

Generative Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: Implications for Academic Performance, Critical Thinking, and Students' Mental Well-Being

*Mrs. Amandeep kaur Gill*¹

*Mrs. Navjyot Kaur*²

¹ Assistant Professor, Faculty of Education, Desh Bhagat University, Mandi Gobindgarh

² Assistant Professor, Faculty of Education, Desh Bhagat University, Mandi Gobindgarh

Abstract

Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) has rapidly become a prominent component of higher education, with tools such as ChatGPT, Gemini, and Copilot increasingly used for information retrieval, brainstorming, writing support, problem solving, presentations, coding, and examination preparation. While these technologies can provide timely and personalised academic assistance, their increasing use also raises concerns about overdependence, academic integrity, reduced cognitive effort, misinformation, and students' psychological well-being. The present conceptual paper examines the educational implications of GenAI across three interrelated domains: academic performance, critical thinking, and mental well-being. Drawing on the existing literature and the issues identified in the original paper, the study adopts an analytical review approach to synthesise potential benefits and risks of AI-assisted learning. The review indicates that GenAI can improve learning efficiency, accessibility, language support, and personalised learning when students actively evaluate and use AI-generated information. Conversely, uncritical dependence may encourage cognitive offloading, weaken independent problem solving, reduce originality, and increase uncertainty regarding academic and career competencies. AI use may also have mixed psychological consequences: it can reduce workload and provide accessible learning support, but excessive screen-based engagement, dependency, academic pressure, and uncertainty about future employment may contribute to stress and digital fatigue. The paper argues for a human-centred model of AI integration in which GenAI functions as a learning assistant rather than a substitute for students' intellectual effort or teachers' pedagogical role. The paper concludes with recommendations for AI literacy, source verification, redesigned assessment, ethical guidelines, and psychologically supportive educational practices.

Keywords: *Generative Artificial Intelligence, Higher Education, Academic Performance, Critical Thinking, Mental Well-Being, AI Literacy, Academic Integrity, Digital Learning*

1. Introduction

The rapid development of Generative Artificial Intelligence has introduced a significant transformation in the ways students access, process, and produce academic knowledge. Unlike conventional digital resources that primarily retrieve existing information, GenAI systems can

generate new text, explanations, summaries, examples, images, code, and other forms of content in response to natural-language prompts. Consequently, students can obtain immediate assistance with tasks that previously required extensive searching, drafting, and revision. The educational relevance of this development is substantial because higher education is simultaneously concerned with knowledge acquisition, independent reasoning, academic integrity, creativity, and students' psychological development.

The use of AI tools by students has expanded across assignments, presentations, research activities, language improvement, coding, problem solving, and examination preparation. The original paper highlights these applications and identifies a central tension: the same technology that can make learning more efficient may also reduce the amount of independent cognitive effort invested by learners. This tension makes the educational impact of GenAI more complex than a simple positive-versus-negative assessment.

From a psychological and educational perspective, three outcomes deserve particular attention. First, academic performance may improve when AI provides explanations, feedback, and personalised assistance; however, performance measured through AI-supported products may not necessarily represent genuine learning. Second, critical thinking may be strengthened when learners compare AI-generated viewpoints and verify claims, but it may be weakened when learners accept generated answers without evaluation. Third, mental well-being may benefit from reduced academic workload and accessible support while being challenged by dependency, digital fatigue, anxiety about future employability, and reduced human interaction.

Therefore, the present paper reframes the original topic toward a more academically focused question: under what conditions can GenAI enhance higher education without compromising students' cognitive independence and psychological well-being? This perspective moves beyond describing AI as simply beneficial or harmful and instead emphasises responsible, human-centred integration.

2. Conceptual Background

2.1 Generative AI and Higher Education

GenAI refers to computational systems capable of producing content in response to user instructions. In higher education, these systems can function as conversational tutors, brainstorming partners, writing assistants, summarisation tools, language-support systems, and coding aids. Their accessibility makes them particularly influential because students can interact with them at any time and request explanations at different levels of difficulty.

The educational value of such systems depends substantially on how they are used. AI can support learning when students use it to generate questions, obtain alternative explanations, identify gaps in understanding, or receive feedback before independently revising their work. The same technology becomes problematic when students outsource the central intellectual task, submit generated material without evaluation, or use AI to avoid learning rather than facilitate learning.

2.2 Academic Performance

Academic performance should be distinguished from task completion. GenAI can help students complete academic tasks faster, improve language expression, organise ideas, and access explanations. These advantages may contribute to improved productivity and potentially better academic outcomes. Personalised assistance can also be valuable for learners who need repeated explanations or additional examples.

Nevertheless, faster completion does not automatically indicate deeper learning. If students rely on AI to formulate arguments, solve problems, or write complete answers, the resulting academic product may conceal gaps in conceptual understanding. The important educational issue is therefore whether AI-supported performance reflects genuine learning. Assessment practices need to focus increasingly on explanation, application, reflection, oral discussion, and process rather than only the final written product.

