

Beyond Tools: Generative AI as Epistemic Infrastructure in Education

Bodong Chen, University of Pennsylvania

Abstract

Background: Generative AI is rapidly being integrated into educational infrastructures worldwide, transforming how knowledge is created, validated, and shared in educational contexts. These AI technologies are reshaping epistemic operations traditionally performed by humans, raising questions about how they might impact human epistemic agency in educational contexts. However, current discourse has inadequately addressed the implications of AI systems as epistemic infrastructures that mediate the fundamental processes of teaching and learning.

Purpose: This paper investigates how emerging AI systems function as epistemic infrastructures in education and analyzes their impact on human epistemic agency. It proposes a situated cognition perspective for examining AI integration in education that considers both the epistemic actions of human agents and how infrastructures enable or constrain these actions.

Research Design: This study follows the value-sensitive design approach to conduct a technical investigation on two representative AI systems widely deployed in educational settings. Following a situated cognition framework, the analysis focuses on how these AI systems impact teacher practice across three dimensions: affordances for skilled epistemic actions, support for epistemic sensitivity, and implications for long-term habit formation. This approach provides a multi-faceted evaluation of how AI systems either enhance or constrain teachers' epistemic agency in their professional practice.

Conclusions: The analysis reveals that current AI systems inadequately support the skilled epistemic actions of teachers, insufficiently foster epistemic sensitivity, and potentially cultivate problematic long-term habits in educational practice, often prioritizing efficiency over epistemic agency. To address these challenges, the paper recommends recognizing the infrastructural transformation occurring in education, developing AI environments that stimulate skilled actions while upholding epistemic norms, and involving educators in AI design processes. These recommendations aim to foster AI integration that aligns with core educational values and maintains human epistemic agency.

Introduction

Generative artificial intelligence (AI¹) technologies, represented by tools like ChatGPT, are undoubtedly impacting education, challenging established practices and sparking debates about the purpose and value of education. While initially viewed with skepticism for its potential damage to academic integrity, generative AI is progressively integrated in educational systems worldwide. This integration process is fraught with tensions, as discussions about AI in education are shaped by complex social, economic, organizational, and geopolitical dynamics (Bearman et al., 2023; Nemorin

¹ AI and generative AI are not distinguished in this paper. Given the centrality of generative AI in current discourse, AI refers primarily to generative AI in this paper unless explicitly stated otherwise.

et al., 2023). In the United States, this complexity manifests in the mixed reactions—both support and opposition—to various AI policy initiatives by large public school districts in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

Concurrently, the educational technology market is marching ahead, producing a range of AI-powered technologies for education use cases. These technologies—featuring automated lesson planning, content customization, and adaptive learning support—often promise to significantly reduce teacher workload or offer personalized learning for students (Celik et al., 2022; Zheng et al., 2024). Many of these development efforts are backed by private ventures, while substantial investment from governmental and philanthropic sources has also contributed to the integration of AI into global educational infrastructures. Meanwhile, organizations like UNESCO have initiated the development of comprehensive AI competency frameworks for both teachers and students (UNESCO, 2024), effectively positioning AI use not only as an essential element of educational practice but also as an educational outcome in its own right.

Amid these developments, AI's integration into educational systems raises important issues. The rapid development of AI tools has largely been driven by technology companies whose interests may not align with educational values, potentially neglecting important issues such as equity, inclusivity, and transparency (Nemorin et al., 2023; van de Poel, 2020). Concerns about bias, privacy, and AI hallucination compound these challenges, with public trust often eroded by AI companies' opaque data practices (Nguyen et al., 2023).

Foundational educational principles have long guided our understanding of education: children should learn to read and write, educational institutions should educate, and teachers should play central roles in supporting student learning (Hansen, 2019). Many of these principles are *epistemic* in nature—concerned with how knowledge is created, validated, shared, and applied in educational contexts. These principles underpin the fundamental processes of teaching and learning, embedding implicit “contracts” in education systems that shape various types of epistemic operations. However, contemporary discourse on AI in education has inadequately addressed how these technologies affect epistemic operations performed by humans in education systems. A critical question emerges: How might AI impact human epistemic agency—the capacity of educators and students to control their processes of knowledge formation and revision? As AI systems increasingly mediate this epistemic agency, they influence not only how information is accessed and disseminated but also how knowledge itself is understood and validated (Coeckelbergh, 2022; Marin, 2022; Prunkl, 2022). Educational stakeholders now navigate an epistemic environment profoundly shaped by AI algorithms and applications, which may either enhance or constrain their ability to perform epistemic operations essential to education's ethical commitments.

Against this backdrop, this paper addresses a critical yet under-explored area at the intersection of AI and education: the role of AI technologies as *epistemic infrastructures*. Epistemic infrastructures are foundational frameworks and systems that facilitate the pursuit of knowledge and understanding within a particular context (Marin, 2022). As generative AI technologies increasingly assume roles traditionally fulfilled by humans, these infrastructures are being fundamentally reshaped, impacting epistemic practices, agency, and the nature of knowledge creation, dissemination, and preservation (Coeckelbergh, 2022; Pavlik, 2023). Education is not immune from this change.

To address these critical questions about AI as epistemic infrastructure in education, this paper begins with an overview of AI integration in educational contexts, establishing the conceptual

foundations of epistemic agency and infrastructure. Building on this foundation, I propose a situated framework for analyzing AI integration from an epistemic perspective, drawing insights from interdisciplinary fields including information science, computer science, educational technology, and political epistemology (Coeckelbergh, 2022; Prunkl, 2022). The framework is then applied to examine real-world applications and case studies that illustrate both current limitations and potential opportunities. The paper concludes by articulating theoretical and practical implications, offering recommendations for responsibly integrating AI within educational systems in ways that sustain and enhance human epistemic agency while promoting an ethically aligned vision of AI in education.

Understanding Generative AI

Generative AI encompasses a class of AI models whose primary function is to *generate* outputs including text, images, music, audio, and video. These systems include large language models (e.g., ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude), image generators (e.g., DALL-E, Midjourney, Stable Diffusion), code generation tools (e.g., Copilot), and audio synthesis applications (from Google and ElevenLabs). Large language models (LLMs) are trained initially on vast text corpora to predict the next token in a sequence, then refined through reinforcement learning to follow specific instructions effectively (Brown et al., 2020; Ouyang et al., 2022). Similarly, image generators are trained on massive datasets comprising text-image pairs, learning to associate textual descriptions with corresponding visual representations, thereby becoming capable of generating images from text prompts (Radford et al., 2021). These AI models are massive—often containing billions or trillions of parameters. They are commonly referred to as “foundational models,” as they demonstrate broad capabilities that can be adapted to various specific applications. The field continues to evolve with specialized foundational models that process diverse information modalities, including newer models capable of handling spatial information and navigating physical environments (M. Lee et al., 2024). Concurrently, AI models with multi-modal capabilities have emerged that can process and generate various information types—text, images, and audio—integrating multiple capabilities into unified platforms.

These foundation models have demonstrated remarkable technical capabilities across multiple domains. Even before the generative AI era, narrow AI systems have surpassed human performance in games like chess and Go. Generative AI has since expanded into creative and scientific endeavors, helping designers develop new fonts and sketches (Carter & Nielsen, 2017), exploring protein structures through models like AlphaFold, and supporting creative work in scriptwriting, arts, and scientific research (Anantrasirichai & Bull, 2022; Dell’Acqua et al., 2023; H.-K. Lee, 2022). Advanced systems now coordinate multiple AI agents to accomplish complex collaborative tasks, further extending AI’s role in augmenting human cognitive capabilities.

Among efforts to help us grapple with AI, rigorous benchmark testing has emerged as a key approach to evaluate AI capabilities against human performance standards. These assessments measure AI performance on tasks ranging from bar exams to academic proficiency levels (grade 8, college, master’s, PhD), often drawing direct comparisons to human cognition. While these benchmarks provide valuable performance metrics, they suffer from significant limitations. They typically treat AI systems as “black boxes,” making the interpretability of their outcomes challenging (Das & Varshney, 2022; Nguyen et al., 2023). More critically, these evaluations often fail to acknowledge the fundamental differences between AI processing and human cognition, creating misleading analogies that obscure rather than illuminate our understanding of AI capabilities (Prunkl, 2022).

