https://doi.org/10.1515/cercles-2022-2044

Nieminen, J. H., & Ketonen, L. (2024). Epistemic agency: a link between assessment, knowledge and society. *Higher Education*, *88*(2), 777–794. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-023-01142-5

Nieminen, J. H., & Lahdenperä, J. (2024). Assessment and epistemic (in)justice: how assessment produces knowledge and knowers. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *29*(1), 300–317. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2021.1973413

Nimi, H., Lu, M., & Chacon, J. C. (2025). Embodied Co-Creation with Real-Time Generative AI: An Ukiyo-E Interactive Art Installation. *Digital*, *5*(4), 61. https://doi.org/10.3390/digital5040061

Nopas, D. (2025). Algorithmic learning or learner autonomy? Rethinking AI's role in digital education. *Qualitative Research Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1108/QRJ-11-2024-0282

Paethrangsi, N., Teekasap, S., Khiewpan, R., & Jandaboue, W. (2024). Empowering Students' Autonomous Learning through Self-regulation, Metacognitive Strategies, and

Collaborative Learning Environments. *Journal of Liberal Arts RMUTT*, *5*(1), 69–79. https://doi.org/10.60101/jla.2024.5.1.4065

Palalas, A., & Uludag, P. (2026). *An Ecological Constructivist Perspective on Online Language Assessment* (pp. 1–25). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-08518-4_1

Pang, S., Nol, E., & Heng, K. (2025). Generative AI as a Personal Tutor for English Language Learning: A Review of Benefits and Concerns. *International Journal of Changes in Education*. https://doi.org/10.47852/bonviewIJCE52023724

Rahman, Md. M., & Hossain, Md. E. (2025). Digital dynamics in technology adoption: Exploring socio-economic development through technology and education. *Technology in Society*, *82*, 102906. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2025.102906

Raković, M., Bernacki, M. L., Greene, J. A., Plumley, R. D., Hogan, K. A., Gates, K. M., & Panter, A. T. (2022). Examining the critical role of evaluation and adaptation in self-regulated learning. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *68*, 102027. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2021.102027

Reja, U., Manfreda, K. L., Hlebec, V., & Vehovar, V. (2003). Open-ended vs. Close-ended Questions in Web Questionnaires. *Development in Applied Statistics*, *19*, 159–177.

Saleh, E. H. (2025). Empowering Learners: Exploring Teaching Strategies, AI Integration, and Motivation Tools for Fostering Autonomous Learning in Higher Education. *East Journal of Human Science*, *1*(6), 14–34. https://doi.org/10.63496/ejhs.Vol1.Iss6.182

Şener, B., & Mede, E. (2023). Promoting learner autonomy and improving reflective thinking skills through reflective practice and collaborative learning. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *17*(2), 364–379. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2022.2047694

Srinivasa, K. G., Kurni, M., & Saritha, K. (2022). *Harnessing the Power of AI to Education* (pp. 311–342). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-6734-4_13

Sutrisno, S., Azis, A., Setyawan, M. B., Dewi, D. A., Hidayah, Y., Hakiki, M., Hamid, M. A., & Fadli, R. (2025). Assessing students' readiness for artificial intelligence-based project learning to strengthen local wisdom values in Indonesia. *Cogent Education*, *12*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2582948

van der Linden, J., van der Vleuten, C., Nieuwenhuis, L., & van Schilt-Mol, T. (2023). Formative Use of Assessment to Foster Self-Regulated Learning: the Alignment of Teachers' Conceptions and Classroom Assessment Practices. *Journal of Formative Design in Learning*, *7*(2), 195–207. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41686-023-00082-8

Vygotsky, L. S., Cole, M., Jolm-Steiner, V., Scribner, S., & Souberman, E. (1978). *Mind in Society: Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvjf9vz4

Werdiningsih, D., Al-Rashidi, A. H., & Azami, M. I. (2022). The Development of Metacognitive Models to Support Students' Autonomous Learning: Lessons from Indonesian Primary Schools. *Education Research International*, *2022*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/6102282

Wilson, S. A., Byrne, P., & Rodgers, S. E. (2024). 'I'd be lost without my smartphone': a qualitative analysis of the use of smartphones and tablets by people living with

dementia, mild cognitive impairment, and their caregivers. *Aging & Mental Health*, *28*(4), 595–603. https://doi.org/10.1080/13607863.2023.2205585

Yan, Z., Panadero, E., Wang, X., & Zhan, Y. (2023). A Systematic Review on Students' Perceptions of Self-Assessment: Usefulness and Factors Influencing Implementation. *Educational Psychology Review*, *35*(3), 81. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09799-1

Yaseen, H., Mohammad, A. S., Ashal, N., Abusaimeh, H., Ali, A., & Sharabati, A.-A. A. (2025). The Impact of Adaptive Learning Technologies, Personalized Feedback, and Interactive AI Tools on Student Engagement: The Moderating Role of Digital Literacy. *Sustainability*, *17*(3), 1133. https://doi.org/10.3390/su17031133

Zapata, G. C., Saini, A., Tzirides, A.-O. (Olnancy), Cope, W., & Kalantzis, M. (2024). The Role of AI Feedback in University Students' Learning Experiences: An Exploration Grounded in Activity Theory. *Ubiquitous Learning: An International Journal*, *18*(2), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.18848/1835-9795/CGP/v18i02/1-30