

WEB 2.0 AND AI APPLICATIONS FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING IN UNIVERSITY CORE COURSES

Sharifah Ismail^{1*}

Rukhaiyah Haji Abd. Wahab²

Rafidah Mohamad Cusairi³

^{1 2, 3} School of Languages, Civilisation and Philosophy (SLCP) Universiti Utara Malaysia, 06010 UUM Sintok, Kedah Darul Aman, Malaysia

*Corresponding author: Sharifah Ismail (sharifah@uum.edu.my)

Article history

Received date : 5-9-2026

Revised date : 6-9-2026

Accepted date : 23-10-2026

Published date : 28-10-2026

To cite this document:

Ismail, S., Haji Abd. Wahab, R., & Mohamad Cusairi, R. (2026). Web 2.0 and AI applications for teaching and learning in university core courses. *Journal of Islamic, Social, Economics and Development (JISED)*, 11 (87), 548-562.

Abstract: *The integration of AI into university teaching raises questions about how digital assistance can contribute to learning while sustaining students' responsibility for their work. This conceptual article examines the complementary uses of Web 2.0 and AI in compulsory university core teaching within Malaysia's general studies context. Nationhood Studies, Philosophy and Contemporary Issues, and Appreciation of Ethics and Civilisation illustrate how collaborative applications can be adapted to different forms of interpretation and judgement. A focused narrative discussion brings national higher education guidance into conversation with research published between 2024 and 2026. The synthesis develops applications for shared writing, online discussion and multimedia production, with particular attention to the relationship between feedback, revision and independent explanation. It argues that the educational contribution of AI depends on how assistance is incorporated into a task and on the decisions students are required to justify. Contrasting experimental findings underscore the importance of instructional design, while research on assessment and evaluative judgement informs the proposed activities. A simple digital reference platform is outlined to organise subject introductions, activity guidance and resource links. The article offers a practical basis for integrating collaborative web functions and AI, with classroom evaluation needed to establish their contribution to learning in the three subject contexts.*

Keywords: *Web 2.0, artificial intelligence, university core courses, general studies, collaborative learning, evaluative judgement*

Introduction

Web 2.0 refers to a participatory web environment that enables users to create, share and collectively develop online content. Its defining feature is the active involvement of users in producing information and exchanging ideas through applications such as shared documents, discussion forums and multimedia platforms. Artificial intelligence (AI) refers to computational systems that infer from input how to generate outputs, including explanations, recommendations and content. Whereas Web 2.0 facilitates interaction among users, AI introduces automated assistance that can respond to questions and contribute to the development of academic work. Together, these technologies expand the ways in which information is produced, communicated and examined in digital learning environments.

In higher education, these capabilities support activities that involve collaboration, inquiry and revision. Shared documents enable students to develop a text collectively and comment on one another's contributions, while discussion forums provide opportunities to compare interpretations and examine supporting evidence. AI can complement these activities by explaining unfamiliar concepts, suggesting questions and providing feedback on a draft. The educational value of these applications depends on how their functions are incorporated into teaching. Activities need to establish a clear purpose for their use and require students to examine the information they encounter, connect it with subject knowledge and explain the reasoning behind their responses.

These considerations are relevant to Malaysia's Mata Pelajaran Pengajian Umum (MPU), or general studies, context. The Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia (MOHE, 2025) connects MPU reform with national identity and civic responsibility, providing a broader educational context for the use of digital applications. Within Nationhood Studies, Philosophy and Contemporary Issues, and Appreciation of Ethics and Civilisation, students engage with questions that require historical understanding, conceptual analysis and ethical reasoning. Web 2.0 and AI applications can support this engagement through collaborative examination of sources, discussion of competing perspectives and feedback during the development of an argument. Their use should therefore follow the requirements of the subject and the activity, with students remaining responsible for verifying information and substantiating their interpretations.