Understanding the fundamental differences between AI and human cognition is essential for meaningful AI integration in social contexts. While deep learning models draw inspiration from biological neurons (Silver et al., 2017), their architecture and learning mechanisms diverge significantly from human cognition (Mitchell, 2019). Humans develop knowledge through embodied experience, social interaction, and conscious reflection, whereas AI primarily operates through “parametric knowledge” stored in billions of model parameters (Bommasani et al., 2022). This parametric knowledge relies on statistical pattern recognition from training data rather than conceptual understanding or causal reasoning. As Ted Chiang aptly described in *The New Yorker*, ChatGPT functions essentially as a “blurry JPEG of the web” (Chiang, 2023)—capable of generating impressively coherent content without genuine comprehension. Human cognition involves intentionality, consciousness, and embodied understanding that AI fundamentally lacks (at least for now). While researchers work to make AI more explainable (Adadi & Berrada, 2018; Yu et al., 2024), these efforts are consistently outpaced by the rapid development and deployment of increasingly complex AI systems in society.

Socio-technical implications of AI systems are profound and go far beyond the technical capabilities of AI models. AI’s impact is evident across domains. In chess, grandmasters have been learning from powerful chess engines for many years. In knowledge-creating domains, generative AI has created a “jagged technological frontier” where AI outperforms humans in certain but not all tasks (Dell’Acqua et al., 2023). As AI technologies permeate different sectors and devices, they redefine technological frontiers and redistribute labor and agency across social activities. Creativity is redefined, raising not only economic questions but also philosophical questions on human agency, dignity, and human-AI relations (H.-K. Lee, 2022; Prunkl, 2022).

Epistemic Concerns with Generative AI in Society

Throughout history, emerging information technologies—from the printing press to the Internet—have disrupted established patterns of knowledge creation, curation, and access. AI represents an intensification of these transformations, as it not only provides tools for information retrieval but also performs interpretive functions on our behalf, often with limited transparency. Simultaneously, AI systems are altering creative work processes and challenging fundamental societal assumptions about the relationship between humans and intelligent technologies.

One notable change is how AI affects human sense-making processes through “knowledge engines” that present AI generated summaries. For example, in 2025 Google rolls out “AI Overview” that provides an AI-generated snapshot with links picked from Google Search results. While these AI-generated snapshots offer convenience, they bypass critical cognitive steps of active sense-making—gathering diverse sources, evaluating credibility, and assembling interpretations—that traditional search engines still required users to perform. Instead of engaging deeply with source materials, users receive pre-digested information that creates an “illusion of understanding” (Nemorin et al., 2023), with the AI functioning as an “epistemic broker” presenting authoritative-sounding conclusions. Riedl (2019) warns these “black-box authoritative statements” encourage “epistemic passivity,” potentially undermining epistemic agency as individuals no longer directly evaluate claims or weigh different perspectives, risking a collapse of deeper interpretative processes across society.

The second major concern emerges when AI is integrated into creative workflows. Whether helping humans brainstorm ideas, explore design options, or generate artifacts, AI raises profound questions about ownership and accountability of epistemic processes and outcomes (Eshraghian, 2020; H.-K. Lee, 2022). As AI systems increasingly contribute to creative and intellectual work—from writing code to composing music to generating scientific hypotheses—the boundaries between human and machine contributions become blurred. This blurring challenges traditional notions of authorship, expertise, and creative agency, potentially reshaping how society values human creative labor and intellectual contribution.

A third, more fundamental concern is cultural—how society conceptualizes the relationship between humans and AI. The widespread depiction of large AI models as “knowing beings” introduces a linguistic framing that shapes public discourse. Compared to older content-management systems or even advanced search tools, AI is often anthropomorphized as possessing “knowledge” or “understanding.” Nash (2024) warns that this anthropomorphized portrayal can blur the lines between human and machine epistemic processes, leading to oversimplified assumptions about AI’s capabilities. A simple shift in language—“the AI says” or “the AI believes”—can subtly encourage users to attribute quasi-human cognitive status to these systems, even though they remain pattern recognizers fundamentally reliant on statistical inferences over training data. This framing affects not just how we use AI tools but how we conceptualize knowledge itself and the role of human judgment in an increasingly AI-mediated information landscape.

Epistemic Agency and Infrastructure

Many of these concerns are related to the distribution of epistemic agency between humans and AI systems. Epistemic agency, while seemingly abstract, refers to our active engagement in pursuing knowledge-related goals. As Ahlstrom (2010) explains, “every time we act in an effort to attain our epistemic goals, we express our epistemic agency.” Philosophically, epistemic agency manifests when individuals actively form beliefs rather than passively accepting them. This concept encompasses several key qualifications: (a) taking an *active* stance toward one’s beliefs; (b) performing *actions* that demonstrate epistemic virtues; (c) assuming *responsibility* for belief formation; and (d) adhering to epistemic *norms* established by cultural or social groups (Elgin, 2013; Fonseca Martínez, 2024; Knorr Cetina, 2007; Setiya, 2013).

Importantly, epistemic agency is not confined to individuals but can be distributed among people collectively or delegated to both humans and nonhuman artifacts, as Martínez (2024) notes. This delegation of epistemic tasks—also known as cognitive offloading or outsourcing—occurs regularly in everyday life (Ahlstrom-Vij, 2016; Atchley et al., 2024; Gerlich, 2025; Zhang, 2023). Consider our knowledge of weather: rather than relying solely on personal observation, we delegate this knowing to weather forecast services supported by networks of people, devices, and computational models. Such cognitive offloading helps manage our cognitive load, but requires metacognitive monitoring to balance its benefits against potential costs (Atchley et al., 2024). Without this metacognitive awareness, mindless cognitive offloading may lead to inaccurate memory and other epistemic problems (Grinschgl et al., 2021).

When AI is integrated into digital systems in society, it shapes what Coeckelbergh (2022) and Marin (2022) call the “epistemic infrastructure”—the frameworks and channels through which knowledge gets created, circulates, and can be validated. These infrastructures, also termed knowledge

infrastructures (Edwards et al., 2013) or thinking infrastructures (Bowker et al., 2019), are the structures and systems that “enable individuals and societies to know what they know and to do what they do” (Hedstrom & King, 2006, p. 113). They encompass the cultural and structural supports that facilitate epistemic operations.

To understand the relationship between epistemic agency and infrastructure, consider two contrasting examples. Weather forecasting represents an epistemic infrastructure where various actors—climate scientists, meteorologists, emergency responders, and ordinary citizens—interact with a network of devices, models, and organizations. While these different groups may relate to the infrastructure differently, they generally share a commitment to accurate measurement and prediction. The infrastructure enables people to form context-responsive beliefs that guide appropriate actions (for instance, responding differently to a three-inch snowfall in Minneapolis versus Seattle).

Social media platforms nowadays, by contrast, are often problematic epistemic infrastructures. Optimized for attention and engagement rather than formation of justified beliefs, these platforms frequently prioritize emotionally provocative content (Marin, 2022). The relationship between users and platform providers involves significant power imbalances, with secret algorithms personalizing content to maximize engagement rather than support epistemic goals like idea diversity. These platforms may encourage maximal cognitive outsourcing, as algorithms would happily supply more content to users to harvest their attention. The delegation of epistemic agency can lead to concerning outcomes, such as irresponsible delegation or even the hijacking of epistemic agency by digital platforms (Dorsch, 2022).

As illustrated by the examples, while epistemic infrastructures ideally support human epistemic agency, this alignment is not guaranteed. Infrastructures may develop emergent properties that deviate from their initial purposes, as when social media platforms designed for social exchange instead foster echo chambers and misinformation (Marin, 2022). Moreover, infrastructures are inherently political and power-embedded, reflecting specific design visions and assumptions. As Star (1999) emphasized, infrastructures are *relational*—they benefit some while potentially harming others. In epistemic contexts, they may enhance some people’s epistemic agency while constraining others’.

