DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.22694275 Cerqueira E, et al. (2024) 3: 001-009

Educational Technology and E-Learning

ISSN: 3117-6615
https://inkwise.org/index.php/ETEL

Inkwise Press

Field Study Open Access

Generative Assistants as Study Partners: A Field Study of Use Patterns Across a Semester

Eufemia Cerqueira[1*], Eibhlin Lehane[2] and Ludovic-P Hennebelle[3]

[1]Centre for Learning Analytics, Baixo Mondego Centre for Digital Education, Montemor-o-Velho, Portugal
[2]Centre for Student Partnership, Slievenamon Centre for Digital Education, Carrick-on-Suir, Ireland
[3]Centre for Higher Education Studies, Bresle Laboratory for Learning Sciences, Eu, France

*Correspondence to: Eufemia Cerqueira, Centre for Learning Analytics, Baixo Mondego Centre for Digital Education, Montemor-o-Velho, Portugal, E-mail: e.cerqueira@bmcde.pt

Received: 18 July 2023; Accepted: 18 October 2023; Published: 05 February 2024

Copyright: © 2024 Eufemia Cerqueira, et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Abstract

Generative Assistants as Study Partners has moved quickly from a niche scientific question to something a wider community can now investigate with reasonably reliable tools, but the evidence behind it has not always kept pace. We pull together the current evidence for generative assistants as study partners, covering the methodological, practical, regulatory and cost angles, with an eye on where practice has genuinely settled and where researchers and reviewers are still largely working it out for themselves. Selective, context-specific pursuit looks better supported by the evidence gathered here than either broad rollout or blanket avoidance.

Keywords: Generative Assistants as Study Partners; Educational technology; E-learning; Evidence synthesis; Research methodology

Introduction

There is no shortage of interest in generative assistants as study partners; what there has been a shortage of, until fairly recently, is work carried out under conditions realistic enough -- independent instruments, longer observing or operating windows -- that findings travel beyond the setting where they were first generated.[1] The present field study sets out what the evidence currently says about generative assistants as study partners, where the science and the surrounding practice have genuinely converged, and where the picture is still mixed.[2]

Interest in generative assistants as study partners has grown quickly as the underlying instrumentation, computation and analytical tools have become more accessible and affordable -- but that speed has left real variation in how different groups define, measure and report on it.[3]

We write this from the standpoint of a researcher or programme lead deciding whether generative assistants as study partners is worth pursuing further, or building on, for their own work, not as a purely academic exercise, and we come back to that practical question throughout.

The remainder of this article sets out the rationale for that framing in more detail, then works through the evidence, the practical and governance considerations, and what we think a reasonable path forward looks like.

Related Work

The published work on generative assistants as study partners makes a reasonably convincing case overall, though that case is considerably stronger for some of its sub-questions than others.[4]

Early work in this area was mostly proof-of-concept -- a single instrument run, one site, a promising result. What has followed since has been slower and more methodical: replication, cross-validation against independent groups, and a small but growing number of studies that actually track outcomes over a longer window rather than a single

observation.[5]

Methodology and Evidence Base

Some parts of the generative assistants as study partners evidence base are backed by several agreeing independent groups; other parts rest on one or two single-team reports whose findings may or may not travel to a different instrument, site or setting.[6][7] Where the evidence is solid, practice has started to converge; where it is not, researchers are still working it out case by case, understandably.[8]

A theme that keeps coming up in the generative assistants as study partners literature is the gap between what a controlled or small-scale study shows and what has actually been demonstrated once the same question is asked under messier, real-world conditions.[9]

Comparing results across the available generative assistants as study partners studies is genuinely difficult -- different instruments, different protocols, different ways of defining a successful outcome -- so the pooled picture presented here is best read as a rough indication rather than a precise figure.[10][11]




Figure 1: Illustrative evidence-maturity summary across five evaluation categories for generative assistants as study partners (scores are for illustration in this synthesis and not drawn from a single external source).

Question	Current evidence	Practical implication
Strength of supporting evidence	Uneven across sub-questions	Weight conclusions by evidence tier
Consistency across sites/instruments	Variable transfer reported	Local validation before wider use
Metrics used	Mixed methodological benchmarks	Prefer studies with real field/operational data
Cost / resource implications	Rarely reported in detail	Assess local cost-effectiveness separately

Table 1: Summary of key considerations for generative assistants as study partners.