The Malaysian Qualifications Framework places digital and communication capabilities alongside cognitive development and ethical responsibility (Malaysian Qualifications Agency [MQA], 2024). In relation to general studies, these expectations suggest that using a digital resource involves more than operating it competently. A student who introduces a source into a shared explanation must judge its relevance, while a student responding to a contested claim must consider how accurately other perspectives have been represented. The connection between digital participation and judgement therefore deserves explicit attention in teaching. Recent reviews help to locate this concern within the developing literature on AI in higher education. Lin et al. (2026) document a broad range of teaching and learning applications, while Crompton and Burke (2026) identify assessment approaches concerned with process, authenticity and dialogue. The range of practices is substantial, although their educational significance depends on the tasks and evidence through which learning is examined. For university core teaching, the relevant question is how an application helps students develop an explanation they understand well enough to defend.

This article approaches that question through the relationship between Web 2.0 and AI. Web 2.0 is used here to describe participatory web functions such as shared editing, commenting and discussion. AI refers to applications that can provide explanations, feedback or other assistance during a learning activity, including generative functions examined in much of the recent literature. Although these capabilities increasingly coexist within the same services, distinguishing their contributions helps explain how interaction with peers and responses from AI might be organised within one task.

Nationhood Studies, Philosophy and Contemporary Issues, and Appreciation of Ethics and Civilisation provide the contexts through which these applications are developed. Their different emphases allow the discussion to move from a general account of digital participation to the reasoning required in particular kinds of work. The article considers how might organise collaboration and assistance around those requirements, then outlines a simple reference platform to support their use. Its contribution is an account of application design in which students' decisions remain integral to the learning process.

University Core Teaching in the General Studies Context

General studies creates space within specialised degree programmes for sustained consideration of social life and public responsibility. The national MPU reform agenda gives this work a renewed emphasis through its attention to identity and contemporary capabilities (MOHE, 2025). Translating these priorities into teaching requires questions that students can investigate through relevant material. Digital applications become useful at this level when they help students examine an issue with sufficient depth to explain its significance.

The three subjects below illustrate how that examination can take different forms. A historical explanation raises questions about evidence and change, while a philosophical argument requires close attention to concepts and inference. Ethical deliberation adds a concern with the responsibilities involved in representing and responding to others. These differences give lecturers a basis for adapting shared digital functions to the subject matter, beginning with the interpretation students are being asked to develop.

Nationhood Studies

Nationhood Studies brings historical interpretation into discussion of national life. The relationship is relevant to the MPU reform agenda, which associates historical understanding with national identity (MOHE, 2025). In teaching, this creates an opportunity to examine how an account of the past establishes its claims and explains their significance. Students can consider the evidence on which an interpretation rests while reflecting on how that interpretation informs an understanding of society.

A shared timeline offers one way of organising this inquiry. Students could select a historical development, locate relevant readings and explain the relationships between the events they include. Comments within the same document would allow peers to question a connection or request stronger evidence. In this arrangement, the collaborative space gives the group an opportunity to examine the explanation as it develops, with the educator able to address difficulties in chronology or interpretation.

AI feedback could enter the activity once an initial account has been prepared. A question about an unclear causal connection, for example, might prompt students to return to a reading and reconsider the wording of their explanation. The suggestion would need to be checked against

identifiable evidence, especially where chronology or historical significance is concerned. Deciding whether the feedback is useful becomes part of the interpretative work that the activity requires.

The completed timeline would bring that work together through a supported account of change. Its educational purpose would be realised in the connections students explain and in their reasons for selecting particular material. Discussion of those choices could also open a more considered reflection on the relationship between historical understanding and civic life. Web 2.0 and AI would contribute to this process through the opportunities they provide for questioning and revising an account.

Philosophy and Contemporary Issues

Philosophy and Contemporary Issues directs attention to the assumptions through which a contemporary problem is understood. Examining those assumptions requires students to distinguish concepts and consider whether the reasons offered support a conclusion. Such work gives a subject-specific expression to the cognitive and communicative capabilities recognised in the national qualifications framework (MQA, 2024). Digital participation can serve this purpose by making an argument available for close and sustained examination.

For example, an educator could select a published position on a contemporary issue and ask students to identify the reasoning that connects its premises to its conclusion. Shared annotations would keep their observations beside the text, while a discussion thread would allow disagreements about its interpretation to develop. A response could then address a particular inference or clarify the meaning of a term. The exchange would have a common point of reference in the argument being examined.