Understanding the complex interplay between epistemic agency and infrastructure is crucial as we navigate the integration of generative AI into educational settings. There exists an inherent tension between agency and infrastructure even in mundane scenarios. By recognizing this tension, rather than ignoring it, we create space for developing more equitable infrastructures that genuinely support human epistemic flourishing rather than undermining it. As AI systems increasingly mediate our knowledge practices, critically examining this relationship becomes not just academically interesting but essential for maintaining meaningful human engagement in teaching and learning.

Evolving Epistemic Infrastructures in Education

Education is fundamentally an epistemic enterprise that is committed to knowledge and knowing. At its core, education in a democratic society aims to equip individuals of all ages with the knowledge and skills necessary for flourishing in society. This epistemic foundation manifests in two primary goals: first, enabling learners to develop reliable, justified knowledge within specific domains; and second, allowing educators to verify that established educational objectives are being achieved

through purposeful pedagogical activities. Unlike other social institutions that may prioritize efficiency or profit, education's primary concern is epistemic—focused on what counts as knowledge, how it is developed, and how we know when learning has occurred.

Epistemic infrastructures in education comprise the systems, tools, and practices that support knowledge-related activities across multiple levels of the educational ecosystem. These infrastructures enable critical epistemic processes such as curriculum development, instructional design, assessment, and educational research. For example, when a teacher prepares to teach about moon phases, they engage with multiple components of this infrastructure: consulting curriculum standards to identify learning objectives, accessing instructional models through professional development networks, and choosing appropriate simulation tools available to their school to enrich learning activities. Similarly, when evaluating student progress, teachers draw on assessment frameworks, rubrics, and data systems that constitute another area of the epistemic infrastructure. These infrastructures are not merely technical systems but socio-material arrangements that shape what knowledge is valued, how it is represented, and who has authority to validate it. Educators occupy a central position within these infrastructures, exercising epistemic agency as they navigate, interpret, and adapt these resources to address fundamental questions about teaching and learning in their specific contexts.

Epistemic infrastructures in education have always been in flux, responding to societal changes, technological innovations, and evolving pedagogical philosophies. Historical transformations include the shift from oral to textual knowledge transmission, the standardization of curriculum in the industrial era, and more recently, the integration of digital technologies into classrooms. The COVID-19 pandemic precipitated perhaps the most abrupt infrastructural transformation in recent memory, forcing educational institutions worldwide to rapidly pivot to emergency remote teaching. This crisis revealed both the fragility and adaptability of existing systems. Other examples of infrastructural evolution include the decades-long development of e-learning environments in both formal education and corporate training, and the rise of learning analytics systems designed to create faster feedback loops for educational improvement (Buckingham Shum, 2012). These transformations are not merely technical upgrades but represent fundamental shifts in how knowledge is constructed, validated, and transmitted within educational contexts.

The current integration of AI systems into education's epistemic infrastructure requires particularly careful examination due to its profound implications for epistemic agency of humans. AI adoption in education has been largely framed through the lens of "personalized learning," which typically envisions an individual learner working with an intelligent tutor to master domain knowledge efficiently. While AI systems may indeed help transcend the limitations of standardized approaches by offering diverse prompts or alternative viewpoints (Das & Varshney, 2022), this model embodies just one vision of education among many possibilities. Critics have questioned the underlying assumptions of AI-driven personalization, noting how it often reduces education's mission to cognitive domains while marginalizing other essential forms of knowledge and development (Biesta, 2023). To avoid repeating mistakes observed in the history of educational technology and social media, we must critically examine the underlying assumptions, logic models, and potential emergent properties of AI systems as they become embedded in education's epistemic infrastructure.

Addressing epistemic infrastructures in education, particularly with the infusion of AI, is important for several reasons. The integration of AI into educational contexts creates a unique epistemic

situation where the boundaries between human and machine knowledge production become increasingly blurred and difficult to detect. Unlike previous technological shifts in education, AI systems can operate at tremendous scale and with unprecedented speed, fundamentally altering how knowledge is created, validated, and disseminated. This transformation necessitates careful analysis of how human epistemic agency and new AI-infused infrastructures are forming novel relationships that reshape educational practices.

To summarize, the interplay between AI-infused epistemic infrastructures and human epistemic agency in education reflects both productive collaboration and significant tensions. AI systems can enhance knowledge building by providing unprecedented access to information resources and computational power. However, they may also circumvent crucial epistemic processes by presenting pre-digested information that reduces humans' engagement with primary sources and independent evaluation of competing interpretations. This circumvention potentially compromises the development of critical thinking skills and epistemic virtues central to educational aims. Moving forward, educators, researchers, and policymakers face the essential task of configuring epistemic infrastructures that value human epistemic agency, if it remains part of education's mission.

A Situated Analysis of Epistemic Agency in AI-infused Epistemic Infrastructure

To examine the complex relationship between AI-infused epistemic infrastructures and human epistemic agency described in the previous section, this section argues for a *situated cognition* perspective of how these dynamics manifest in educational contexts. The challenge ahead—creating educational environments where AI and human intelligence complement each other—requires conceptual approaches that can capture the nuanced interplay between technological systems and human knowledge practices. Rather than viewing AI tools as neutral additions to existing educational practices, this analysis examines how they fundamentally reshape the epistemic landscape within which teachers and students operate. By adopting a situated perspective, we can better understand how AI technologies become embedded within educational environments, how they mediate epistemic activities, and how they influence the development and expression of epistemic agency among educational stakeholders. This approach allows us to move beyond simplistic narratives of technological determinism or human-centered control, toward a more ecological understanding of how knowledge practices emerge from the dynamic interaction between human agents and technological infrastructures in specific educational contexts.

Situated cognition posits that cognitive processes extend beyond the brain to include the body and environment, challenging traditional cognitive science's view of cognition as internal symbol manipulation. This theoretical perspective has evolved into the comprehensive "4E" framework, which characterizes human thinking as *embodied, embedded, enacted, and extended* in real-world contexts (Carney, 2020). At its core, this approach views the brain, body, and surrounding environment as an integrated cognitive system in continuous interaction. This perspective has gained recognition as a more ecologically valid account of "how much of cognition actually occurs" in everyday activities (Carney, 2020). The 4E framework builds on significant intellectual foundations in psychology and philosophy, including J.J. Gibson's theory of *affordances*, Vygotsky's work on cultural mediation, and Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology, all of which demonstrated how cognition is inherently shaped by bodily and environmental factors (Carney, 2020). While each dimension of the 4E framework emphasizes different aspects of cognition, they frequently overlap and complement each other. Ultimately, the framework converges on understanding the mind as a

“dynamic coupling” of brain–body–world, functioning as an autonomous, self-regulating system (Newen et al., 2018; Robbins & Aydede, 2008).

The situated perspective provides a powerful lens for analyzing the complex interplay between AI systems and human epistemic practices in educational settings. The 4E framework—embodied, embedded, enacted, and extended cognition—offers complementary insights for understanding this relationship. From an embodied cognition perspective, a user’s sensorimotor engagement with AI systems is integral to thinking, particularly with multimodal interfaces. Physical interactions—typing, clicking, or gesturing—directly influence how users perceive and interpret AI-generated content. Different interaction modalities (keyboard, touchscreen, voice, movement) trigger distinct sensory feedback, creating a reciprocal relationship where bodily engagement both shapes and is shaped by cognitive processes. The *embedded* dimension reveals how cognitive processes are inherently situated within and shaped by environmental contexts, showing that teachers’ and students’ thinking processes become fundamentally dependent on the AI systems they interact with, which both enable new possibilities (such as rapid generation of diverse examples) and impose constraints (perhaps limiting consideration of approaches not represented in the AI’s training data). This embedded perspective also highlights how institutional structures, cultural practices, and social relationships mediate AI-human interactions, as the integration of AI writing assistants depends on school policies, pedagogical traditions, and cultural attitudes toward technology. The *enacted* dimension illuminates how knowledge emerges through active engagement rather than passive consumption, as when students develop understanding through questioning and exploration in dialogue with AI tutoring systems, shaping not just what they learn but how they learn to learn; this perspective also emphasizes the transformative, co-evolutionary nature of these interactions, where both human users and technological systems develop new strategies and adaptations over time. Finally, the *extended* dimension conceptualizes how cognition distributes across internal and external resources, creating hybrid cognitive systems where human and artificial intelligence work in concert, effectively extending the mind beyond biological boundaries. Together, these perspectives help us understand AI tools not as mere add-ons but as active participants in knowledge co-creation, revealing how new forms of epistemic agency emerge within human-AI ecologies—a crucial insight for designing educational environments where AI and human intelligence genuinely complement each other.