Evaluation Considerations Across Studies

Study quality across the generative assistants as study partners literature is mixed. A minority of the work is properly benchmarked against a real comparison dataset or baseline; a larger share reports results from a single run or a single site, with no formal baseline -- useful as a signal, but not something a follow-on programme would want to build on alone.[12]

How "success" gets measured for generative assistants as study partners also varies a lot between studies, and a result measured against one benchmark is simply not the same thing as one measured against another, even when both get described in similar language in the abstract.[13]

Implementation Considerations

Getting generative assistants as study partners to actually work reliably involves more than the core method: a validated process, a way to confirm findings hold up under repeat runs, and a plan for what to do when a dataset or observation run underperforms all matter as much as the underlying technique.[14] More than one of the programmes we reviewed ran into trouble not because the underlying science was wrong, but because nobody had budgeted for these unglamorous downstream logistics before starting.[15]

How much this costs to run, and how much specialist equipment, computation or expertise it needs, differs a great deal by setting and organisation, and anyone evaluating generative assistants as study partners should budget for a proper pilot of their own rather than assuming a figure from someone else's programme will transfer unchanged.[16]

Question	Practical implication
Does generative assistants as study partners need specialised instrumentation or access?	Budget for setup and lead time before relying on it
Is there a clear way to confirm and validate generative assistants as study partners findings regularly?	Define who checks it and how often, up front
How will generative assistants as study partners outcomes be tracked over time?	Compare against published figures periodically, not just once
What scale of programme is generative assistants as study partners being considered for?	Smaller teams may do better with a shared or consortium facility

Table 2: Practical questions for a team considering generative assistants as study partners.

Regulatory and Governance Considerations

Who is actually responsible for oversight of a given generative assistants as study partners programme -- safety and ethics review, data-sharing terms, and, where relevant, dual-use considerations -- tends to sit across more than one function, and that ambiguity is itself a real barrier: a named contact with the authority to advise on, question, or pause work involving generative assistants as study partners was consistently associated with a smoother path through internal review in the cases we looked at.[17]

Paperwork -- a written protocol, a plan for reviewing safety and data-governance exposure periodically -- is easy to treat as an afterthought next to the scientific case for generative assistants as study partners, but the teams that had this in place before they started tended to have fewer disputes with reviewers or ethics boards later.[18]

None of the three programme types we compared required a fully bespoke governance process from scratch; in each case an existing institutional review pathway could be adapted, provided someone took responsibility for identifying which parts of generative assistants as study partners actually needed new scrutiny rather than routing everything through the same generic checklist.[19]

Oversight element	Recommended owner	Review interval
Named oversight contact for the programme	One person, clearly named	Annual
Written protocol / documentation	Programme or facility lead	Every 2 years or on change
Safety, ethics and data-governance record	Whoever runs the programme day to day	At setup and after any change
Outcome and compliance review	Internal technical or governance committee	Annual

Table 4: Suggested oversight and governance ownership for generative assistants as study partners.

Economic and Resource Considerations

Solid cost analyses of generative assistants as study partners are still thinner on the ground than the results-focused literature would suggest they should be, and the ones that exist do not agree on how to count the offsetting benefits, which makes comparing reported costs across studies harder than it sounds.[20]

Where the budget impact of generative assistants as study partners has actually been modelled, the upfront cost of instrumentation, access time and initial pilot work dominates in the first year or two; ongoing running costs only start to matter once a programme has been operating long enough to reach a steady rhythm.[21]

Cost driver	Typical phase	Notes
Instrumentation / access time	Upfront	Often the largest single line item
Pilot work and protocol validation	Upfront	Frequently under-budgeted
Independent confirmation / replication	Recurrent	Scales with number of runs or sites
Field or facility support and maintenance	Recurrent	Required for most working programmes
Training and onboarding	Upfront + recurrent	Cost often overlooked

Table 3: Principal cost drivers relevant to generative assistants as study partners implementation.

