

NIGERIAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY

**PHILOSOPHY, ARTIFICIAL
INTELLIGENCE, AND DIGITAL
EDUCATION**

VOLUME 35 NO. 2, OCTOBER, 2025

ISSN: 0794-0114

e-ISSN: 2971-5652

Published by

PHILOSOPHERS OF EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OF NIGERIA (PEAN)

www.peanpapers.com.ng

Formatted & Printed in Nigeria by



www.timsmek.com | info@timsmek.com | +234-703-455-9895

EDITORIAL POLICY/GUIDELINES OF NIGERIAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY (NJEP)

Nigerian Journal of Educational Philosophy (NJEP) is published two times a year, April and October by Philosophers of Education Association of Nigeria (PEAN). Although, NJEP provides an outlet for the discussion of most substantive issues in educational theory and practice, it draws specifically upon philosophical insights and welcomes articles presented within a philosophical frame of reference.

Editorial Policy Guidelines for contributions: Submission of Articles

- Manuscripts: The style of reference is mainly the TURABIAN method.
- Articles should not exceed 5000 words/15 pages (including abstract of not more than 250 words), typed on A4 paper with double line spacing using Times New Roman, Font size 12. Since Articles should be sent anonymously to consulting editors for assessment/peer review, the author's name, GSM's number(s), qualification, post and address should be typed on a separate detachable page.
- Quotations: Quotations that are 40 words and above should be properly indented with ½ inch margin to the left and right respectively.
- Articles submitted to any other body/Journal for publication or already published should NOT be sent to the Editor.
- On submission, three copies of the manuscript with the evidence of payment of vetting fee (N5000) should be sent to the Editor. This is only applicable to April version of the Journal.
- On the receipt of vetting article from the Editor, soft copy of the final manuscript after the necessary corrections should be submitted to the Editor with the publication fee.
- Information on the Journal volume where the article will appear will be communicated to the author(s) immediately the article is accepted for publication.
- Note that NO vetting fee is charged on article presented in the conference by the conference attendee or conference Edition of the NJEP Journal published in October every year (conference edition is published in October).
- Also, note that April edition of NJEP will attract vetting fee of N5000.
- Plagiarism: The author should ensure that he/she avoid high percentage level of plagiarism (preferable not more than 20%)
- NJEP Journal from 2022 will have both print and online editions (www.peanpapers.com)

All correspondence should be directed to:

Editor

Prof. S. D. Osaat

Department of Educational Foundations

University of Port Harcourt, P.M.B 5323, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria.

Sunday.osaat@uniport.edu.ng

osaatsundan@gmail.com

+234 803 673 1057

+234 703 440 6894

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor:

Prof. Sunday D. Osaat

Faculty of Education, University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

Associate Editors:

Prof. Chris J. A. Onwuka

Institute of Education, University of Nigerian, Nsukka.

Prof. Abeke Adesanya

Adekunle Ajasin University Akwoba, Ondo State, Nigeria

Prof. A. Owan Enoh

Faculty of Education, Cross River University of Technology Calabar, Nigeria.

Prof. A.A. Bagudo

Institute of Education and Extension Services, Usman Dan Fodio University, Sokoto, Sokoto State, Nigeria.

Prof. Kolu Babarrinde

Faculty of Education, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.

Consulting Editors:

Prof. D.E. Denton

University of Kentucky, U.S.A.

Prof. Philip Rothman

Antioch College, U.S.A

Prof. J. Nelson Omatseye

Faculty of Education, University of Benin, Benin city, Nigeria

Prof. Joseph D. Okoh

Faculty of Education, University of Port Harcourt.

Prof. Orona Orokah

Faculty of Education, Delta State University of Abraka, Nigeria

Prof. Oluremi Ayodele-Bamisaye

Faculty of Education, University of Ibadan.

Department of Educational Foundations
Faculty of Education
University of Nigeria, Nsukka

Department of Educational Foundations
Faculty of Education
University of Nigeria, Nsukka

&

Department of Educational Foundations
Faculty of Education
University of Nigeria, Nsukka

Abstract

This paper presents a critical examination of the intersection of philosophy and artificial intelligence (AI) in education. As AI becomes increasingly integrated into educational settings, it raises important philosophical questions about the nature of knowledge, intelligence, and cognition. This paper explores the implications of AI on teaching, learning, and the very notion of education itself, highlighting the need for a nuanced and critical approach to technological integration. Through a review of existing literature and philosophical frameworks, this paper identifies key areas of concern, including the potential for bias and discrimination, the impact on social relationships and community, and the need for transparency and accountability. Ultimately, this paper argues that the future of education in the age of AI depends on our ability to thoughtfully navigate these philosophical complexities and prioritize inclusive, equitable, and transformative learning experiences for all.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, education, philosophy, critical pedagogy, technological integration.