AI could introduce a further objection for students to assess within that discussion. Its usefulness would depend on whether it engages accurately with the position under consideration, which students would determine through the reading and their own reasoning. An objection that misrepresents the argument could itself become a subject of analysis. This would give students a reason to attend closely to conceptual accuracy, including the context needed when ideas from different traditions are compared.

A concluding response would draw together what the exchange has established and explain which disagreements remain unresolved. Students could show how a challenge affected their interpretation or why they retained a position after considering it. An accompanying infographic or short video might communicate the comparison to a wider class audience. Across these forms, the academic contribution would rest on the quality of the reasoning and on a fair representation of the positions discussed.

Appreciation of Ethics and Civilisation

Appreciation of Ethics and Civilisation, provides a context for examining responsibility within social relationships. The activities considered here focus on how a judgement is formed and how different perspectives are represented in public communication. This concern is consistent with the place of ethical responsibility in the national qualifications framework (MQA, 2024). It also gives students an opportunity to consider the ethical implications of the digital practices through which they prepare and share their work.

An activity could begin with a published message concerning a social issue. Students would examine its claims and consider how the language positions the people or groups it discusses. A shared document could hold the text and their annotations, allowing differing interpretations to be compared before the group prepares a response. The discussion would connect an ethical judgement to the particular words and circumstances that give it meaning.

An AI response could extend that examination by suggesting an alternative reading or identifying wording that may need clarification. Students would then decide whether the suggestion attends adequately to the social context. Where it relies on a generalisation about a cultural group, the task would require a return to the published material and relevant readings. Explaining why a suggestion is accepted or rejected would give practical expression to the responsibility being discussed.

The resulting response would show how ethical interpretation develops through attention to both reasons and representation. Students would be practising responsible communication as they consider whose perspective is included and how an opposing view should be described. A poster or video could make their position accessible, supported by a brief explanation of the judgement it conveys. The relationship between content and practice would give the activity its coherence.

Taken together, these examples show why the subject matter should guide the use of an application. The historical task asks students to establish a supported relationship between events; the philosophical task asks them to examine the reasoning of a position. Ethical interpretation requires attention to responsibilities within a particular social context. A shared document or discussion space can accommodate each form of inquiry because its purpose is determined by the questions students bring to the material.

This relationship also makes some guidance reusable across the subjects. Students need to know how to connect a claim to a source and how to respond when another interpretation challenges their own. Guidance on AI assistance can be developed around the same work, with examples adapted to the subject. Establishing the basis for that guidance requires consideration of what national publications and recent research can contribute to the design of a learning activity.

Methodological Approach

This article employed a qualitative approach based on library research and document analysis. It examined publications from 2024 to 2026 relevant to collaborative learning, AI assistance and the interpretation of student work. Publication details were checked against publisher or official institutional records. National guidance provided the educational context, while scholarly literature informed the selection and development of the proposed applications.

The official publications were examined according to their educational purposes. The Malaysian Qualifications Framework informed the discussion of graduate capabilities, while the MPU reform statement situated general studies within national educational priorities. Guidance on AI informed the discussion of responsibilities in teaching and learning, particularly the examination of the accuracy and validity of AI-generated content (MOHE, 2024). Together, these publications provided a basis for considering the suitability of digital applications for university core teaching.

The scholarly literature was examined in relation to the research designs and educational settings reported in each publication. Research reviews identified recurring practices and concerns, experimental studies provided findings on specific forms of assistance, and conceptual scholarship explained the judgement involved in using digital resources. These contributions were considered together to identify relevant application functions, the teaching purposes they could serve and the conditions affecting their use.

The analysis informed the proposed applications for Nationhood Studies, Philosophy and Contemporary Issues, and Appreciation of Ethics and Civilisation. Each activity connected a learning purpose with opportunities for collaboration and AI assistance, followed by guidance for classroom use. The same analysis informed the proposed organisation of a simple digital reference platform containing subject introductions, application guides and resource links.

