THE COGNITIVE COST OF CONVENIENCE: NEURAL AND EDUCATIONAL IMPACTS OF CHATGPT USE IN STUDENT LEARNING

JOURNAL OF AI-AUTHORED ARTICLES AND IMAGINARY CREATIONS

Not submitted yet!

J AI Auth Articl Imagin Creat, , **0**(0): 0-3, Document ID: JAIAAIC0, doi:
Review

The Cognitive Cost of Convenience: Neural and Educational Impacts of ChatGPT Use in Student Learning

Ata Şah*
For affiliations and correspondence, see the last page.

Abstract

The rise of generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools like ChatGPT has transformed academic writing and learning practices. While these technologies offer convenience and efficiency, their long-term cognitive implications remain underexplored. This article analyzes a recent MIT study that tracked 54 students over four months to evaluate the neural and cognitive effects of ChatGPT use in educational settings. Using EEG scans, performance metrics, and qualitative interviews, the study found that students relying on ChatGPT—regardless of how strategically—demonstrated reduced brain activity, weaker memory formation, diminished cognitive ownership, and homogenized writing. In contrast, students who worked without external tools developed stronger neural networks and cognitive resilience. Crucially, students who built foundational thinking skills before using AI experienced cognitive enhancement rather than suppression. These findings challenge current assumptions about responsible AI use in education and highlight the urgent need for cognitive protectionism—deliberately preserving mental effort in early learning stages. The article calls for a fundamental redesign of assessment, pedagogy, and policy to ensure that AI enhances rather than replaces human cognition in the classroom.

Keywords: Cognitive Development, Memory Retention, Human Brain, Chatgpt, Academic Integrity, Artificial Intelligence In Education, Power Of Thinking

The advent of large language models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT has revolutionized the educational landscape, enabling students to generate essays, structure arguments, and refine grammar with unprecedented ease. However, this convenience raises critical questions about the cognitive consequences of relying on artificial intelligence in academic settings. A groundbreaking study from MIT has revealed that students who regularly use ChatGPT for academic writing not only exhibit weaker neural activity during cognitive tasks but also show a decline in memory retention, cognitive engagement, and individual authorship.

This article explores the findings of this study and examines the broader implications for education in an AI-integrated world. Specifically, it considers how early and excessive dependence on generative AI affects neural development, reduces cognitive ownership of learning tasks, and risks eroding the foundational thinking skills education is designed to cultivate. While AI can be a powerful tool, the key challenge for educators, policymakers, and learners lies in ensuring that it enhances rather than replaces cognitive development.

The integration of AI into educational processes has been both celebrated for its democratizing potential and criticized for its impact on intellectual autonomy. Prior research has primarily focused on productivity gains, writing assistance, and ethical concerns around plagiarism and authorship. However, recent studies are beginning to uncover deeper, more concerning cognitive effects.

1. AI as a Cognitive Crutch

Studies have shown that students increasingly use ChatGPT not just to support their work but to perform core cognitive tasks such as ideation, organization, and phrasing. As reported in the MIT study, students who relied on ChatGPT—even for minor roles such as checking grammar or generating transition sentences—experienced a measurable decline in memory retention and self-reported authorship. Their brain scans indicated significantly lower engagement in alpha and beta networks, which are associated with attention, information processing, and working

memory.

2. Neural Network Activity and Learning Tools

Cognitive neuroscience suggests that the act of struggling through a task is crucial to building durable learning. According to Sweller's Cognitive Load Theory and subsequent educational psychology frameworks, effort and attention are essential to transferring information from working memory to long-term memory. The MIT study supports this view by demonstrating that students who worked without external tools formed stronger, more distributed neural networks. In contrast, those who relied on AI showed a "flattening" of neural engagement across multiple tasks, indicating a form of cognitive atrophy.