Introduction

The intersection of philosophy and artificial intelligence (AI) in education presents a fascinating and complex landscape, ripe for exploration. As AI technologies increasingly permeate educational settings, philosophers and educators must critically examine the implications of these innovations on teaching, learning, and the very nature of knowledge

itself. According to Burbules¹, AI challenges traditional notions of intelligence, cognition, and knowledge, forcing educators to reevaluate their assumptions about human learning and the role of technology in the educational process. Similarly, Biesta² argues that AI-driven education risks perpetuating a narrow, instrumentalist view of learning, neglecting essential aspects of human experience and agency. On the other hand, authors like Peters³ and Knox⁴ see AI as an opportunity to augment human capabilities, enhance pedagogy, and promote more inclusive and personalized learning environments. They contend that AI can facilitate new forms of collaborative intelligence, bridging the gap between human and machine cognition.

Philosophers of education must engage with these debates, drawing on theoretical frameworks from epistemology, ethics, and metaphysics to illuminate the intersection of philosophy and AI in education. By examining the ontological and epistemological implications of AI-driven education, we can better understand the potential consequences for human flourishing, agency, and the pursuit of knowledge. As we navigate the intersection of philosophy and AI in education, we must consider the ethical implications of AI-driven pedagogy. Authors like Bostrom⁵ and Russell⁶ warn of the potential risks and biases inherent in AI systems, highlighting the need for careful consideration of AI's impact on educational equity and justice.

Furthermore, the integration of AI in education raises fundamental questions about the nature of knowledge and intelligence. Philosophers like Dreyfus⁷ and Winch⁸ have long argued that human knowledge and understanding cannot be reduced to mere computational processes, emphasizing the importance of embodied experience and social context in learning. In contrast, AI enthusiasts like Kurzweil⁹ and Rose¹⁰ envision a future where AI surpasses human intelligence, potentially revolutionizing education and cognitive development. However, this vision raises essential questions about the role of human teachers, the value of human knowledge, and the purposes of education.

To fully grasp the intersection of philosophy and AI in education, we must engage with these debates, drawing on insights from philosophy of mind, epistemology, ethics, and political philosophy. By examining the complex interplay between human and artificial intelligence, we can better understand the Implications of AI-driven education for human flourishing, agency, and the pursuit of knowledge.

The intersection of philosophy and AI in education also raises important questions about the nature of learning and intelligence. According to Searle¹¹, AI systems lack true understanding and intentionality, merely simulating intelligence through complex algorithms and computations. This perspective has implications for how we design AI-driven educational systems, highlighting the need for careful consideration of what it means to learn and understand.

The intersection of philosophy and AI in education also raises important questions about the nature of teaching and learning. As AI systems become more advanced, they are increasingly being used to support or even replace traditional teaching methods (Luckin et al.¹²). However,

this shift towards AI-driven pedagogy challenges traditional notions of teaching as a human-centered activity¹³ Philosophers like Gert Biesta¹⁴ argue that teaching is not just about transmitting knowledge, but about fostering human relationships and promoting student agency.

As we explore the intersection of philosophy and AI in education, we must also consider the potential consequences of AI-driven pedagogy on human relationships and social dynamics. According to Turkle¹⁵ AI systems can erode our capacity for empathy and deep human connection, leading to a society of "alone together" individuals. In contrast, authors like Rose¹⁶ and Selinger¹⁷ argue that AI can facilitate new forms of social interaction and community building, particularly in online learning environments. However, these perspectives raise essential questions about the nature of human relationships, intimacy, and sociality in the age of AI.