Overall, these situated cognition perspectives help us understand how AI tools become integral components of the epistemic infrastructure, not as mere add-ons to existing cognitive processes, but as active participants in the co-creation of knowledge and understanding. By adopting this theoretical lens, we can move beyond simplistic questions about whether AI enhances or diminishes human agency, toward a more nuanced analysis of how new forms of agency emerge within human-AI ecologies. This approach reveals how epistemic agency is not a fixed capacity that individuals either possess or lack, but rather a dynamic achievement that emerges through skilled participation in socio-technical systems. Such insights are crucial for designing educational environments where AI and human intelligence can genuinely complement each other, fostering epistemic practices that leverage the unique strengths of both while mitigating potential limitations.

A Framework for Analyzing Epistemic Agency in AI-infused Epistemic Infrastructures

Building on this situated cognition perspective, we can examine how AI-infused epistemic infrastructures shape human epistemic agency through specific mechanisms. This paper employs

technical investigation in value-sensitive design (Friedman & Hendry, 2019) as its primary research method, examining how AI systems in education embody particular values while enabling or constraining human epistemic agency. This analysis is guided by an analytical framework proposed by Marin (2022) for investigating social media platforms as epistemic environments—whether they enable or constrain users’ abilities to engage meaningfully with information. While Marin’s analysis focuses primarily on social media, their conceptual tools can be productively applied to AI systems in educational contexts. This framework highlights three critical conditions that need to be met for an environment or infrastructure to foster epistemic agency: *skilled epistemic actions*, *epistemic sensitivity*, and *habit-building*.

The first condition, *skilled epistemic actions*, encompasses the meaningful ways users interact with information in AI systems. From a situated cognition perspective, a successful epistemic infrastructure fosters specific actions by leveraging the existing skills or expertise of epistemic agents. In traditional educational settings, teachers exercise complex skills during lesson planning, drawing on professional knowledge and experience (Tanchuk, 2024), while students develop advanced learning strategies when confronting ill-defined problems. AI-infused infrastructures ostensibly aim to support these activities through algorithmically curated options and automated recommendations. However, this “assistance” often carries unintended consequences by reducing skilled actions to simplified ones. Consider an adaptive learning system that generates personalized reading lists based on student behavior; if students cannot modify, annotate, or critically evaluate these recommendations, their role as active epistemic agents diminishes. Similarly, teachers using AI-assisted grading may receive suggested scores without the ability to interrogate the underlying reasoning or adjust assessment criteria. When AI environments limit user control to binary choices—accept or reject—they fundamentally undermine deep epistemic engagement. By contrast, well-designed epistemic infrastructures provide multiple opportunities for users to take skilled actions, enabling users to question and refine AI-generated outputs.

The second condition, *epistemic sensitivity*, refers to the ability of users to recognize situations where they should take skilled epistemic actions. In AI-infused infrastructures, epistemic sensitivity is influenced by the design of the system—whether it encourages critical reflection or conditions users to accept outputs without question. AI-infused platforms often personalize content to maximize user engagement, but this personalization can suppress exposure to diverse viewpoints and discourage verification of information. In environments where AI-generated summaries, recommendations, or decisions appear authoritative, users may become less attuned to the importance of human judgement. For example, in automated news aggregation platforms, if trending articles are promoted based on engagement rather than accuracy, users may become desensitized to distinctions between credible reporting and misinformation. Effective epistemic infrastructures should therefore incorporate features that prompt users to critically engage with AI-generated information, such as transparency indicators, contextual explanations, or prompts that encourage verification. If epistemic sensitivity is eroded, users may passively consume information without recognizing when it is necessary to challenge or investigate it.

The third condition, *habit-building*, examines how repeated interactions with AI systems shape long-term epistemic behaviors. Over time, users develop patterns of engagement that become automatic, reinforcing either critical epistemic agency or passive reliance on AI-generated outputs. Many AI systems are designed to streamline decision-making, but in doing so, they risk fostering habits of epistemic dependency. For example, managers using AI-generated performance evaluations may

come to trust the system’s assessments without conducting independent reviews; social media platforms condition users to engage in rapid consumption of information through infinite scrolling, reinforcing behaviors that prioritize speed over deliberation. These habitual interactions can curb users’ ability to engage in slow, reflective reasoning, which is essential for skilled epistemic actions. To counteract this, AI systems should incorporate deliberate “speed bumps”—features that encourage users to pause, reflect, or engage in deeper interactions. This might include requiring users to verify AI-generated outputs before acting on them, limiting the frequency of automated suggestions, or providing structured opportunities for users to compare multiple perspectives before making decisions.

Taken together, these three conditions—skilled epistemic actions, epistemic sensitivity, and habit-building—provide a framework for evaluating how AI-infused epistemic infrastructures shape human epistemic agency. Following the situated perspective, while AI systems have the potential to augment cognitive processes, they also introduce new challenges by structuring interactions in ways that can either support or suppress critical engagement. If AI systems reduce opportunities for skilled actions, erode sensitivity to epistemic relevance, and reinforce habits of passive reliance, they undermine the very conditions necessary for building reliable knowledge.

AI Tools as Epistemic Infrastructures for Teachers and Students

Building on the situated framework established in the previous section, I now examine two representative AI tools designed to support key epistemic actions in educational contexts: an AI tool to assist teachers with lesson planning and another one that help teachers provide feedback on student essays. Through analysis of the dimensions outlined earlier—skilled epistemic actions, epistemic sensitivity, and habit building—I demonstrate how various AI tools function as epistemic infrastructures in education, highlighting both their affordances and limitations. The intention here is not to criticize any AI tools but to surface opportunities of advancing various AI tools towards their potential of truly effective epistemic infrastructures.

Case 1: Lesson Plan Generators

Lesson planning represents an established professional activity for educators worldwide, serving as an essential bridge between high-level curriculum standards and concrete classroom teaching (Hoover & Hoover, 1967). This process demands significant teacher knowledge. Experienced teachers bring unique pedagogical approaches, instructional preferences, and creative strategies that enrich how standards are interpreted and implemented (John, 2006). Beyond content knowledge, they possess valuable contextual understanding about their school culture, available resources, community values, and—most importantly—their students’ specific needs, interests, and learning profiles. This contextual intelligence allows teachers to craft lessons that are not only academically sound but responsive and meaningful to students. The professional judgment exercised during lesson planning reflects years of accumulated professional knowledge, where teachers draw on their understanding of how different instructional approaches affect diverse learners, how to sequence concepts effectively, and how to anticipate and address potential misconceptions. This expertise manifests in thoughtful decisions about sequencing, pacing, student grouping, assessment methods, and differentiation techniques that honor student needs.

Despite the clear value of lesson planning, many educators find this process overwhelming amid competing demands. Research finds many teachers frequently lacking sufficient time to prepare lessons effectively, with planning often relegated to evenings and weekends (Hunter et al., 2022). The willingness to engage deeply in the craft of lesson design frequently conflicts with the administrative burdens, documentation requirements, and accountability pressures experienced by educators across contexts. This tension between professional ideals and practical constraints has created a need for technological solutions. AI-powered lesson plan generators have emerged as a potential solution, leveraging generative AI to automate lesson planning while potentially preserving space for teacher creativity and judgment.