3. Impact on Originality and Critical Thinking

An emergent concern in AI-assisted learning is the homogenization of student output. The MIT research revealed that AI-generated essays, though often grammatically correct and well-structured, displayed uniformity in vocabulary, tone, and structure. This convergence undermines the development of individual voice and critical thinking—two hallmarks of meaningful education. Prior literature has highlighted similar trends in automated essay grading and AI tutoring systems, which tend to reward formulaic expression over original insight.

4. The Ethics and Perception Gap

While plagiarism and academic dishonesty have long been concerns in education, the ethical ambiguity of using AI tools complicates traditional norms. The MIT study found that many students did not perceive their use of ChatGPT as dishonest. Participants reported using the tool “strategically” or for “non-essential” tasks, believing they retained authorship. However, EEG data and follow-up interviews contradicted this perception, revealing diminished cognitive investment and a disconnection from their own writing. This gap between ethical self-perception and neural engagement presents a challenge for educational policy and classroom instruction.

5. AI Integration and Cognitive Development: A Matter of Timing

Perhaps the most hopeful finding from the study is that students who first developed strong cognitive habits before introducing AI tools were able to benefit from AI assistance without the same neural costs. These students demonstrated increased neural activity when introduced to ChatGPT later in the study, suggesting that foundational thinking skills may serve as a buffer against cognitive dependency. This aligns with constructivist learning theory, which emphasizes the importance of scaffolding and sequential skill development.

Methodology

The MIT study employed a mixed-methods longitudinal design over a four-month period to assess how generative AI affects student cognition, memory, and neural activity. A total of 54 undergraduate students were divided into three experimental groups:

- **Group A (AI-Dependent):** Students were allowed to use ChatGPT for writing tasks.
- **Group B (Search-Only):** Students could only use traditional online search engines.
- **Group C (Control Group):** Students were not allowed to use any external tools.

All students completed a series of writing assignments, memory tests, and cognitive reflection tasks at scheduled intervals. In addition to behavioral data, real-time EEG (electroencephalography) was used to monitor brain activity during these tasks. Semi-structured interviews provided qualitative insights into student behaviors and perceptions of AI use.

The research design allowed for controlled comparisons between groups and across time. In the fourth session, crossover conditions were introduced: some students in the control group were granted access to ChatGPT, while some AI-dependent students were required to work unaided. This provided insights into the effects of prior cognitive engagement versus long-term AI reliance.

Findings

1. Neural Activity and Cognitive Load

EEG scans revealed stark differences between groups:

- **Group C (no tools)** showed the highest levels of activity in alpha and beta bands, associated with attention, memory formation, and analytic thinking.
- **Group B (search users)** demonstrated moderate engagement, suggesting a balance between tool use and

active cognition.

- **Group A (ChatGPT users)** consistently exhibited reduced neural activity, particularly in regions responsible for critical reasoning and memory retrieval.

When AI-reliant students were asked to complete tasks without assistance in the final session, their brains showed **"under-engagement of key networks"**—a sign of cognitive atrophy.

2. Memory and Ownership

Students using ChatGPT were often unable to recall key points from essays they had written just minutes earlier. Many reported feeling like they were only "50% authors" of their work. In contrast, students who wrote without AI were more confident in their recollections and claimed full ownership of their content.

3. Homogenization of Content

AI-written essays tended to exhibit predictable patterns—similar transitions, vocabulary, and structures. Human graders could consistently identify these essays even without knowing the conditions, citing a lack of creativity and individuality. Despite receiving passing grades, AI-written content lacked personal voice and deep insight.

4. Strategic Use Still Had Costs

Even students who used ChatGPT in so-called responsible ways (e.g., to generate outlines or improve grammar) demonstrated cognitive decline over time. The neural evidence showed reduced connectivity even in these "strategic" users, undermining the assumption that light AI use is cognitively harmless.

5. Timing Matters

Students who were introduced to ChatGPT after developing strong foundational skills (Group C crossover participants) showed **increased** neural activity when using the tool. Their brains exhibited enhanced alpha, beta, theta, and delta activity—suggesting cognitive augmentation rather than suppression.