2.3 Critical Thinking and Cognitive Engagement

Critical thinking involves analysing information, evaluating evidence, comparing alternatives, identifying assumptions, and reaching reasoned conclusions. GenAI can provide multiple perspectives and examples that stimulate these processes. For example, students can ask an AI system to present competing interpretations of a topic and then evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of each interpretation using scholarly sources.

The risk arises when AI becomes an answer-generating substitute for thinking. Instant responses may encourage cognitive offloading, particularly when learners accept fluent and confident outputs without checking accuracy. GenAI systems can also produce incomplete, biased, or inaccurate information. Consequently, AI literacy must include not only the ability to operate an AI system but also the ability to question, verify, contextualise, and ethically use its outputs.

2.4 Mental Well-Being

Students' mental well-being is closely connected with academic workload, perceived competence, social relationships, uncertainty, and digital habits. GenAI may have a supportive role by helping students organise information, clarify difficult concepts, and manage demanding academic tasks. Students who feel hesitant to ask questions publicly may also find conversational AI less intimidating as an initial learning support.

At the same time, excessive use may create new pressures. Continuous screen engagement can contribute to digital fatigue, while dependency may reduce students' confidence in their own abilities. Concerns about AI-driven changes in employment may further increase uncertainty about the value of particular skills. These effects are not inevitable; they depend on patterns of use, the educational environment, and the degree to which AI complements rather than replaces human learning and interaction.

3. Objectives of the Study

- To examine the potential influence of Generative AI on academic performance in higher education.

- To analyse the relationship between AI-assisted learning and students' critical-thinking processes.
- To examine the potential positive and negative implications of GenAI use for students' mental well-being.
- To identify educational conditions that encourage productive and ethical use of GenAI.
- To propose recommendations for integrating GenAI without compromising academic integrity, cognitive independence, or human interaction.

4. Methodology

The paper adopts a conceptual and analytical review design. It is based on the themes and arguments presented in the original manuscript and supported by selected academic and institutional literature on Artificial Intelligence in Education, cognitive learning, educational technology, ethics, and student well-being. The approach is interpretive rather than experimental; therefore, the paper does not claim causal effects or report original survey or experimental data.

The analysis is organised around three outcome domains—academic performance, critical thinking, and mental well-being—and a fourth cross-cutting domain, responsible educational use. Positive and negative implications are compared to develop a balanced framework for AI integration. This approach is appropriate for identifying emerging educational questions and for developing recommendations that can subsequently be tested through empirical research.

5. Analysis and Discussion

5.1 GenAI and Academic Performance

GenAI can improve learning efficiency by providing immediate summaries, explanations, examples, and feedback. Students can use it to break complex topics into manageable components and to receive alternative explanations when a conventional textbook explanation is difficult to understand. Language support is another important advantage, particularly for students developing academic writing skills. AI can help identify grammatical problems, improve clarity, and suggest alternative wording.

However, the educational benefit depends on active engagement. If students simply request a finished assignment, the technology may improve the appearance of the final product while reducing learning. The distinction between assistance and substitution is therefore central. AI-assisted performance is educationally meaningful when students remain responsible for understanding, evaluating, revising, and communicating the final work.

5.2 GenAI and Critical Thinking

The relationship between GenAI and critical thinking is best understood as conditional. AI can stimulate critical thinking by presenting alternative perspectives, counterarguments, examples, and questions. Students can use generated material as an object of critique rather than as an unquestioned authority. This approach can transform AI from an answer provider into a cognitive partner.

Conversely, repeated dependence on ready-made solutions may reduce opportunities for productive struggle. Problem solving often requires learners to make mistakes, test alternatives, and revise their reasoning. If these processes are consistently outsourced to AI, students may practise less independent reasoning. The solution is not to prohibit AI completely but to design learning tasks in which students must demonstrate the reasoning that led to their conclusions.

5.3 GenAI and Mental Well-Being

The psychological impact of GenAI is similarly mixed. Academic assistance may reduce perceived workload and provide immediate support, potentially making demanding tasks more manageable. AI may also help students plan tasks and obtain clarification without waiting for formal instructional support.

However, excessive reliance can contribute to digital fatigue and dependency. Students may become uncertain about whether their achievements reflect their own abilities. In addition, concerns about automation and future employment may influence students' perceptions of competence and career security. Educational institutions should therefore address not only technical AI skills but also students' emotional responses to technological change.

5.4 Academic Integrity and Ethical Use

The increasing availability of GenAI challenges conventional understandings of authorship and plagiarism. Copying generated material and presenting it as entirely one's own undermines academic integrity, while uncritical acceptance of generated references or factual claims can compromise research quality. At the same time, treating every use of AI as misconduct may discourage legitimate learning support.