Teachers can leverage generative AI for lesson design in multiple ways, ranging from basic applications to more sophisticated implementations. At the most basic level, educators can use ChatGPT to generate lesson plans, while more advanced options include specialty AI systems that offer additional features such as standards alignment. Research examining these applications has documented diverse teacher experiences and outcomes. In one study examining 29 pre-service science teachers who integrated ChatGPT into their lesson planning process, researchers found that while the tool facilitated a variety of teaching methods and strategies, concerns emerged regarding hallucinations, accuracy, and potential over-reliance on AI (G.-G. Lee & Zhai, 2024). A comparative analysis of lesson plans created by ChatGPT and Google Gemini revealed that while both platforms produced content structurally similar to human-written educational materials, they also embedded implicit pedagogical preferences—such as favoring individual work over collaborative activities in math instruction (Baytak, 2024), a potential spillover from data these LLMs were trained on. Research suggests these limitations can be partially addressed through prompt engineering. For instance, a study focused on language teaching demonstrated that iterative prompting with additional context and specificity improved the quality of generated lesson plans (Dornburg & Davin, 2024). Sophisticated prompts can enhance student agency and classroom dialogues reflected in AI-generated lesson designs (Authors, 2025). Going further, some researchers have developed specialized systems like *LessonPlanner*, which supports interactive lesson construction with adaptive LLM-generated content based on specific instructional frameworks (Fan et al., 2024). These developments highlight the potential of AI tools to serve as educators' assistants (Moundridou et al., 2024).

MagicSchool AI is an industry leader in this space, offering a suite of tools including lesson plan generators that help educators create lesson plans aligned with educational standards. According to MagicSchool, their lesson planning tool “simplifies the process of crafting comprehensive and engaging lesson plans” for both experienced and new teachers. The generator features customization capabilities that allow teachers to tailor content to their curriculum and instructional goals while automatically aligning with required academic standards and learning objectives. The tool's primary value proposition centers on time efficiency—streamlining the planning process so educators can redirect time toward instruction or student needs—and providing a structured starting point for novice teachers developing their lesson-planning skills. MagicSchool's generator is one of many similar AI-powered lesson planning tools available that aspire to support the lesson planning process.

5E Model Lesson Plan

Generate a 5E model lesson plan for your science class. Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, Evaluate.

Grade level:

8th grade

Topic, Standard, or Objective:

What role do muscles, tendons, ligaments and bones play in allowing a human to walk?

Additional Customization (Optional):

We are exploring the musculoskeletal system and its functions. The guiding question for our lesson is how do bones, muscles, tendons and ligaments work together to allow humans to walk around their environment?

Standards Set to Align to (Optional):

NGSS

Generate

Fig. 1. One Lesson Plan Generator Offered by MagicSchool AI.

Following the situated framework introduced in the previous section, MagicSchool affords teachers both binary and skilled epistemic actions. Binary actions include accepting generated lesson plans without modification or implementing AI suggestions verbatim. Skilled actions involve pedagogically informed decisions: customizing plans based on knowledge of student needs, integrating specific pedagogical approaches, and carefully inspecting and iterating on AI-generated content. A skilled MagicSchool user crafts lesson plans that balance educational objectives with contextual understanding of classroom dynamics, drawing on professional expertise to adapt AI-generated content—a process that benefits from a design mindset (Laurillard, 2012). However, MagicSchool’s interface design does not necessarily reward these additional efforts, as the platform emphasizes efficiency and quick generation over pedagogical refinement. Thus, MagicSchool fares somewhat negatively concerning skilled epistemic actions, allowing for sophisticated engagement but primarily marketing itself for time-saving.

Epistemic sensitivity in lesson planning is related to how the user could uphold epistemic norms in the practice such as reliable content knowledge and sound pedagogical designs. MagicSchool allows teachers to add guidance and context to inform AI generation, but the generation process remains opaque, making it difficult to inspect content quality or alignment with pedagogical methods and curricular standards. The epistemic desensitization of teachers is a genuine concern with MagicSchool and similar AI lesson planning tools. This desensitization occurs not simply because teachers are presented with ready-made plans, but because these platforms do not incentivize scrutiny of epistemic standards. The AI generates any requested lesson plan, presenting it as valid educational content without foregrounding norms for pedagogical soundness, curricular coherence,

or contextual relevance. There is limited accountability for what epistemic standards the AI follows, and teachers may gradually accept lower standards for verification. Attempting to maintain epistemic sensitivity while using MagicSchool may seem burdensome since the platform rewards efficiency rather than epistemic rigor, potentially undermining teachers' engagement with deeper pedagogical reasoning over time.

Regarding habit formation, MagicSchool users may develop patterns that prioritize efficiency over pedagogical depth. These include generating lesson plans quickly without customization, accepting AI suggestions uncritically, and implementing plans without reflection. While the platform offers customization options that theoretically preserve teacher expertise—allowing modification of parameters or direct editing of content—these skilled actions require deliberate effort that contradicts the platform's efficiency-focused design. The interface does not actively encourage critical evaluation of generated content, making it easy for users to accept “good enough” plans. To better support epistemic agency, the tool could incorporate reflection prompts that guide teachers in evaluating plans or documenting implementation outcomes. For educators facing significant administrative burdens, the path of least resistance—accepting AI-generated content with minimal scrutiny—may become the default approach, potentially eroding professional judgment in lesson design over time.

To summarize this critical analysis of MagicSchool, the platform fares somewhat negatively on the skilled action dimension, as it allows for but do not actively encourage sophisticated engagement with lesson planning. It scores negatively on epistemic sensitivity, as the platform does not incentivize scrutiny of epistemic standards and may lead to teachers accepting lower epistemic standards. Regarding habit building, MagicSchool presents mixed outcomes—while it offers customization options that could maintain teacher expertise, its emphasis on efficiency encourages habits of quick generation without deep reflection. Teachers with strong professional judgment and commitment to epistemic norms may successfully navigate these challenges, but those with less professional knowledge (e.g., novice teachers) risk developing over-reliance and detrimental habits over time. Ultimately, the platform's design prioritizes efficiency over epistemic rigor, potentially reshaping teachers' professional habits in ways that warrant careful consideration.

Case 2: Instant Feedback on Student Essays

Brisk Teaching is an AI-powered Chrome extension that has gained significant traction in educational settings, with close to 1 million registered users. While the platform offers various features for educators, this analysis focuses specifically on its automated essay feedback tool, which enables teachers to provide rapid assessment of student writing in Google Docs (see Fig. 2). The core value proposition of Brisk Teaching centers on automating what it considers routine aspects of assessment. Its marketing materials emphasize how the tool allows teachers to redirect their time toward “more creative” teaching activities and achieve better work-life balance—to “reclaim your evenings and weekends” for instance. The company's founder has publicly celebrated the tool's efficiency, claiming that “a high school English teacher... [can] grade 147 essays in one afternoon without sacrificing quality,” positioning speed and volume as primary benefits of the system.




Fig. 2. Automated Feedback Generated by Brisk.

In education, teacher feedback on student essays is widely recognized not only as a teacher task but also as a catalyst for improved learning. Timely, specific feedback on writing has been shown to significantly enhance students' writing skills while also fostering metacognitive awareness and supporting student motivation by guiding them toward improvement (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Shute, 2008). For example, Hattie and Timperley (2007) identified feedback as one of the most powerful influences on student achievement, reporting substantially higher learning gains when it is implemented effectively. However, providing meaningful formative feedback is a complex, labor-intensive task for teachers, as it requires carefully diagnosing each student's needs and crafting individualized, high-quality comments—an effort that demands time and effort. Despite these challenges, the substantial benefits of formative feedback for improving student performance, self-regulation, and engagement underscore its importance in education (Shute, 2008).

The automation of student writing feedback is not a new phenomenon and has evolved significantly over time. Automated writing evaluation systems employ natural language processing to analyze student texts and provide immediate, individualized feedback on grammar, style, and structure, facilitating iterative draft revisions. Research across educational levels demonstrates that these tools can enhance both writing processes—such as encouraging more frequent revisions—and outcomes, including improved writing performance and self-efficacy (Li et al., 2015; Wilson & Roscoe, 2020). The field has advanced further with generative AI and LLMs that can produce content-specific feedback. Experimental studies indicate that AI-generated feedback can rival human feedback in effectiveness for student revisions (Escalante et al., 2023), with students particularly valuing the immediacy and detail of AI comments while still recognizing the importance of human input (Escalante et al., 2023). These developments highlight the potential of AI-based feedback systems to scale effective writing instruction.

