HUMAN-CENTERED LEARNING AS A PEDAGOGICAL RESPONSE TO AI IN HIGHER EDUCATION

N. A. Yahorava

University of the National Academy of Sciences of Belarus,
Minsk, 220070, Radialnaya St., 38B, egorov1977@yandex.ru

The integration of AI in higher education shapes the academic work of master's students, raising concerns about the dehumanization of learning. This study examines the impact of AI-generated content on student performance and explores the application of human-centered learning as a pedagogical framework. Drawing on examples from English-language instruction for students of various majors the article highlights strategies for fostering critical thinking, and ethical engagement, ensuring AI enhances rather than replaces authentic intellectual growth.

Keywords: human-centered learning, artificial intelligence; higher education; graduate students; academic discourse; pedagogy.

ОРИЕНТИРОВАННОЕ НА ЧЕЛОВЕКА ОБУЧЕНИЕ В ВЫСШЕМ ОБРАЗОВАНИИ КАК ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКИЙ ОТВЕТ ЭПОХЕ ИСКУССТВЕННОГО ИНТЕЛЛЕКТА

Н. А. Егорова

Университет НАН Беларуси,
Минск, 220070, ул. Радиальная, 38Б, egorov1977@yandex.ru

Интеграция ИИ в высшее образование всё сильнее оказывает влияние на академическое общение магистрантов, вызывая опасения по поводу дегуманизации обучения. В статье рассматривается влияние ИИ на учебную деятельность студентов и применение концепции человекоцентрированного обучения. На примере преподавания английского для студентов разных специальностей языка показаны стратегии формирования критического мышления и этической ответственности, обеспечивающие интеллектуальное развитие молодых ученых при помощи ИИ как сопровождающего, а не замещающего средства.

Ключевые слова: ориентированное на человека обучение; искусственный интеллект; высшее образование; магистранты; академический дискурс; педагогика.

The rapid integration of AI into higher education has profoundly transformed academic communication. Increasingly, university instructors encounter essays, reflections, and even dialogues that are not the authentic product of human cognition but the polished output of intelligent machines.

Students, in their pursuit of efficiency and linguistic perfection, frequently rely on AI tools to generate academic texts – from research papers to critical reflections. Consequently, pedagogical discourse, once a space of genuine intellectual exchange and personal engagement, is gradually becoming dehumanized. This transformation affects the essence of education as a human-centered process designed to cultivate individuality, creativity, and critical thinking [1]. The interaction between teacher and student has shifted from an authentic exchange of ideas to a negotiation with algorithmically produced narratives (texts that simulate reasoning but lack emotional and ethical depth). Thus, contemporary academia faces a paradox: while AI broadens access to information and enhances linguistic sophistication, it simultaneously undermines the authenticity of voice and the relational fabric of learning. The issue becomes particularly pronounced in master's education [2], where independent analysis and original research are essential components of scholarly development. Graduate students, though highly proficient in digital technologies, increasingly substitute their intellectual effort with AI-generated content. This substitution compromises academic integrity and erodes the development of an individual scholarly voice which stands out as a cornerstone of advanced academic work. Within the context of the National Academy of Sciences, where methodological rigor and research culture constitute the foundation of academic excellence, this phenomenon calls for urgent critical reflection [2]. The growing reliance on AI in academic writing and communication alters the epistemological nature of learning itself, shifting it from the production of knowledge to the reproduction of algorithmic patterns.

The purpose of this study is to analyze the implications of AI-generated discourse in the academic communication of master's students and to explore pedagogical strategies that can restore human-centered engagement within the educational and research environment of the University of the National Academy of Sciences. In terms of increasing AI dependence, the concept of human-centered learning gains special significance [3, p. 23] by reaffirming the essential role of human presence, empathy, and critical reflection in education. It shifts the focus from the production of flawless texts to the development of authentic thought, emphasizing intellectual autonomy, emotional intelligence, and ethical responsibility.