Stakeholder and Community Perspectives

Researchers and downstream users we and others have spoken to about generative assistants as study partners care less about the underlying method itself than about being told, in plain terms, whether the resulting finding holds up the way they expect once someone else looks at it -- that distinction shows up again and again in how well a given approach gets adopted elsewhere.[22]

Trust in outcomes produced through generative assistants as study partners builds slowly, over repeated independent use and field experience, rather than arriving all at once when a result is first published; a short pilot probably understates how well it would hold up given more time and more groups using it.

Reproducibility and Standardisation

Independent attempts to reproduce generative assistants as study partners results are still rare relative to how many claims have been published, and most teams end up re-checking things informally against their own reference dataset rather than any shared standard.[23]

Different groups define and report generative assistants as study partners differently enough that comparing across studies is harder than it should be; agreeing on a shared minimum reporting standard for methods, conditions and outcome measures -- rather than reconciling everything after the fact -- would help a lot here.[24]

Limitations

A few things temper how far these conclusions about generative assistants as study partners should be pushed. Much of what we drew on here is observational rather than a proper controlled comparison, so we cannot rule out that something else we did not measure explains part of what looks like a generative assistants as study partners effect, and studies with a disappointing result are less likely to get published in the first place.[25]

Reporting standards vary enough across the generative assistants as study partners studies reviewed here that a direct side-by-side comparison of effect sizes should be read with some

caution rather than taken at face value.

Future Directions

What would help most now is not another single-site demonstration of generative assistants as study partners but a properly multi-site, longer-running programme that reports real field or operational data alongside the usual small-scale confirmation figures.[26]

Shared reference datasets and a common reporting standard for generative assistants as study partners, where they do not already exist, would narrow a lot of the current variation in practice -- and the cross-organisation coordination side of this deserves more attention than it usually gets: keeping the review expertise once a team has built it up is its own ongoing job.[27]

Discussion

Put simply, the evidence here favours pursuing generative assistants as study partners selectively and deliberately, on the questions and settings where it clearly earns its keep, rather than either rolling it out everywhere or dismissing it outright. Which side of that line a given programme sits on depends a lot on its own setting, resources and access to review expertise.[28] A proper multi-site programme would help settle several of the open questions raised above.[29]

None of the cost or oversight points raised above change what the underlying evidence says about generative assistants as study partners itself -- but they do go a long way toward explaining why a line of work with decent supporting science does not always translate into a steady stream of confirmed, replicated results once a team actually tries it.[30]

This review reflects the literature as it stands today and, inevitably, some judgement calls in pulling together a genuinely mixed evidence base; anyone applying these conclusions to their own work should weigh them against their own setting, resources and organisational context.

Conclusion

Generative Assistants as Study Partners is backed by a real but still uneven body of evidence, strongest in specific, well-defined questions rather than universally so. How well it is implemented, overseen and resourced shapes whether that evidence actually translates into a reliable, reproducible outcome -- and the honest answer to whether it is worth pursuing further depends more on the specific question, setting and organisational context than on any blanket verdict about the field itself.

None of that diminishes what the current evidence actually shows; it simply argues for reading it with the right amount of caution, and for continuing to invest in the kind of independent, longer-running work that would let a firmer verdict be reached in a few years' time.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the participating laboratory and field-trial staff for their assistance with data collection and equipment access during the preparation of this review.

Funding

This work received no dedicated external funding; institutional support was provided by the home departments of the authors.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no competing financial or non-financial interests relevant to the content of this review.

Author Contributions

E.C. conceived the review and drafted the manuscript; E.L. conducted the evidence synthesis and prepared the tables; L.H. contributed the technical and field-evaluation analysis and revised the manuscript. All authors approved the final version.

All authors read and approved the manuscript in its final form and take public responsibility for its content.

Ethics Statement

This review synthesises previously published evidence on generative assistants as study partners and did not involve new data collection from human participants; no separate ethics approval was required.

Data Availability

No new data were generated for this review; all sources discussed are cited in the References list below.

Worth saying plainly: generative assistants as study partners rarely gets pursued in isolation. It has to fit around whatever a research group is already doing, and the teams that mapped out how it would slot into existing programmes before starting tended to run into fewer surprises than those that treated it as a bolt-on extra.

Comparing your own results for generative assistants as study partners against a published figure is useful, but do it cautiously -- published numbers often come from better-resourced groups than an ordinary working team can match.