Nevertheless, important challenges remain. Automated systems often struggle with higher-order writing skills such as idea development and argumentation, tending to focus on surface-level

features. This limitation raises concerns that students may prioritize grammar and form over content development and critical thinking (Li et al., 2015). Additionally, both students and teachers express mixed perceptions of AI-based feedback—many learners hesitate to fully trust or implement machine-generated critiques without teacher guidance, while educators stress the importance of aligning automated feedback with curriculum goals and sound writing pedagogy (Escalante et al., 2023; Knight et al., 2020). The field also faces persistent ethical and practical issues, including algorithmic biases in feedback and risks of over-reliance on generative tools (Godwin-Jones, 2024). While data-driven analytics and generative AI technologies offer significant potential to enhance formative feedback in writing instruction, a fundamental challenge remains ensuring that AI-generated feedback is pedagogically relevant, accurate, and ethically implemented—complementing rather than replacing teacher feedback and supporting students in developing robust writing skills.

Departing from these perspectives, Brisk Teaching affords teachers a spectrum of epistemic actions ranging from binary to skilled. Binary actions include accepting AI-generated feedback without modification or using default settings to process essays in bulk, aligning with the platform's emphasis on efficiency. In contrast, skilled actions involve teachers exercising professional judgment to critically evaluate AI suggestions, and thoughtfully modify comments to address individual student needs. A skilled Brisk Teaching user carefully reviews each AI-generated comment, customizes feedback based on knowledge of students' writing development, identify additional points for feedback, and supplements automated suggestions with personal insights. This requires sophisticated professional knowledge, similar to how experienced educators blend content knowledge, pedagogical expertise, and contextual understanding in traditional assessment. However, unlike traditional practices where teachers decide where and how to comment, Brisk Teaching pre-determines comment placement, potentially constraining teachers' agency in exercising skilled judgment. While teachers can modify AI-suggested comments, the platform's interface primarily rewards speed and volume rather than thoughtful customization. Consequently, Brisk Teaching presents a mixed picture regarding skilled epistemic actions: it allows for sophisticated engagement but structurally incentivizes minimal-effort approaches.

Epistemic sensitivity in essay feedback relates to how users uphold assessment norms such as accuracy, fairness, constructiveness, and alignment with learning objectives. Brisk Teaching presents significant challenges to epistemic sensitivity across multiple dimensions. First, while teachers can review AI-generated comments before sending them to students, the platform makes a critical epistemic decision on their behalf: determining what aspects of student writing merit feedback and where comments should be placed. This automated selection process remains largely opaque to users, making it difficult to evaluate whether the system's attention aligns with sound pedagogical priorities. Second, the quality of AI-generated comments themselves receives limited scrutiny within the platform's workflow, with no explicit mechanisms for teachers to evaluate whether feedback adheres to epistemic standards for constructive assessment. Third, Brisk Teaching exhibits insensitivity to the alignment between feedback and individual student contexts—the AI lacks access to students' learning histories, emotional states, or specific developmental needs that would inform truly responsive feedback. The epistemic desensitization of teachers manifests as they gradually accept the system's judgment about what deserves comment, potentially bypassing critical reflection on feedback quality and appropriateness. Teachers attempting to maintain high epistemic standards while using Brisk Teaching face an uphill battle, as the platform's design prioritizes efficiency over epistemic rigor.

Regarding habit formation, Brisk Teaching users may develop problematic patterns of practice, including processing student work rapidly without deep engagement, accepting AI-suggested feedback uncritically, and prioritizing completion metrics over meaningful assessment. These habits align with the platform's emphasis on reclaiming efficiency. While work-life balance is important, the specific habits encouraged raise questions about long-term impact on teachers' assessment expertise. As teachers repeatedly delegate feedback decisions to the AI system, they may experience a gradual atrophy of their own assessment skills. This is particularly concerning because providing feedback is not merely an administrative task but a crucial opportunity for teachers to develop knowledge of their students. When this process is mediated primarily through AI, teachers may develop less nuanced knowledge about their students' writing development, hampering their ability to make informed instructional decisions. The platform does afford options for customization, theoretically allowing teachers to maintain their epistemic agency. However, these skilled actions require additional time and effort that contradict the platform's primary selling point of efficiency.

To summarize this critical analysis of Brisk Teaching, the platform presents significant concerns across all three dimensions of epistemic infrastructure. While it technically allows for skilled actions through customization of AI-generated feedback, its design and marketing strongly incentivize minimal-effort approaches that prioritize speed over skilled actions. On epistemic sensitivity, Brisk Teaching fares poorly by making opaque decisions about what aspects of student writing merit feedback, offering limited mechanisms for quality control, and showing insensitivity to individual student contexts. Regarding habit formation, the platform risks fostering patterns that prioritize processing volume over meaningful engagement, potentially leading to an atrophy of teachers' assessment expertise over time. Both Brisk Teaching and MagicSchool illustrate a concerning trend in educational AI tools: while marketed as time-saving assistants that enhance teacher capacity, their design often prioritizes efficiency over epistemic rigor, potentially reshaping teachers' professional practices in ways that diminish rather than enhance their expertise. This analysis reveals the need for more thoughtfully designed AI systems that genuinely support, rather than supplant, the complex epistemic work that characterizes effective teaching and assessment.

General Discussion

AI is rapidly being integrated into education, paralleling its incorporation across other social sectors. AI technologies are becoming embedded in critical education infrastructures—the foundational structures designed to support educational activities. This integration necessitates careful examination of various use cases to prevent potential harms resulting from uncritical adoption. While conventional critiques of AI systems often center on the technology itself—such as characterizing LLMs as “stochastic parrots” (Bender et al., 2021) or uncovering the “machinic gaze” in image generators (Arora et al., 2024)—I advocate expanding our analysis to encompass the human–AI relationship. This broader perspective motivates a situated approach that considers both the epistemic actions of human agents and how infrastructure either enables or constrains these actions. Within this framework, epistemic harms manifest beyond mere hallucinations, occurring when users are prevented from exercising skilled actions, when they become desensitized to important epistemic norms, or when they develop detrimental habits that undermine knowledge production and maintenance. AI systems intended to support education must foster the skilled actions of the humans they serve—teachers, students, administrators, and so forth. By adopting this

situated approach, we acknowledge the significance of both user actions and infrastructural biases, thereby opening new avenues for design.

In this paper, I analyzed two representative AI systems that are already widely deployed to support teachers, impacting many teachers and students. Following the situated approach outlined earlier, I examined three critical dimensions: (1) affordances for skilled actions in teaching practice, (2) support for epistemic sensitivity, and (3) potential for developing long-term habits in educational practice. The analysis reveals that these AI systems, in their current form, perform inadequately across these dimensions. The skilled epistemic actions of teachers—which are essential to expertise development (Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 2005)—are insufficiently supported and often sacrificed for speed and efficiency. While these AI tools sometimes preserve space for human judgment, they are generally designed or marketed in ways that sideline epistemic sensitivity. These systems technically offer opportunities for quality assessment, but their interaction patterns typically prioritize immediate generation over thoughtful iteration. This reduction in human epistemic operations fosters habits that may ultimately throttle practitioners' knowledge of their practice and their understanding of other humans, a consequence of allowing technology to erode essential human capacities (Vallor & Vierkant, 2024).

This analysis does not aim to criticize specific AI systems but rather to highlight tensions within the educational technology ecosystem. Many emerging AI systems in education operate as commercial enterprises with incentive structures that may not align with core educational values (Selwyn et al., 2020). Software companies design user experiences that address practical educational challenges (e.g., providing efficient feedback) while simultaneously generating profit. While these goals appear benign and meaningful, the costs to epistemic agency and the long-term production and maintenance of educational knowledge warrant deeper investigation. Education involves complex value judgments that cannot be reduced to technical solutions (Biesta, 2015). The question of whether these platforms should purposefully design to maximize users' epistemic agency necessitates a broader discussion about the politics of AI systems in education. This connects to Star's (1999) insight that infrastructures are inherently political and embed particular values that shape practice in profound ways. The infrastructural nature of these AI systems means they are not merely tools but are reshaping the landscape of educational practice in ways that require critical examination.