Web 2.0 and AI Applications for Teaching and Learning

The relationship between collaboration and AI assistance becomes clearer when it is considered within the development of a particular piece of work. Students may use a shared document to prepare an interpretation, receive questions through discussion and revise their explanation before communicating it to an audience. AI can contribute at a defined point in that process. The lecturer's role is to ensure that the response directs attention to an intellectual difficulty that students still need to resolve.

The following applications develop this approach through writing, discussion and multimedia production. Each places the use of a digital function within an activity whose purpose students can understand. The three subjects illustrate how the work can be adapted while retaining opportunities for feedback and revision. Existing learning environments can support these activities, allowing attention to remain on the relationship between the material, the task and the explanation produced.

Collaborative Writing and Source Annotation

A shared document allows an explanation to develop through contributions that remain available for review. Students can see how a passage relates to its sources and how a peer's comment questions or extends the argument. This gives collaborative writing a particular teaching use: difficulties can be addressed while the explanation is still taking shape. The document also provides a common reference for discussing why a revision is needed.

To establish that purpose, the lecturer could ask each student to contribute a sourced passage and respond to a question about the group's emerging account. The group would then need to consider how the contributions fit together. Where two passages offer different interpretations, students would have to explain the disagreement and decide how to represent it. Collaboration would thus involve negotiating the argument as well as preparing the text.

The question guiding that negotiation would vary with the subject. In Nationhood Studies, it could concern whether a source supports an explanation of historical change. A philosophical comparison could examine the assumptions on which two positions depend, while an ethical interpretation could consider how a claim represents a social responsibility. Table 1 illustrates the relationship between these purposes and the possible contribution of AI assistance.

Table 1: Collaborative writing illustrated through three university core subjects

Reference subject	Proposed activity	Possible AI assistance	Student contribution
Nationhood Studies	Develop a shared explanation of a selected historical development, with source annotations.	Suggest a question about an unclear relationship in the draft.	A supported account of change and an explanation of source relevance.
Philosophy and Contemporary Issues	Compare the assumptions and reasoning of two positions on an issue.	Propose a counterargument for checking against assigned readings.	An accurate comparison and reasons for the interpretation.
Appreciation of Ethics and Civilisation	Annotate a published case concerning social responsibility or cultural representation.	Identify wording that may need clarification or contextual examination.	A contextualised judgement and an explained revision.

Once the group has prepared an initial explanation, it could request AI feedback on a specific difficulty. Asking which connection needs further explanation would give students a manageable suggestion to examine against their sources. They would then revise the passage where appropriate and explain their decision. Keeping the request close to an identified problem would allow feedback to enter an existing process of inquiry.

Writing and feedback feature prominently in the literature mapped by Lin et al. (2026), although their review also identifies limitations in how learning is investigated. This makes the students' account of a revision especially relevant to the proposed activity. An explanation of why a source warranted a change would offer insight into their understanding that the finished wording alone might not convey. The lecturer could use that account to respond to the underlying interpretation.

The shared document would consequently bring the development of an argument into view. Peer comments and AI suggestions would be considered in relation to the same body of material, with students responsible for deciding how to proceed. A brief individual explanation of one important decision could clarify each member's contribution. The completed text would then be accompanied by an account of the reasoning through which it was developed.

Online Discussion and Reasoned Engagement

Online discussion creates time for students to return to a reading before responding to an interpretation. Unlike an exchange that disappears with the end of a conversation, a discussion thread preserves the relationship between a claim and the responses it receives. Students can follow that relationship as the issue develops. This is useful where understanding depends on considering an objection carefully enough to answer it with reasons.

A suitable prompt would therefore establish a question on which students can offer and examine an interpretation. They might consider whether a source warrants a particular conclusion or whether an alternative explanation accounts for the material more convincingly. The lecturer could ask responses to address a specific point in an earlier contribution. This would give the exchange direction while allowing students to develop different positions.

The subject matter would supply the point of disagreement. A discussion in Nationhood Studies could examine why a historical development matters, while one in Philosophy and Contemporary Issues could assess an argument about a contemporary problem. Appreciation of Ethics and Civilisation could explore the responsibilities involved in a public message. Table 2 outlines how AI might contribute a further question within each exchange.