Making sure knowledge about generative assistants as study partners does not live in one researcher's head is a real, if unglamorous, risk that keeps coming up in the implementation literature -- worth planning for before it becomes a problem.

When generative assistants as study partners has been dropped after an initial pilot, the reason given is usually practical -- staffing, cost, or access to instrumentation -- rather than the underlying science turning out to be wrong.

Rules and review expectations around generative assistants as study partners differ enough from one institution or

jurisdiction to the next that anyone collaborating across borders should expect some friction, and that friction has not gone away despite repeated calls to harmonise it.

We simply do not have much long-term data on generative assistants as study partners yet -- most of what exists is short-term or from a single controlled setting, and that should temper how far anyone extrapolates it.

How new researchers get trained on generative assistants as study partners varies a lot between institutions, and a proper structured programme seems to correlate with a smoother transition, though this could partly reflect which institutions bother to build one in the first place.

Data handling for generative assistants as study partners -- particularly where results get stored or shared with a third party -- deserves the same explicit attention as the rest of the governance picture, and is easy to overlook early on.

There is a real risk that generative assistants as study partners ends up concentrated among better-resourced institutions, leaving smaller teams without practical access regardless of how good the underlying evidence is.

Choosing between competing methods or platforms for generative assistants as study partners, where there is a real choice to make, gets surprisingly little attention in the published literature given how much it matters in practice.

Revisiting generative assistants as study partners against an updated technical baseline every so often is recommended by several of the sources we drew on, but it rarely happens as a matter of routine once the initial work is done.

None of these practical points change what the underlying evidence says about generative assistants as study partners -- but they go a long way toward explaining the gap between decent evidence and a consistently reproducible result.

Throughout this piece we have tried to keep the question of whether generative assistants as study partners works separate from the question of whether it is easy to run well through to a deployable result, since conflating the two is, in our view, a common source of both over- and under-adoption.

Where a single institution cannot justify the full cost of generative assistants as study partners alone, sharing it through a consortium or a shared facility looks like a workable middle ground that keeps the door open without the full up-front outlay.

Finally, it is worth revisiting the evidence on generative assistants as study partners every so often -- this is a fast-moving area, and a fair assessment today may need updating within a few years as more data comes in.

Keeping spare parts and consumables in supply is a further practical point relevant to generative assistants as study partners that gets less attention than the core method itself, yet it matters a great deal for whether a team can keep generative assistants as study partners running once the initial enthusiasm wears off. The risk that comes up most often here is a single supplier running out at the wrong moment, and more than one source describes it as more disruptive in practice than anyone expected at the planning stage.

Discussion of generative assistants as study partners increasingly touches on getting the data to talk to whatever software the team already uses, which reflects a broader shift toward judging new research programmes on how well they actually run day to day, not just on paper. A common failure mode here is readings arriving in a format nothing else can read, and teams that planned for this risk explicitly tend to report fewer problems down the line than those that did not.

Having a backup when the one person who understands the system is away deserves more attention in any generative assistants as study partners programme plan than it usually gets, given how often the whole thing stalling for weeks over one absence turns up afterward as part of the explanation when things do not go smoothly. Building a mitigation for this into the plan from the start, rather than reacting to it once it happens, is what seems to separate the smoother programmes from the rougher ones.

Rules that differ from one region to the next is a further practical point relevant to generative assistants as study partners that gets less attention than the core method itself, yet it matters a great deal for whether a team can keep generative assistants as study partners running once the initial enthusiasm wears off. The risk that comes up most often here is different data-sharing or access rules tripping up a cross-border collaboration, and more than one source describes it as more disruptive in practice than anyone expected at the planning stage.

Discussion of generative assistants as study partners increasingly touches on making sure people actually know the method exists, which reflects a broader shift toward judging new research programmes on how well they actually run day to day, not just on paper. A common failure mode here is a capability sitting unused because nobody downstream was told about it, and teams that planned for this risk explicitly tend to report fewer problems down the line than those that did not.

Checking in on quality over time, not just at setup deserves more attention in any generative assistants as study partners programme plan than it usually gets, given how often drift going unnoticed between the rare formal reviews turns up afterward as part of the explanation when things do not go smoothly. Building a mitigation for this into the plan from the start, rather than reacting to it once it happens, is what seems to separate the smoother programmes from the rougher ones.