To conclude, I present four recommendations to help navigate the ongoing AI transformation in education. First, we must recognize the profound infrastructural transformation occurring in education, acknowledging how we are consciously or unconsciously outsourcing essential epistemic operations to AI systems. This recognition requires critical reflection on which aspects of educational practice should remain human-driven and which might benefit from technological augmentation. Second, educators should transcend mere AI adoption to actively participate in AI design processes. Current AI tools often prioritize efficiency over nurturing educators' skilled actions in practice, frequently compromising human epistemic agency. Rather than accepting AI tools as presented, educators should be supported to advocate for designs that align with core educational values and maintain their professional judgment. Third, we should develop AI infrastructures that deliberately stimulate the skilled actions of teachers, students, and other educational stakeholders. These infrastructures must uphold fundamental epistemic norms including truthfulness, authenticity, evidence-based reasoning, and consistency. This necessitates innovative interface designs that reinforce these norms rather than circumventing them for convenience or speed. Finally, while

developing AI-infused “Big Infrastructures”—high-profile, institutionalized systems supporting entire educational ecosystems—we must simultaneously invest in what I call “small infrastructures” led by people on the ground. These localized design efforts make institutionalized infrastructures functional and create cohesion across multiple systems (Penuel, 2019). The infrastructuring activities undertaken by educators generate the alignment and working conditions necessary for achieving education’s true mission.

References

- Adadi, A., & Berrada, M. (2018). Peeking Inside the Black-Box: A Survey on Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI). *IEEE Access*, 6, 52138–52160. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2018.2870052>
- Ahlstrom-Vij, K. (2016). Is There a Problem With Cognitive Outsourcing? *Philosophical Issues*, 26(1), 7–24. <https://doi.org/10.1111/phis.12072>
- Anantrasirichai, N., & Bull, D. (2022). Artificial intelligence in the creative industries: A review. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 55(1), 589–656. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-021-10039-7>
- Arora, V., Magee, L., & Munn, L. (2024). (Re)framing built heritage through the machinic gaze. *Journal of Social Archaeology*, 24(2), 197–217. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14696053241237949>
- Atchley, P., Pannell, H., Wofford, K., Hopkins, M., & Atchley, R. A. (2024). Human and AI collaboration in the higher education environment: Opportunities and concerns. *Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications*, 9(1), 20. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41235-024-00547-9>
- Baytak, A. (2024). The Content Analysis of the Lesson Plans Created by ChatGPT and Google Gemini. *Research in Social Sciences and Technology*, 9(1), 329–350. <https://doi.org/10.46303/ressat.2024.19>
- Bearman, M., Ryan, J., & Ajjawi, R. (2023). Discourses of artificial intelligence in higher education: A critical literature review. *Higher Education*, 86(2), 369–385. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00937-2>
- Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big?  *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 610–623. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922>
- Biesta, G. (2015). Improving education through research? From effectiveness, causality and technology to purpose, complexity and culture. *Policy Futures in Education*, 14(2), 194–210. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210315613900>
- Biesta, G. (2023). The Integrity of Education and the Future of Educational Studies. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 71(5), 493–515. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2023.2242452>
- Bommasani, R., Hudson, D. A., Adeli, E., Altman, R., Arora, S., Arx, S. von, Bernstein, M. S., Bohg, J., Bosselut, A., Brunskill, E., Brynjolfsson, E., Buch, S., Card, D., Castellon, R., Chatterji, N., Chen, A., Creel, K., Davis, J. Q., Demszky, D., ... Liang, P. (2022). *On the Opportunities and Risks of Foundation Models* (arXiv:2108.07258). arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2108.07258>
- Bowker, G. C., Elyachar, J., Kornberger, M., Mennicken, A., Miller, P., Nucho, J. R., & Pollock, N. (2019). Introduction to Thinking Infrastructures. In M. Kornberger, G. C. Bowker, J. Elyachar, A. Mennicken, P. Miller, J. R. Nucho, & N. Pollock (Eds.), *Research in the Sociology of Organizations* (pp. 1–13). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S0733-558X20190000062001>
- Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J. D., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Agarwal, S., Herbert-Voss, A., Krueger, G., Henighan, T., Child, R., Ramesh, A., Ziegler, D., Wu, J.,

- Winter, C., ... Amodei, D. (2020). Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 1877–1901.
<https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/1457cod6bfc4967418bfb8ac142f64a-Abstract.html>
- Buckingham Shum, S. (2012). *UNESCO Policy Brief: Learning Analytics*. UNESCO Institute for Information Technologies in Education.
- Carney, J. (2020). Thinking avant la lettre: A Review of 4E Cognition. *Evolutionary Studies in Imaginative Culture*, 4(1), 77–90. <https://doi.org/10.26613/esic/4.1.172>
- Carter, S., & Nielsen, M. (2017). Using Artificial Intelligence to Augment Human Intelligence. *Distill*, 2(12), e9. <https://doi.org/10.23915/distill.00009>
- Celik, I., Dindar, M., Muukkonen, H., & Järvelä, S. (2022). The Promises and Challenges of Artificial Intelligence for Teachers: A Systematic Review of Research. *TechTrends*, 66(4), 616–630. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-022-00715-y>
- Coeckelbergh, M. (2022). Democracy, epistemic agency, and AI: Political epistemology in times of artificial intelligence. *AI and Ethics*, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-022-00239-4>
- Das, P., & Varshney, L. R. (2022). Explaining Artificial Intelligence Generation and Creativity: Human interpretability for novel ideas and artifacts. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 39(4), 85–95. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2022.3141365>
- Dell’Acqua, F., McFowland, E., Mollick, E. R., Lifshitz-Assaf, H., Kellogg, K., Rajendran, S., Kraymer, L., Candelon, F., & Lakhani, K. R. (2023). *Navigating the Jagged Technological Frontier: Field Experimental Evidence of the Effects of AI on Knowledge Worker Productivity and Quality* (SSRN Scholarly Paper) 4573321. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4573321>
- Dornburg, A., & Davin, K. J. (2024). ChatGPT in foreign language lesson plan creation: Trends, variability, and historical biases. *ReCALL*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344024000272>
- Dorsch, J. (2022). Hijacking Epistemic Agency: How Emerging Technologies Threaten our Wellbeing as Knowers. *Proceedings of the 2022 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, 897. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3514094.3539537>
- Dreyfus, H. L., & Dreyfus, S. E. (2005). Peripheral Vision: Expertise in Real World Contexts. *Organization Studies*, 26(5), 779–792. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840605053102>
- Edwards, P., Jackson, S., Chalmers, M., Bowker, G., Borgman, C., Ribes, D., Calvert, S., et al. (2013). *Knowledge infrastructures: Intellectual frameworks and research challenges*. Deep Blue.
- Elgin, C. Z. (2013). Epistemic agency. *Theory and Research in Education*, 11(2), 135–152. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1477878513485173>
- Escalante, J., Pack, A., & Barrett, A. (2023). AI-generated feedback on writing: Insights into efficacy and ENL student preference. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20(1), 57. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00425-2>
- Eshraghian, J. K. (2020). Human ownership of artificial creativity. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 2(3), 157–160. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-020-0161-x>
- Fan, H., Chen, G., Wang, X., & Peng, Z. (2024). LessonPlanner: Assisting Novice Teachers to Prepare Pedagogy-Driven Lesson Plans with Large Language Models. *Proceedings of the 37th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3654777.3676390>