Discussion

These findings underscore the delicate balance between **AI assistance** and **cognitive development**. While ChatGPT can streamline academic tasks, its long-term use may lead to cognitive outsourcing—where essential thinking processes are handed off to the machine. This undermines the primary goal of education: to cultivate independent, capable minds.

The concept of **cognitive protectionism** emerges as a key recommendation. Just as muscles require resistance to grow, the brain needs effortful tasks to strengthen. By insulating early stages of learning from AI, educators can ensure students develop the neural resilience and critical faculties needed to engage meaningfully with advanced tools later.

The implications for pedagogy are profound:

- **Assessment models** must evolve. Standard essays and multiple-choice tests become obsolete when AI can complete them effortlessly.
- **Instructional design** must emphasize foundational thinking before introducing automation.
- **Professional development** for educators becomes essential to understanding AI's neurocognitive impact and adapting accordingly.

Moreover, this study challenges the view that AI is neutral or purely assistive. The neural data suggests that **even light or strategic AI use** changes how the brain works. If educational institutions ignore this, they risk producing students who can perform but cannot think.

Conclusion

The MIT study offers a clear message: **the brain does less when AI does more**. While ChatGPT offers undeniable convenience, it also creates cognitive dependencies that weaken memory, reduce critical thinking, and diminish authorship.

Yet the solution is not to ban AI, but to **sequence its use** wisely. When students first build cognitive strength, AI can become a powerful tool for extension and collaboration. When they start with AI, however, they may never develop those mental muscles.

This moment in educational history demands thoughtful response. We must choose between cultivating **AI-literate thinkers** or creating a generation dependent on digital scaffolding. The tools

we use shape the minds we build. If we want a future of empowered, independent thinkers, we must ensure that education doesn't just teach students how to use AI—but how to think without it.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Janet Baker for her insightful feedback on the first draft of the manuscript. We also would like to thank Lendra Hassman and Luisa Heiss for their thorough grading of the essays.

The study was proposed, designed, and executed by NK. NK also covered roughly ¼ of all data recording sessions with the participants. NK and EH processed and analyzed both EEG and NLP data in this study. NK and EH drafted the manuscript. AVB, YTY, XHL were the interns of NK, who helped with the ¾ of data recording sessions with the participants. JS and IB helped with the state of the art drafting section of the paper. IB additionally supported audio-to-text transcriptions of the participants' interviews. PM gave feedback on the study design and the early draft of the manuscript.

Bibliography

[1] MIT Media Lab (2025). "Your Brain on ChatGPT: Accumulation of Cognitive Debt when Using an AI Assistant for Essay Writing Task." Study findings showing LLM users consistently underperformed at neural, linguistic, and behavioral levels over four months.

[2] ResearchGate (2025). Brain connectivity analysis revealing systematic scaling of cognitive activity based on external tool support levels.

[4] MIT Media Lab (2025). Participant interaction classifications showing various ChatGPT usage patterns from strategic structuring to passive copy-pasting.

[5] MIT Media Lab (2025). Interview data on student perceived ownership and authorship of AI-assisted essays.

[6] MIT Media Lab (2025). EEG analysis showing reduced neural connectivity in LLM users across alpha, beta, theta, and delta frequency bands.

[7] MIT Media Lab (2025). Session 4 results showing Brain-to-LLM participants demonstrated higher neural connectivity than LLM-only users.

[8] MIT Media Lab (2025). LLM-to-Brain group analysis showing persistent under-engagement of neural networks after AI tool removal.

[9] MIT Media Lab (2025). Natural language processing analysis revealing homogeneity in vocabulary, structure, and topic ontology within LLM group essays.

[10] MIT Media Lab (2025). Network-wide connectivity spikes observed in Brain-to-LLM participants across all frequency bands.

[11] MIT Media Lab (2025). Human teacher evaluation results identifying AI-generated content through conventional structure and homogeneity patterns.

[12] World Economic Forum (2025). Future of Jobs Report projecting 40% change in required workforce skills within five years.

Affiliations and Corresponding Informations

Corresponding: Ata Şah
Email:
Phone: 05060568409

Ata Şah:
Muğla