Human-centered pedagogy encourages instructors to design learning environments that stimulate students' self-awareness and metacognitive engagement. Instead of prohibiting the use of AI outright educators can transform it into a tool for reflection: guiding students to analyze, critique, and ethically integrate machine-generated content. Through dialogic teaching, case-based learning, and research supervision grounded in discussion rather

than submission, the teacher reclaims the human dimension of academic communication [4, p. 34]. In this framework combating the uncritical use of AI is not about resistance, but about reclaiming authorship and meaning. The role of the teacher evolves from that of a knowledge transmitter to that of a mentor of intellectual authenticity (one who teaches students not merely to produce information, but to think, feel, and interpret as human beings). This paradigm offers a methodological basis for developing educational practices that reconcile technological progress with the preservation of humanistic values in higher education.

Given the omnipresence of digital platforms that offer instant access to AI tools, the educator's mission is no longer limited to detecting AI-generated content, but rather to cultivating students' capacity to use such technologies consciously and responsibly [2, p. 446]. The challenge is not to forbid the use of AI (an obviously futile endeavor) but to transform it into a meaningful pedagogical resource that promotes critical and creative engagement.

Integrating AI literacy into the curriculum presupposes that teachers introduce students to the mechanisms, limitations, and ethical dimensions of AI systems. By analyzing examples of AI-generated texts in class students learn to identify the absence of personal voice, emotional nuance, and contextual reasoning. This reflection helps them to appreciate the difference between machine output and human expression.

Instructors can redesign assessment methods as well. Traditional written assignments can be replaced or supplemented by oral defenses, dialogic presentations, or reflective essays documenting the process of idea formation. This shifts evaluation from the final product to the process of thinking: making plagiarism-by-algorithm less meaningful and authentic reflection more valuable.

Educators may invite students to use AI as a partner in inquiry rather than a ghostwriter: for instance, by asking them to critique, modify, or ethically reframe machine-generated content. Such activities restore authorship and transform AI from a replacement of thought into an instrument for intellectual growth.

Human-centered learning requires that educators openly discuss the emotional and ethical aspects of digital communication: empathy, responsibility, and integrity. These discussions re-establish the moral fabric of the academic environment, reminding students that education is not only about producing texts, but about becoming reflective and responsible individuals.

The pedagogical response to AI accessibility does not consist in opposing technology, but in humanizing its use. The educator becomes a mediator between the algorithmic and the authentic, ensuring that technological progress serves the development of human consciousness rather than replacing it.

While AI can easily replicate linguistic accuracy and structural coherence, it still lacks emotional depth, contextual sensitivity, and the subtle traces of personal reasoning that characterize authentic academic work. Therefore, the teacher's task is not only to evaluate the correctness of a text or presentation, but to recognize its human authorship.

When assessing written papers, educators can look for several indicators of AI-generated content: 1) stylistic uniformity and lack of individuality: AI texts often maintain a perfectly neutral tone, avoiding digressions, irony, or emotional color that naturally appear in human writing; 2) shallow argumentation beneath formal perfection: a student's text might seem flawless in grammar and structure, yet remain curiously empty of genuine insight, self-reflection, or contradictory thought (signals of automated reasoning.); 3) inconsistency between classroom performance and written sophistication (when a student's in-class discussions reveal moderate linguistic or analytical ability, yet their submitted paper reads as a polished academic article, the discrepancy suggests algorithmic assistance). To deal with such cases, the teacher may apply dialogic verification: short reflective interviews or "micro-defense" sessions where the student explains the logic of their own text. If the explanation lacks spontaneity, personal association, or awareness of nuance the "machine echo" becomes evident.

In oral formats students who rely heavily on AI-generated materials often demonstrate strong memorization but weak improvisation. They recite arguments fluently but struggle to respond to spontaneous questions or connect abstract ideas to real-life or disciplinary contexts. The teacher can therefore integrate dynamic questioning (brief follow-up questions that test the student's ability to reason beyond prepared material). Authentic learners typically show hesitation, humor, or self-correction; AI-dependent students tend to reproduce detached, overly coherent patterns.

One of the most effective tactics is to include a reflective commentary as part of every major assignment, where students describe their intellectual process: why they chose certain arguments, how their ideas evolved, and what difficulties they faced. AI cannot convincingly simulate genuine intellectual struggle, and it is precisely this struggle that signals human-centered learning.