Moreover, the integration of AI in education challenges traditional notions of knowledge, truth, and epistemology. According to Foucault¹⁸, knowledge is always a product of power relationships and social constructs. AI-driven education may perpetuate existing power dynamics, reinforcing dominant narratives and marginalizing alternative perspectives. In response, philosophers like Latour¹⁹ and Stengers²⁰ advocate for a more nuanced understanding of knowledge production, recognizing the agency of non-human actors and the complexity of knowledge ecologies. This perspective has significant implications for how we design AI-driven educational systems, highlighting the need for more inclusive, participatory, and adaptive approaches to knowledge creation.

To guide us in this intellectual discourse, it is pertinent that we pause awhile to consider the concept of artificial intelligence in education according to various scholars.

Concept of Artificial Intelligence in Education

Artificial intelligence (AI) has transformed various sectors, including education. However, its definition varies among authors. In this paper, the authors reviewed different authors' definitions of AI in education, highlighting similarities and differences. Finally, an operational definition of AI in education was provided at the end of the review.

One of the earliest definitions of AI was provided by John McCarthy, who coined the term "Artificial Intelligence" in 1956. McCarthy²¹ defined AI as the science and engineering of making intelligent machines. In the context of education, this definition laid the groundwork for the development of intelligent tutoring systems.

Russell and Norvig²² defined AI as the study of agents that perceive their environment and take actions to achieve their goals. In education, this definition applies to machine learning algorithms that adapt to students' learning styles and abilities. For example, intelligent tutoring systems like Carnegie Learning's Cognitive Tutor use machine learning to provide personalized feedback.

In the context of Educational Technology, Mayer²³ defined AI in education as "the use of computational methods to analyze and improve learning processes." This definition emphasizes the role of AI in educational technology, such as learning management systems and adaptive assessment tools.

From Cognitive Science Perspective, Anderson et al²⁴ defined AI in education as "the application of cognitive science and computer science to improve learning outcomes." This definition highlights the importance of understanding human cognition in designing effective AI-based educational interventions.

From Human-Centered Perspective, Verbelen²⁵ defined AI in education as "a human-centered approach to enhance teaching and learning through intelligent systems." This definition emphasizes the need for AI systems to prioritize human values, such as empathy and creativity.

From Critical Perspectives, Selwyn²⁶ argued that AI in education should be defined as "a complex socio-technical system that reflects and reinforces existing power dynamics." This critical perspective highlights the need for educators to consider the social implications of AI in education.

From the foregoing definitions, there are four common themes which need to be highlighted. These themes are:

1. **Intelligence:** AI systems demonstrate intelligent behavior, such as problem-solving and adaptation.
2. **Technology:** AI relies on computational methods and technologies.
3. **Education:** AI aims to improve learning outcomes and processes.
4. **Human-centered:** AI should prioritize human values and needs.

Based on the review of definitions, this paper proposes the following operational definition: Artificial intelligence in education refers to the integration of computational methods, cognitive science, and human-centered design to create adaptive, intelligent systems that enhance teaching and learning, prioritize human values, and promote equitable educational outcomes. This definition acknowledges the complex interplay between technology, cognition, and human values in AI-based educational interventions.

As we can see from the above definitions, Artificial intelligence in education is a multifaceted concept with varying definitions. By synthesizing these definitions, educators and researchers can develop a nuanced understanding of AI's potential to transform education. The proposed operational definition provides a foundation for further research and development of effective AI-based educational interventions and for a critical examination of the Philosophical Implications of AI integration in education.

AI Integration in Education: A Critical Examination of the Philosophical Implications

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in education has sparked intense debate among philosophers, educators, and technologists. As AI-based educational technologies become increasingly prevalent, it is essential to critically examine the philosophical implications of this intersection.

Ethical Considerations of AI in Education

From an ethical perspective, AI-powered educational systems raise concerns about student autonomy, bias, and fairness. As Selwyn²⁷ notes, the use of AI in education raises important questions about the extent to which students are able to exercise control over their own learning. Again, Slade & Prinsloo²⁸ raise concern that AI-powered learning analytics can collect vast amounts of data on students, raising concerns about privacy and surveillance. This can lead to a loss of autonomy and agency for students.

Again, philosophers have also argued that AI systems can challenge traditional notions of agency and autonomy, requiring a re-evaluation of human values²⁹. For instance, AI systems can make decisions that have significant moral implications, such as in healthcare or criminal justice. Therefore, it is crucial to consider the philosophical implications of AI decision-making to ensure that AI systems align with human values. Similarly, O'Neil warns that AI systems can perpetuate existing biases and inequalities, particularly if trained on biased data sets³⁰. This echoes the concerns of critical pedagogues like Freire³¹ who argue that educational technologies can reinforce existing power structures and inequalities. These existing power structures and inequalities are reinforced in many ways. Therefore, philosophers must develop AI-specific ethical frameworks and examine AI's impact on educational values such as equity and inclusivity.