A more constructive approach is transparent and purpose-based AI governance. Institutions can define acceptable uses, require disclosure where appropriate, teach students how to verify information, and assess learning through methods that make individual reasoning visible. Ethical AI use should therefore become part of academic literacy rather than merely a disciplinary issue.

6. Human-Centred Framework for AI-Supported Learning

The analysis suggests a Human-Centred AI-Supported Learning Framework consisting of four connected principles: augmentation, verification, reflection, and well-being.

- **Augmentation:** AI should extend students' learning capacity by providing explanations, examples, brainstorming, feedback, and accessibility support.
- **Verification:** Students should check important claims, references, statistics, and interpretations against credible academic sources.
- **Reflection:** Students should explain what they learned from AI, what they changed, and why they accepted or rejected generated suggestions.
- **Well-being:** AI use should be balanced with offline study, teacher interaction, peer collaboration, and healthy digital habits.

Within this framework, the teacher remains an important facilitator. Teachers can design prompts and activities that require comparison, justification, source evaluation, and reflection. Assessment can include viva voce components, drafts, learning journals, problem-solving demonstrations, and application-based tasks. Such methods shift attention from detecting AI use alone toward evaluating actual learning.

7. Educational Implications and Recommendations

- Develop institution-level guidelines that clearly distinguish acceptable, limited, and unacceptable uses of GenAI.
- Introduce AI literacy programmes covering prompting, verification, bias, hallucinations, privacy, citation, and academic integrity.
- Redesign assessments to emphasise application, analysis, reflection, oral explanation, and problem solving.
- Require students to verify AI-generated information using credible academic and primary sources.
- Encourage students to use AI for brainstorming and feedback before independently developing final arguments.
- Provide faculty development so teachers can design AI-aware assessments and guide ethical use.
- Monitor students' digital well-being and encourage balanced use of technology with face-to-face academic and social interaction.
- Encourage transparent acknowledgement of substantive AI assistance where institutional policy requires it.
- Use AI as a complement to teachers and peers rather than as a replacement for human interaction.

8. Limitations and Future Directions

The present paper is conceptual and does not provide primary empirical data. Therefore, the conclusions should be interpreted as analytical propositions rather than causal findings. GenAI tools are also evolving rapidly, meaning that patterns of use and their educational consequences may change over time.

Future research should examine these relationships through empirical designs. Surveys and longitudinal studies could investigate associations between frequency and type of AI use, academic performance, critical-thinking measures, and psychological well-being. Experimental studies could compare AI-supported and conventional learning tasks while controlling for prior academic ability. Mixed-method research could additionally examine students' experiences, motivations, and concerns regarding AI. Such work would help determine when GenAI genuinely improves learning and when it primarily improves task efficiency.

9. Conclusion

Generative AI represents an important shift in higher education, but its educational value cannot be determined by technological capability alone. The central issue is how students and institutions use the technology. GenAI can support academic performance through personalised explanations, language assistance, accessibility, and efficient learning support. It can also contribute to critical thinking when students compare, question, and verify its outputs. At the same time, uncritical dependence may encourage cognitive offloading, reduce independent problem solving, and create uncertainty about students' own competencies.

The psychological consequences are also multidimensional. AI may reduce academic pressure by providing timely assistance, while excessive use may contribute to digital fatigue, dependency, and concerns about future employability. A responsible approach therefore requires a balance between technological innovation and human-centred education. Students must remain active learners, teachers must remain facilitators of intellectual development, and institutions must establish clear ethical and assessment frameworks.

Ultimately, the goal should not be to keep students away from GenAI, nor to allow technology to replace learning. The goal is to develop AI-literate learners who can use intelligent tools critically, ethically, creatively, and psychologically responsibly. Such an approach can enable GenAI to strengthen higher education while protecting the core purposes of education: understanding, reasoning, originality, human connection, and lifelong learning.

References

- Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning. Center for Curriculum Redesign.
- Luckin, R. (2018). Machine learning and human intelligence: The future of education for the 21st century. UCL Institute of Education Press.
- Ministry of Education, Government of India. (2020). National Education Policy 2020.
- OECD. (2021). OECD digital education outlook 2021: Pushing the frontiers with AI, blockchain and robots. OECD Publishing.
- Selwyn, N. (2022). Education and technology: Key issues and debates. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2), 257–285.
- Tlili, A., Shehata, B., Adarkwah, M. A., Bozkurt, A., Hickey, D. T., Huang, R., & Agyemang, B. (2023). What if the devil is my guardian angel: ChatGPT as a case study of using chatbots in education. *Smart Learning Environments*, 10.
- UNESCO. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. UNESCO.
- World Health Organization. (2022). World mental health report: Transforming mental health for all. World Health Organization.