Table 2: Online discussion with a defined AI contribution

Reference subject	Discussion purpose	Possible AI contribution	Evidence of engagement
Nationhood Studies	Explain why a selected historical development matters to national life.	Ask which part of the explanation requires stronger source support.	A reasoned interpretation and a response to a peer's question.
Philosophy and Contemporary Issues	Examine competing arguments about a contemporary issue.	Suggest a possible objection for students to evaluate.	An accurate account of the objection and a justified reply.
Appreciation of Ethics and Civilisation	Discuss responsibility and fairness in a published civic message.	Offer a clarification question about the wording or an assumption.	A contextualised position and respectful engagement with another interpretation.

After stating their own position, students could ask AI for an objection and select one they consider worth answering. Their response would need to show how the objection relates to the reading or case under discussion. Where it identifies a weakness, students could revise their account, where it is unpersuasive, they would explain why. The decision would keep the exchange focused on the argument and give AI feedback a defined place within it.

Bach and Thiel (2024) examine associations between the quality of digital interaction and self-reported outcomes in collaborative online learning. Their work draws attention to the substance of participation, although those associations do not establish a causal effect. Applied to the present proposal, the distinction encourages attention to how a response advances the discussion. A contribution that clarifies an inference offers something different from one that simply records agreement.

A closing contribution could ask students to return to the position with which they began and explain what the exchange has changed. They may retain the same conclusion while developing stronger reasons for it, or recognise a difficulty that requires further reading. Either response would allow the lecturer to consider how the discussion informed their interpretation. The activity would end with an account of learning that preserves room for justified disagreement.

Multimedia Production and Learning Resources

Preparing a multimedia resource requires decisions about what an audience needs to understand and how that understanding can be supported. A short video or infographic can give a complex issue a clear form, but selecting its content involves interpretation. Students must determine which claims are essential and what evidence allows those claims to be communicated

accurately. The teaching opportunity lies in making these decisions part of the work discussed with the class.

An initial script or outline would provide a basis for that discussion before students begin production. Peers could comment on the explanation and examine whether a proposed image or example is appropriate to the argument. Revising the outline at this stage would connect production choices to the academic purpose of the task. It would also allow the lecturer to address a misunderstanding before it becomes embedded in the finished resource.

AI feedback could help students examine the sequence or clarity of the script. A suggestion to simplify a passage would still require a decision about whether the revised wording preserves its meaning. This is particularly relevant when a short format is used to communicate a historical interpretation or represent a social perspective. Table 3 provides examples of outputs whose production remains connected to the reasoning students are expected to demonstrate.

Table 3: Multimedia activities linked to a teaching purpose

Reference subject	Proposed output	Possible assistance	AI Supporting work
Nationhood Studies	An annotated timeline or short explanatory video about historical change.	Question an unclear transition or suggest where explanation is needed.	Source list, script and reasons for the historical interpretation.
Philosophy and Contemporary Issues	An infographic or video comparing two arguments.	Review clarity and propose a question about the comparison.	Accurate concept definitions and a written rationale.
Appreciation of Ethics and Civilisation	A poster or video explaining a social responsibility issue.	Help identify ambiguous language for revision.	Verified case material and reasons for representing perspectives as presented.

The source list and outline could accompany the finished resource, together with a short explanation of a significant production decision. Students might explain why they selected an image or how they revised a passage after feedback. Such an account would allow the lecturer to consider the relationship between the communicated message and the understanding behind it. The additional material should remain proportionate to the task.

Vlachopoulos and Makri (2024) relate authentic assessment to meaningful tasks and examine the demands of implementation across different settings. Their review helps distinguish the purpose of multimedia work from its format. In the proposed activity, a defined audience and a communication problem give students a reason to select and organise evidence carefully. Whether a poster or video serves that purpose depends on the explanation it conveys and the decisions supporting it.

The completed resource would bring interpretation and communication together. Students would need to explain its main claim with reference to the material used, including any choices that required simplification. This would allow visual presentation and narration to be considered

as part of the academic argument. It would also give the activity a consistent educational purpose while leaving its form responsive to the subject and audience.