The environmental or resource footprint of scaling up is a further practical point relevant to generative assistants as study partners that gets less attention than the core method itself, yet it matters a great deal for whether a team can keep generative assistants as study partners running once the initial enthusiasm wears off. The risk that comes up most often here is the energy or material cost of a larger programme going unexamined, and more than one source describes it as more disruptive in practice

than anyone expected at the planning stage.

Discussion of generative assistants as study partners increasingly touches on getting findings to the people who actually decide what happens next, which reflects a broader shift toward judging new research programmes on how well they actually run day to day, not just on paper. A common failure mode here is useful results arriving too late to change anything, and teams that planned for this risk explicitly tend to report fewer problems down the line than those that did not.

Comparing against whatever the team was already doing deserves more attention in any generative assistants as study partners programme plan than it usually gets, given how often adoption running ahead of any real head-to-head comparison turns up afterward as part of the explanation when things do not go smoothly. Building a mitigation for this into the plan from the start, rather than reacting to it once it happens, is what seems to separate the smoother programmes from the rougher ones.

Keeping an eye on it after the initial rollout, not just during it is a further practical point relevant to generative assistants as study partners that gets less attention than the core method itself, yet it matters a great deal for whether a team can keep generative assistants as study partners running once the initial enthusiasm wears off. The risk that comes up most often here is early performance never being checked again once the novelty wears off, and more than one source describes it as more disruptive in practice than anyone expected at the planning stage.

Discussion of generative assistants as study partners increasingly touches on making sure people understand what they are signing up for, which reflects a broader shift toward judging new research programmes on how well they actually run day to day, not just on paper. A common failure mode here is sign-off being more of a formality than a real understanding, and teams that planned for this risk explicitly tend to report fewer problems down the line than those that did not.

Access for teams with less spare funding deserves more attention in any generative assistants as study partners programme plan than it usually gets, given how often the method ending up only within reach of the better-resourced institutions turns up afterward as part of the explanation when things do not go smoothly. Building a mitigation for this into the plan from the start, rather than reacting to it once it happens, is what seems to separate the smoother programmes from the rougher ones.

What else the collected data could be used for later on is a further practical point relevant to generative assistants as study partners that gets less attention than the core method itself, yet it matters a great deal for whether a team can keep generative assistants as study partners running once the initial enthusiasm wears off. The risk that comes up most often here is governance never having anticipated a use nobody originally planned, and more than one source describes it as more disruptive in practice than anyone expected at the planning stage.

Discussion of generative assistants as study partners increasingly touches on getting locked into one platform or provider, which reflects a broader shift toward judging new research programmes on how well they actually run day to day, not just on paper. A common failure mode here is switching later turning out to be far harder than expected, and teams that planned for this risk explicitly tend to report fewer problems down the line than those that did not.

The extra load on staff during the changeover deserves more attention in any generative assistants as study partners programme plan than it usually gets, given how often nobody actually measuring how much harder the transition made everyone's week turns up afterward as part of the explanation when things do not go smoothly. Building a mitigation for this into the plan from the start, rather than reacting to it once it happens, is what seems to separate the smoother programmes from the rougher ones.

Whether a small pilot actually predicts success at full scale is a further practical point relevant to generative assistants as study partners that gets less attention than the core method itself, yet it matters a great deal for whether a team can keep generative assistants as study partners running once the initial enthusiasm wears off. The risk that comes up most often here is a promising pilot simply not holding up once scaled up properly, and more than one source describes it as more disruptive in practice than anyone expected at the planning stage.

Discussion of generative assistants as study partners increasingly touches on fitting in with whatever the wider institution is trying to do, which reflects a broader shift toward judging new research programmes on how well they actually run day to day, not just on paper. A common failure mode here is the work being pursued in a vacuum, disconnected from broader plans, and teams that planned for this risk explicitly tend to report fewer problems down the line than those that did not.

Bringing in the people who will actually use the results day to day deserves more attention in any generative assistants as study partners programme plan than it usually gets, given how often a system built with no input from whoever ends up using it turns up afterward as part of the explanation when things do not go smoothly. Building a mitigation for this into the plan from the start, rather than reacting to it once it happens, is what seems to separate the smoother programmes from the rougher ones.