- Fonseca Martínez, M. (2024). Practices and normativity: Philosophy of Science, Agency and Epistemic Normativity. *Cuadernos de Filosofía Latinoamericana*, 45(130). <https://doi.org/10.15332/25005375.9585>
- Friedman, B., & Hendry, D. G. (2019). *Value Sensitive Design: Shaping Technology with Moral Imagination*. MIT Press.
- Gerlich, M. (2025). AI Tools in Society: Impacts on Cognitive Offloading and the Future of Critical Thinking. *Societies*, 15(1), 6. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15010006>
- Godwin-Jones, R. (2024). Distributed Agency in Second Language Learning and Teaching through Generative AI. *Language Learning & Technology*, 28(2), 5–31.
- Grinschgl, S., Papenmeier, F., & Meyerhoff, H. S. (2021). Consequences of cognitive offloading: Boosting performance but diminishing memory. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 74(9), 1477–1496. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17470218211008060>
- Hansen, D. T. (2019). *Ethical Visions of Education: Philosophies in Practice*. Teachers College Press.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The Power of Feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Hedstrom, M., & King, J. L. (2006). *Epistemic Infrastructure in the Rise of the Knowledge Economy*. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/1132.003.0013>
- Hoover, K. H., & Hoover, H. M. (1967). Lesson Planning: Key to Effective Teaching. *The Clearing House*, 42(1), 41–44. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/30183236>
- Hunter, J., Sonnemann, J., & Joiner, R. (2022). *Making time for great teaching: How better government policy can help*. Grattan Institute. <https://policycommons.net/artifacts/2234509/making-time-for-great-teaching/2992442/>
- John, P. D. (2006). Lesson planning and the student teacher: Re-thinking the dominant model. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 38(4), 483–498. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220270500363620>
- Knight, S., Shibani, A., Abel, S., Gibson, A., Ryan, P., Sutton, N., Wight, R., Lucas, C., Sándor, Á., Kitto, K., Liu, M., Mogarkar, R. V., & Shum, S. B. (2020). AcaWriter: A learning analytics tool for formative feedback on academic writing. *Journal of Writing Research*, 12(1), 141–186. <https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2020.12.01.06>
- Knorr Cetina, K. (2007). Culture in global knowledge societies: Knowledge cultures and epistemic cultures. *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews*, 32(4), 361–375. <https://doi.org/10.1179/030801807X163571>
- Laurillard, D. (2012). *Teaching as a Design Science: Building Pedagogical Patterns for Learning and Technology*. Routledge.
- Lee, G.-G., & Zhai, X. (2024). Using ChatGPT for Science Learning: A Study on Pre-service Teachers' Lesson Planning. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/10531039/?casa_token=3WPJlrly__EAAAAA:AoS44x5CitsNyYA66a-loeqvlhV8tgkzJM8fOJpHh4XnqX-TlyiG8PypG8chbgxzAc2O-rxW9UM
- Lee, H.-K. (2022). Rethinking creativity: Creative industries, AI and everyday creativity. *Media, Culture & Society*, 44(3), 601–612. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01634437221077009>
- Lee, M., Srivastava, M., Hardy, A., Thickstun, J., Durmus, E., Paranjape, A., Gerard-Ursin, I., Li, X. L., Ladhak, F., Rong, F., Wang, R. E., Kwon, M., Park, J. S., Cao, H., Lee, T., Bommasani, R., Bernstein, M., & Liang, P. (2024). *Evaluating Human-Language Model Interaction* (arXiv:2212.09746). arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2212.09746>

- Li, J., Link, S., & Hegelheimer, V. (2015). Rethinking the role of automated writing evaluation (AWE) feedback in ESL writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 27, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.10.004>
- Marin, L. (2022). How to Do Things with Information Online. A Conceptual Framework for Evaluating Social Networking Platforms as Epistemic Environments. *Philosophy & Technology*, 35(3), 77. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-022-00569-5>
- Mitchell, M. (2019). *Artificial intelligence: A guide for thinking humans*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Moundridou, M., Matzakos, N., & Doukakis, S. (2024). Generative AI tools as educators' assistants: Designing and implementing inquiry-based lesson plans. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 7, 100277. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666920X24000808>
- Nemorin, S., Vlachidis, A., Ayerakwa, H. M., & Andriotis, P. (2023). AI hyped? A horizon scan of discourse on artificial intelligence in education (AIED) and development. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 48(1), 38–51. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2022.2095568>
- Newen, A., Bruin, L. D., & Gallagher, S. (2018). *The Oxford Handbook of 4E Cognition*. Oxford University Press.
- Nguyen, A., Ngo, H. N., Hong, Y., Dang, B., & Nguyen, B.-P. T. (2023). Ethical principles for artificial intelligence in education. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28(4), 4221–4241. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11316-w>
- Ouyang, L., Wu, J., Jiang, X., Almeida, D., Wainwright, C., Mishkin, P., Zhang, C., Agarwal, S., Slama, K., Ray, A., Schulman, J., Hilton, J., Kelton, F., Miller, L., Simens, M., Askell, A., Welinder, P., Christiano, P. F., Leike, J., & Lowe, R. (2022). Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. In S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, & A. Oh (Eds.), *Advances in neural information processing systems* (Vol. 35, pp. 27730–27744). Curran Associates, Inc. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/file/b1efde53be364a73914f58805a001731-Paper-Conference.pdf
- Pavlik, J. V. (2023). Collaborating With ChatGPT: Considering the Implications of Generative Artificial Intelligence for Journalism and Media Education. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 10776958221149577. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10776958221149577>
- Penuel, W. R. (2019). Infrastructuring as a Practice of Design-Based Research for Supporting and Studying Equitable Implementation and Sustainability of Innovations. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 28(4-5), 659–677. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508406.2018.1552151>
- Prunkl, C. (2022). Human autonomy in the age of artificial intelligence. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 4(2), 99–101. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-022-00449-9>
- Radford, A., Kim, J. W., Hallacy, C., Ramesh, A., Goh, G., Agarwal, S., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Mishkin, P., Clark, J., Krueger, G., & Sutskever, I. (2021). Learning Transferable Visual Models From Natural Language Supervision. *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 8748–8763. <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/radford21a.html>
- Riedl, M. O. (2019). Human-centered artificial intelligence and machine learning. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, 1(1), 33–36. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.117>
- Robbins, P., & Aydede, M. (2008). *The Cambridge Handbook of Situated Cognition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Selwyn, N., Hillman, T., Eynon, R., Ferreira, G., Knox, J., Macgilchrist, F., & Sancho-Gil, J. M. (2020). What's next for Ed-Tech? Critical hopes and concerns for the 2020s. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 45(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1694945>

- Setiya, K. (2013). Epistemic agency: Some doubts. *Philosophical Issues*, 23, 179–198.
- Shute, V. J. (2008). Focus on formative feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(1), 153–189. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654307313795>
- Silver, D., Schrittwieser, J., Simonyan, K., Antonoglou, I., Huang, A., Guez, A., Hubert, T., Baker, L., Lai, M., Bolton, A., Chen, Y., Lillicrap, T., Hui, F., Sifre, L., van den Driessche, G., Graepel, T., & Hassabis, D. (2017). Mastering the game of Go without human knowledge. *Nature*, 550(7676), 354–359. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature24270>
- Star, S. L. (1999). The Ethnography of Infrastructure. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43(3), 377–391. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00027649921955326>
- Tanchuk, N. J. (2024). Teachers as Professionals: How Contextual Knowledge Justifies Teacher Autonomy. *Teachers College Record*, 126(10), 3–29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01614681241307105>
- UNESCO. (2024). *AI competency framework for teachers*. UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.54675/ZJTE2084>
- Vallor, S., & Vierkant, T. (2024). Find the Gap: AI, Responsible Agency and Vulnerability. *Minds and Machines*, 34(3), 20. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-024-09674-0>
- van de Poel, I. (2020). Embedding Values in Artificial Intelligence (AI) Systems. *Minds and Machines*, 30(3), 385–409. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-020-09537-4>
- Wilson, J., & Roscoe, R. D. (2020). Automated Writing Evaluation and Feedback: Multiple Metrics of Efficacy. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 58(1), 87–125. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0735633119830764>
- Yu, H., Atanasova, P., & Augenstein, I. (2024). *Revealing the Parametric Knowledge of Language Models: A Unified Framework for Attribution Methods* (arXiv:2404.18655). arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2404.18655>
- Zhang, X. (2023). Practical knowledge without practical expertise: The social cognitive extension via outsourcing. *Philosophical Studies*, 180(4), 1255–1275. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11098-022-01905-3>
- Zheng, Y., Li, X., Huang, Y., Liang, Q., Guo, T., Hou, M., Gao, B., Tian, M., Liu, Z., & Luo, W. (2024). Automatic Lesson Plan Generation via Large Language Models with Self-critique Prompting. In A. M. Olney, I.-A. Chounta, Z. Liu, O. C. Santos, & I. I. Bittencourt (Eds.), *Artificial Intelligence in Education. Posters and Late Breaking Results, Workshops and Tutorials, Industry and Innovation Tracks, Practitioners, Doctoral Consortium and Blue Sky* (Vol. 2150, pp. 163–178). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-64315-6_13