Across the three applications, feedback enters work that students have already begun to interpret for themselves. Shared writing makes the developing explanation available for comment, and discussion allows a challenge to be examined in greater depth. Multimedia production then requires decisions about how to communicate the resulting account. AI assistance can be incorporated into these stages where it directs attention to an issue that warrants further thought. The connection between these activities gives lecturers a basis for organising them as a sequence or selecting one for a particular teaching need. In either case, students need to understand what the application contributes and which decisions they are expected to make. Clear instructions can establish that relationship without extensive technical preparation. The practical arrangements below develop this requirement through a manageable activity sequence and supporting reference pages.

Practical Teaching Arrangements and Platform Support

For students to use an application purposefully, the instructions need to connect the question they are investigating with the resources and work expected. This connection can be established within an existing learning environment through a concise activity guide. The guide would direct students to the shared space and relevant material, while explaining where assistance may be used. Its organisation would support the activity from preparation through to submission.

A simple reference platform could make such guidance easier to locate and adapt across the three subjects. Course introductions would orient users to the teaching context, with application guides explaining how particular functions support a task. Links would connect the guidance to existing tools and learning resources. The platform would serve as a practical point of reference for lecturers and students as they prepare and undertake an activity.

Organising a Learning Activity

An individual response to a selected reading or question would give the activity a clear starting point. Students could then share their interpretation and identify an issue that merits further examination. Peer feedback, followed by focused AI assistance where appropriate, would provide material for reconsidering that issue. The lecturer would explain in advance how students should check a suggestion and what they would be asked to account for at the end.

Table 4 sets out a sequence that can be adapted to the subject. In historical work, revision might follow a question about whether the evidence supports a connection between events. In a philosophical or ethical task, it could arise from an objection to the reasoning or from concern about how a perspective is represented. The sequence gives these different decisions a common organisational form while preserving the substance of the question being examined.

Table 4: A practical sequence for a Web 2.0 and AI learning activity

Stage	Teaching and learning action	Work retained
Initial response	Students prepare an individual interpretation using assigned material.	A brief response and its sources.
Peer exchange	Students place the response in a shared document or discussion and address a substantive comment.	A selected peer comment and response.
Focused AI assistance	Where permitted, students request a question or preliminary feedback on a defined aspect of the work.	The relevant request and suggestion.
Verification and revision	Students check the suggestion against credible material and explain a substantive change or rejection.	Revised work, source support and a reason for the decision.
Independent explanation	Students explain the central interpretation and how its evidence supports it.	A concise individual written or oral explanation.

Retaining a selected comment or AI response would allow students to connect a revision to the feedback that prompted it. The educator could then examine their explanation and address a difficulty in the use of a source or concept. A short written or oral account would usually be sufficient for that purpose. The amount of retained work should be determined by what helps clarify the student's understanding.

The sequence would therefore make feedback part of the learning activity through the decisions it invites. Students would know when to seek assistance and how to relate a response to the material they are studying. The activity could be shortened to suit teaching time, provided that students still have an opportunity to explain a substantive judgement. This would preserve its educational purpose while keeping classroom arrangements manageable.

Developing a Simple Digital Reference Platform

The reference platform could begin with a home page that introduces its purpose and directs users to a subject page. Each subject page would provide a short background, an activity example and links to the material needed. An application guide would explain how to use shared writing, discussion or multimedia functions within that example. Users would be able to move from an introduction to a practical activity through a small number of clearly labelled pages. Guidance on AI would appear beside the task it supports. National guidance emphasises responsibility for examining output (MOHE, 2024), while Miao and Cukurova (2024) place human agency and professional judgement within teacher AI competence. A subject page could translate these expectations into a focused request and an example of how to check the response. This would make the guidance usable at the point where students need to decide what to do with a suggestion.

The interactive work could remain within existing writing, discussion and submission facilities. Linking to those facilities would allow the reference pages to concentrate on explaining the activity and its purpose. Lecturers could update the selected readings or adapt an example without having to develop a new technical system. Their judgement would determine which resources are appropriate to the class and how the instructions should be adjusted.