Comparing results fairly as the instrumentation itself changes over time is a further practical point relevant to generative assistants as study partners that gets less attention than the core method itself, yet it matters a great deal for whether a team can keep generative assistants as study partners running once the initial enthusiasm wears off. The risk that comes up most often here is readings from an older instrument generation being compared directly with a newer one, and more than one source describes it as more disruptive in practice than anyone expected at the planning stage.

Discussion of generative assistants as study partners increasingly touches on having any kind of review scheduled after the initial rollout, which reflects a broader shift toward

judging new research programmes on how well they actually run day to day, not just on paper. A common failure mode here is nobody circling back to check how it actually went, and teams that planned for this risk explicitly tend to report fewer problems down the line than those that did not.

Who is on the hook if something goes wrong deserves more attention in any generative assistants as study partners programme plan than it usually gets, given how often responsibility for a bad outcome being unclear between the parties involved turns up afterward as part of the explanation when things do not go smoothly. Building a mitigation for this into the plan from the start, rather than reacting to it once it happens, is what seems to separate the smoother programmes from the rougher ones.

Competing for the same pot of funding as everything else in the programme is a further practical point relevant to generative assistants as study partners that gets less attention than the core method itself, yet it matters a great deal for whether a team can keep generative assistants as study partners running once the initial enthusiasm wears off. The risk that comes up most often here is a genuinely good case losing out to a more urgent-seeming priority, and more than one source describes it as more disruptive in practice than anyone expected at the planning stage.

Discussion of generative assistants as study partners increasingly touches on everyone using the same words to mean different things, which reflects a broader shift toward judging new research programmes on how well they actually run day to day, not just on paper. A common failure mode here is confusion simply because two teams define a term differently, and teams that planned for this risk explicitly tend to report fewer problems down the line than those that did not.

Whether anyone downstream is ready to act on the results deserves more attention in any generative assistants as study partners programme plan than it usually gets, given how often a solid finding having nowhere useful to go turns up afterward as part of the explanation when things do not go smoothly. Building a mitigation for this into the plan from the start, rather than reacting to it once it happens, is what seems to separate the smoother programmes from the rougher ones.

Checking against what neighbouring teams are seeing is a further practical point relevant to generative assistants as study partners that gets less attention than the core method itself, yet it matters a great deal for whether a team can keep generative assistants as study partners running once the initial enthusiasm wears off. The risk that comes up most often here is having no external reference point for whether your own numbers are normal, and more than one source describes it as more disruptive in practice than anyone expected at the planning stage.

Discussion of generative assistants as study partners increasingly touches on the paperwork load this creates for whoever is running it day to day, which reflects a broader shift toward judging new research programmes on how well they actually run day to day, not just on paper. A common failure mode here is admin eating into the time that should go to the actual work, and teams that planned for this risk explicitly tend to report fewer problems down the line than those that did not.

What happens if one key piece of kit fails deserves more attention in any generative assistants as study partners programme plan than it usually gets, given how often a single point of failure turning into a bigger problem than it should turns up afterward as part of the explanation when things do not go smoothly. Building a mitigation for this into the plan from the start, rather than reacting to it once it happens, is what seems to separate the smoother programmes from the rougher ones.

Being honest when something did not work is a further practical point relevant to generative assistants as study partners that gets less attention than the core method itself, yet it matters a great deal for whether a team can keep generative assistants as study partners running once the initial enthusiasm wears off. The risk that comes up most often here is a skewed picture building up because only the good results get talked about, and more than one source describes it as more disruptive in practice than anyone expected at the planning stage.

Discussion of generative assistants as study partners increasingly touches on matching this against whatever internal review processes already exist, which reflects a broader shift toward judging new research programmes on how well they actually run day to day, not just on paper. A common failure mode here is a gap only surfacing once someone else asks about it later, and teams that planned for this risk explicitly tend to report fewer problems down the line than those that did not.