Regular interaction between teacher and student (short mentoring sessions, draft discussions, or feedback dialogues) allows the instructor to sense the authentic rhythm of the learner's thought. This continuity makes it much harder for a student to insert purely AI-generated work unnoticed.

Through such practical measures, the teacher transforms assessment from a mechanical procedure into a living dialogue. Evaluation thus becomes an act of recognizing humanity in the learning process – the subtle art of

distinguishing between what is merely well-written and what is truly thought through.

When teaching English to master's students of various disciplines (history, archaeology, art studies, physics, or chemistry) AI dependency becomes especially visible. These students are often capable researchers in their own fields, yet they approach language learning pragmatically: "If AI can write better than me, why bother?" The instructor's task, therefore, is to transform AI from a linguistic crutch into a didactic mirror – a tool for reflection rather than substitution.

In classroom the teacher assigns an essay: "Cultural Identity in Modern Europe." Most students bring perfectly structured, stylistically smooth essays (almost too perfect). The instructor initiates a "Human revision session." Students are asked to: 1) read a paragraph aloud and explain why they chose those specific arguments; 2) identify which sentences express their personal interpretation versus general facts; 3) modify one paragraph to include their own academic experience (for instance, how archaeological data might support their argument.) Within minutes, it becomes clear whose writing is lived through and whose is merely generated. The discussion turns into a genuine intellectual exploration: the machine text becomes raw material for human rethinking.

For students of Art History, the assignment is: "Describe and interpret a painting in the style of an art critic." Instead of banning AI, the teacher allows students to generate an initial description using ChatGPT or another tool, but then asks them to critique it. Questions such as: what emotional tone is missing? Does the AI grasp the symbolic dimension of the artwork? Where would you disagree with the machine? The task thus becomes meta-linguistic: students learn to identify subtle shades of meaning and emotional inadequacy (the "cold perfection") of AI speech versus the human capacity for wonder and interpretation.

In groups of Physics and Chemistry students, AI tools are often used to produce reports and abstracts in flawless academic English. The instructor proposes a different format: each student submits an AI-assisted abstract but must then rewrite it from memory during class (using their own words, without access to prompts). The rewritten texts always differ; they reveal what the student truly understood. This practice not only exposes overreliance on AI but strengthens conceptual clarity and linguistic independence. At the end of each module, the teacher conducts brief reflective interviews: what was the most difficult idea to express in English? What would you change in your text if you were writing it again without AI help? How do you feel your thinking changed through this topic? Such questions bring emotional intelligence into evaluation. The teacher thus measures not

only linguistic competence but intellectual and ethical growth – the true goal of human-centered education.

These examples demonstrate that the fight against AI-dependence is not a confrontation but a transformation of the educational space. The teacher becomes not a detective, but a conductor orchestrating the dialogue between machine precision and human depth.

Human-centered learning offers a response that transcends prohibition and fear. It redefines education as a living process in which technology serves human growth rather than substitutes it. By integrating AI literacy, reflective practice, and dialogic assessment educators can reestablish authenticity as the central value of academic culture. The classroom becomes not a site of surveillance, but a workshop of consciousness where students learn to recognize their own voice against the algorithm. The examples drawn from English-language instruction at the master's level illustrate that genuine learning occurs not when students produce perfect texts, but when they engage critically, emotionally, and ethically with knowledge. The teacher's mission is no longer to guard the borders between human and machine, but to mediate their interaction. In this sense, the educator of the 21st century becomes both a researcher and a moral guide – a guardian of authenticity in the world written by machines where the core idea is not to resist AI, but to humanize it.

References

1. Laurillard D. Teaching as a Design Science: Building Pedagogical Patterns for Learning and Technology. London: Routledge, 2012. P. 1–320.

2. Yahorava N. A. Integration of Artificial Intelligence into the Philology plus paradigm // Филология будущего, которое мы создаем: тенденции, смыслы, приоритеты: материалы I Междунар. науч.-практ. конф. / Московский международный университет / Отв. ред. Л.М. Бузинова. Москва, 2025. С. 445–449.

3. Selwyn N. Education and Technology: Key Issues and Debates. London: Continuum, 2011. P. 1–240.

4. Anderson C. Makers: The New Industrial Revolution. New York: Crown Business, 2012. P. 1–320.