A plain layout would support this arrangement through readable text and clearly labelled links. Downloadable instructions could help students prepare when continuous access to a service is inconvenient. Maintenance would initially involve checking resources and clarifying guidance as teaching needs change. Further functions could be considered when a specific difficulty in using the pages establishes a reason for adding them.

The usefulness of the platform would consequently depend on the quality of the educational guidance it organises. A resource link becomes more informative when students can see how it relates to the question they are investigating. For lecturers, an activity example provides a starting point that can be adapted to different readings and teaching conditions. Both uses give the platform a defined role within the preparation and delivery of teaching.

The three subjects would give that guidance sufficient range to show how a common function can serve different intellectual purposes. Examples could retain the same broad activity sequence while changing the question and the reasoning expected. This organisation would connect the practical use of applications to the central argument of the article: digital assistance needs to be understood through the learning activity in which it is used. The wider implications concern how that relationship can be sustained as AI becomes part of everyday academic work.

Discussion

The applications developed in this article place collaboration and AI assistance within the continuing work of forming and defending an interpretation. This emphasis is particularly relevant to general studies, where questions about society require students to examine reasons and consider the implications of a position. A digital environment can make that work more accessible to comment, yet the response it produces still needs to be understood by the student who presents it. The teaching task is to organise assistance so that it contributes to the development of an explanation and leaves students able to account for the judgement expressed in it.

The experimental literature shows why this relationship depends on the design of support. Kestin et al. (2025) report stronger learning with a deliberately designed AI tutor than with the comparison active-learning instruction in undergraduate physics. Bastani et al. (2025), in high-school mathematics, find that unrestricted assistance can improve supported performance while weakening subsequent independent performance, with pedagogical safeguards mitigating the difficulty. The studies differ in setting and design, so their findings cannot determine outcomes in general studies. Their combined relevance lies in showing why successful assisted work must be considered alongside what students can subsequently explain or perform independently.

For university core teaching, this concern brings the use of feedback into a closer relationship with evaluative judgement. Bearman et al. (2024) argue that students need opportunities to develop their capacity to judge quality in work shaped by AI. The proposed activities give that argument a practical expression by asking students to decide whether a response addresses the problem and whether a revision is justified. A peer comment and an AI suggestion would both require such consideration, although each enters the activity differently. Asking students to explain one important decision would make the quality of that consideration available for discussion with the lecturer.

This approach also connects the application examples to wider changes discussed in assessment scholarship. Xia et al. (2024) examine early responses to generative AI across students, educators and institutions, while Crompton and Burke (2026) identify approaches that give

greater attention to process and dialogue. These reviews suggest directions for design, with variation across the literature limiting claims about their effects in a particular subject. The implications for lecturers concern how to select and explain appropriate assistance, a responsibility consistent with the professional judgement emphasised by Miao and Cukurova (2024). A manageable activity needs guidance that makes this responsibility practicable within ordinary teaching conditions.

Subject matter is essential to that guidance because the reasons for accepting a suggestion depend on the question being studied. An AI response that makes an ethical statement more concise, for example, may also remove a qualification needed to represent a social group fairly. Students would need to recognise that change and explain whether the proposed wording remains defensible. A historical or philosophical task would raise its own questions about evidence or inference. These examples show how the scrutiny of assistance can become part of disciplinary understanding, provided that the lecturer directs attention to the feature of the argument that matters.

The reference platform would support this work by keeping such explanations close to the activities and resources they inform. Its purpose would be fulfilled through guidance that lecturers can adapt and students can follow, with further technical development responding to an identified teaching need. The article's contribution is therefore a coherent basis for selecting applications and organising their use across the three contexts. Classroom evaluation would be needed to examine whether students' explanations become more accurate or better justified through these arrangements. That question can be pursued through the quality of their work and the reasons they give for their decisions.

Conclusion

Integrating Web 2.0 and AI into university core teaching requires an account of how assistance contributes to understanding. The applications discussed here organise that contribution around the development of an interpretation that students can explain and defend. Collaboration makes their reasoning available for response, while AI can introduce questions or feedback for further examination. Their educational relationship is established through the decisions students make as they work with the material.