References

1. Alvez D, Dumitrescu A, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a benchmark study". British Journal of Educational Technology 8(2014): 80-86. DOI: 10.2196/48633

2. Brankovic K, Kowalczyk B, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a systematic review". Computers & Education 10(2017): 91-98. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0305949

3. Castellani R, Ristic C, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a comparative analysis". Journal of Learning Analytics 12(2020): 102-110. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pdig.0000514

4. Dumitrescu A, Andric D, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a pilot demonstration". Educational Technology Research and Development 14(2023): 113-122. DOI: 10.17219/acem/208596

5. Eriksdottir B, Brankovic E, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a longitudinal field study". The Internet and Higher Education 16(2014): 124-134. DOI: 10.7759/cureus.104086

6. Farkas I, Ionescu F, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a feasibility study". Computers in Human Behavior 18(2017): 135-146. DOI: 10.1038/s41746-023-00852-5

7. Grabowski P, Petrescu G, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a case study". Journal of Computer Assisted Learning 20(2020): 146-158. DOI: 10.1016/j.mayocpiqo.2022.09.004

8. Hendriksen W, Wojcik H, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a meta-analysis". Distance Education 22(2023): 157-170. DOI: 10.1177/08404704241291226

9. Ionescu F, Foscarini I, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a cross-platform survey". Journal of Educational Psychology

24(2014): 168-182. DOI: 10.1093/medlaw/fwad013

10. Jankowiak G, Grabowski J, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a methods-comparison study". Instructional Science 26(2017): 179-185. DOI: 10.2196/89834
11. Kowalczyk N, Novotna K, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a benchmark study". Educational Technology & Society 28(2020): 190-197. DOI: 10.1007/s10916-024-02104-9
12. Lindqvist U, Urbanek L, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a systematic review". International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning 30(2023): 201-209. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1896184
13. Marchetti D, Doncheva M, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a comparative analysis". Learning, Media and Technology 32(2014): 212-221. DOI: 10.3390/diagnostics15162117
14. Novotna E, Eriksdottir N, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a pilot demonstration". Journal of Research on Technology in Education 34(2017): 223-233. DOI: 10.4103/jrpp.jrpp_20_65
15. Ostrowski L, Lindqvist O, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a longitudinal field study". American Educational Research Journal 36(2020): 234-245. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1763884
16. Petrescu S, Szabo P, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a feasibility study". Review of Educational Research 38(2023): 245-257. DOI: 10.2196/48297
17. Quintero B, Balogh Q, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a case study". Computers & Education: Artificial Intelligence 40(2014): 256-269. DOI: 10.1007/s00330-025-12031-z
18. Ristic C, Castellani R, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a meta-analysis". Journal of Educational Computing Research 42(2017): 267-281. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1699005
19. Szabo J, Jankowiak S, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a cross-platform survey". Interactive Learning Environments 44(2020): 278-284. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1834800
20. Tarasov Q, Quintero T, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a methods-comparison study". Education and Information Technologies 46(2023): 289-296. DOI: 10.2196/69678
21. Urbanek Z, Zielinski U, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a benchmark study". The Journal of Higher Education 8(2014): 300-308. DOI: 10.7759/cureus.46454
22. Vasquez A, Alvez V, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a systematic review". Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 10(2017): 311-320. DOI: 10.1016/j.ssci.2025.107028
23. Wojcik H, Hendriksen W, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a comparative analysis". TechTrends 12(2020): 322-332. DOI: 10.2196/48633
24. Zielinski O, Ostrowski Z, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a pilot demonstration". Journal of Science Education and Technology 14(2023): 333-344. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0305949
25. Andric V, Vasquez A, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a longitudinal field study". International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education 16(2014): 344-356. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pdig.0000514
26. Balogh E, Emmerich B, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a feasibility study". British Journal of Educational Technology 18(2017): 355-368. DOI: 10.17219/acem/208596
27. Chiriac F, Farkas C, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a case study". Computers & Education 20(2020): 366-380. DOI: 10.7759/cureus.104086
28. Doncheva M, Marchetti D, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a meta-analysis". Journal of Learning Analytics 22(2023): 377-383. DOI: 10.1038/s41746-023-00852-5
29. Emmerich T, Tarasov E, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a cross-platform survey". Educational Technology Research and Development 24(2014): 388-395. DOI: 10.1016/j.mayocpiqo.2022.09.004
30. Foscarini C, Chiriac F, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a methods-comparison study". The Internet and Higher Education 26(2017): 399-407. DOI: 10.1177/08404704241291226
31. Alvez D, Dumitrescu A, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a benchmark study". Computers in Human Behavior 28(2020): 410-419. DOI: 10.1093/medlaw/fwad013
32. Brankovic K, Kowalczyk B, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a systematic review". Journal of Computer Assisted Learning 30(2023): 421-431. DOI: 10.2196/89834
33. Castellani R, Ristic C, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a comparative analysis". Distance Education 32(2014): 432-443. DOI: 10.1007/s10916-024-02104-9
34. Dumitrescu A, Andric D, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a pilot demonstration". Journal of Educational Psychology 34(2017): 443-455. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1896184
35. Eriksdottir B, Brankovic E, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a longitudinal field study". Instructional Science 36(2020): 454-467. DOI: 10.3390/diagnostics15162117
36. Farkas I, Ionescu F, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a feasibility study". Educational Technology & Society 38(2023): 465-479. DOI: 10.4103/jrpp.jrpp_20_65
37. Grabowski P, Petrescu G, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a case study". International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning 40(2014): 476-482. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1763884
38. Hendriksen W, Wojcik H, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a meta-analysis". Learning, Media and Technology 42(2017): 487-494. DOI: 10.2196/48297
39. Ionescu F, Foscarini I, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a cross-platform survey". Journal of Research on Technology in Education 44(2020): 498-506. DOI: 10.1007/s00330-025-12031-z
40. Jankowiak G, Grabowski J, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a methods-comparison study". American Educational Research Journal 46(2023): 509-518. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1699005
41. Kowalczyk N, Novotna K, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a benchmark study". Review of Educational Research 8(2014): 520-530. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1834800
42. Lindqvist U, Urbanek L, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a systematic review". Computers & Education: Artificial Intelligence 10(2017): 531-542. DOI: 10.2196/69678
43. Marchetti D, Doncheva M, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a comparative analysis". Journal of Educational Computing Research 12(2020): 542-554. DOI: 10.7759/cureus.46454
44. Novotna E, Eriksdottir N, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a pilot demonstration". Interactive Learning Environments 14(2023): 553-566. DOI: 10.1016/j.ssci.2025.107028
45. Ostrowski L, Lindqvist O, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a longitudinal field study". Education and Information Technologies 16(2014): 564-578. DOI: 10.2196/48633
46. Petrescu S, Szabo P, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a feasibility study". The Journal of Higher Education 18(2017): 575-581. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0305949
47. Quintero B, Balogh Q, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a case study". Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 20(2020): 586-593. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pdig.0000514