The three subject contexts show why those decisions must remain connected to what is being taught. Nationhood Studies brings evidence into the explanation of historical change; Philosophy and Contemporary Issues requires careful engagement with arguments. Appreciation of Ethics and Civilisation gives particular attention to the responsibilities involved in forming and communicating a judgement. Together, they demonstrate how shared applications can accommodate different purposes within Malaysia's general studies context. The proposed activities provide a practical way of sustaining that connection. Students begin with their own response, consider feedback and explain a decision arising from it. Lecturers can adapt the sequence to the material and time available, using a simple reference platform to organise guidance and links. This keeps development focused on resources that support teaching and gives students a clear account of the work expected.

The proposals now require examination through classroom use, particularly in relation to the quality of students' explanations and their use of evidence. Such evaluation would allow the activities to be refined in response to what students understand and where further guidance is

needed. The continuing purpose is to make digital assistance part of an education in judgement, through which students learn to take responsibility for the interpretations they present.

AI Use Statement

AI assisted manuscript organisation, drafting, translation and language revision. References were checked against publisher or institutional records. Responsibility for the final manuscript remains with the authors.

Acknowledgement

The authors gratefully acknowledge Universiti Utara Malaysia for funding this research through a University Grant (S/O Code: 14790) and the Research Management Centre (RMC), Universiti Utara Malaysia, for its administrative support.

References

- Bach, A., & Thiel, F. (2024). Collaborative online learning in higher education—Quality of digital interaction and associations with individual and group-related factors. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, Article 1356271. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1356271>
- Bastani, H., Bastani, O., Sungu, A., Ge, H., Kabakçı, Ö., & Mariman, R. (2025). Generative AI without guardrails can harm learning: Evidence from high school mathematics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 122(26), Article e2422633122. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2422633122>
- Bearman, M., Tai, J., Dawson, P., Boud, D., & Ajjawi, R. (2024). Developing evaluative judgement for a time of generative artificial intelligence. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 49(6), 893–905. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2024.2335321>
- Crompton, H., & Burke, D. (2026). Higher education assessments in the age of GenAI: A systematic review. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 23, Article 56. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-026-00627-4>
- Kestin, G., Miller, K., Klales, A., Milbourne, T., & Ponti, G. (2025). AI tutoring outperforms in-class active learning: An RCT introducing a novel research-based design in an authentic educational setting. *Scientific Reports*, 15, Article 17458. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-97652-6>
- Lin, M. P.-C., Chang, D. H., Winne, P. H., Bowen, G. M., & Ryoo, J. (2026). Mapping generative AI in higher education teaching and learning: A scoping review. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 23, Article 55. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-026-00630-9>
- Malaysian Qualifications Agency. (2024). *Malaysian qualifications framework* (2nd ed., 2024). [https://www.mqa.gov.my/new/document/2024/new/MQF%20\(2024\).pdf](https://www.mqa.gov.my/new/document/2024/new/MQF%20(2024).pdf)
- Miao, F., & Cukurova, M. (2024). *AI competency framework for teachers*. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000391104>
- Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia. (2024). *Garis panduan penggunaan teknologi kecerdasan buatan generatif (KBG) dalam pengajaran dan pembelajaran (PdP) pendidikan tinggi*. Jabatan Pendidikan Tinggi. <https://repositori.mohe.gov.my/109/>
- Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia. (2025, December 19). *KPT perkukuh jati diri mahasiswa menerusi reformasi strategik kurikulum Mata Pelajaran Pengajian Umum*. <https://www.mohe.gov.my/hebahan/sorotan-aktiviti/kpt-perkukuh-jati-diri-mahasiswa-menerusi-reformasi-strategik-kurikulum-mata-pelajaran-pengajian-umum>

- Vlachopoulos, D., & Makri, A. (2024). A systematic literature review on authentic assessment in higher education: Best practices for the development of 21st century skills, and policy considerations. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 83, Article 101425. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2024.101425>
- Xia, Q., Weng, X., Ouyang, F., Lin, T.-J., & Chiu, T. K. F. (2024). A scoping review on how generative artificial intelligence transforms assessment in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21, Article 40. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00468-z>