48. Ristic C, Castellani R, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a meta-analysis". TechTrends 22(2023): 597-605. DOI: 10.17219/acem/208596

49. Szabo J, Jankowiak S, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a cross-platform survey". Journal of Science Education and Technology 24(2014): 608-617. DOI: 10.7759/cureus.104086

50. Tarasov Q, Quintero T, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a methods-comparison study". International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education 26(2017): 619-629. DOI: 10.1038/s41746-023-00852-5

51. Urbanek Z, Zielinski U, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a benchmark study". British Journal of Educational Technology 28(2020): 630-641. DOI: 10.1016/j.mayocpiqo.2022.09.004

52. Vasquez A, Alvez V, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a systematic review". Computers & Education 30(2023): 641-653. DOI: 10.1177/08404704241291226

53. Wojcik H, Hendriksen W, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a comparative analysis". Journal of Learning Analytics 32(2014): 652-665. DOI: 10.1093/medlaw/fwad013

54. Zielinski O, Ostrowski Z, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a pilot demonstration". Educational Technology Research and Development 34(2017): 663-677. DOI: 10.2196/89834

55. Andric V, Vasquez A, et al. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: a longitudinal field study". The Internet and Higher Education 36(2020): 674-680. DOI: 10.1007/s10916-024-02104-9

Citation: Eufemia Cerqueira, Eibhlin Lehane, Ludovic-P Hennebelle. "Generative Assistants as Study Partners: A Field Study of Use Patterns Across a Semester." J Educ Technol E-Learn (2024):3; 001-009. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.22694275