Epistemological Implications

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in education has sparked intense debate about the epistemological implications of this technology. Epistemology, the branch of philosophy concerned with the nature and scope of knowledge, is crucial in understanding the impact of AI on education.

One of the primary concerns is the potential for AI to alter the way we understand knowledge and learning. AI-powered educational tools can perpetuate a narrow, instrumental view of knowledge, where learning is reduced to mere information processing.³² This can lead to a lack of critical thinking and deep understanding, as students are not encouraged to question or challenge the information presented to them.

Moreover, AI systems can perpetuate existing power dynamics and knowledge hierarchies, reinforcing dominant epistemologies and marginalizing alternative perspectives³³. This can result in a lack of diversity and inclusivity in education, as certain groups are excluded from the knowledge-production process.

Furthermore, the use of AI in education raises questions about the nature of intelligence and cognition. Some argue that AI systems can enhance human cognition, freeing us from mundane tasks and allowing us to focus on higher-level thinking³⁴. Others contend that AI

systems can never truly replicate human intelligence, as they lack the embodied and social aspects of human cognition.³⁵

Additionally, AI-powered educational tools can also perpetuate a view of knowledge as objective and absolute, rather than subjective and context-dependent³⁶. This can lead to a lack of nuance and complexity in education, as students are not encouraged to consider multiple perspectives or challenge dominant narratives.

Again, the use of AI in education raises questions about the role of the teacher and the nature of pedagogy. Some argue that AI systems can augment the teacher's role, providing personalized learning experiences and freeing up instructors to focus on higher-level tasks³⁷. Others contend that AI systems can never replace the complex, nuanced, and contextual nature of human teaching³⁸.

Moreover, the integration of AI in education has significant implications for our understanding of knowledge and truth. AI systems can perpetuate dominant epistemologies and reinforce existing power structures, marginalizing alternative perspectives and ways of knowing³⁹. This can result in a lack of diversity and inclusivity in education, as certain groups are excluded from the knowledge-production process.

Furthermore, the use of AI in education raises questions about the nature of agency and autonomy. Some argue that AI systems can enhance human agency, providing individuals with the tools and resources they need to make informed decisions⁴⁰. Others contend that AI systems can undermine human agency, perpetuating a culture of surveillance and control⁴¹.

In all, the epistemological implications of AI in education are complex and multifaceted. Educators and philosophers must therefore critically examine the impact of AI on our understanding of knowledge, learning, and intelligence. By doing so, we can ensure that AI is used in a way that promotes inclusive, critical, and nuanced education and pedagogy.

Pedagogical and Learning Implications

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in education has significant pedagogical and learning implications. AI can enhance personalized learning, automate administrative tasks, and provide real-time feedback, but it also raises concerns about the role of teachers, the nature of learning, and the potential for bias.

Personalized learning is a key benefit of AI in education. AI can analyze individual students' learning styles, abilities, and preferences, tailoring instruction to meet their unique needs⁴². However, this also raises concerns about the potential for AI to perpetuate existing inequalities, as students from disadvantaged backgrounds may have limited access to AI-powered learning tools⁴³.

AI can also automate administrative tasks, freeing teachers to focus on higher-level tasks such as lesson planning and student support⁴⁴. However, this also raises concerns about the potential for AI to replace teachers, particularly in subjects, where content is easily quantifiable⁴⁵.

Moreover, AI can provide real-time feedback, enabling students to track their progress and identify areas for improvement⁴⁶. However, this also raises concerns about the potential for AI to create a culture of surveillance, where students are constantly monitored and evaluated⁴⁷.

The pedagogical and learning implications of AI in education are complex and multifaceted. While AI has the potential to enhance personalized learning, automate administrative tasks, and provide real-time feedback, it also raises concerns about the role of teachers, the nature of learning, and the potential for bias. As educators and researchers, we must critically examine the impact of AI on education, ensuring that its benefits are equitably distributed and its risks are mitigated.

Furthermore, AI-powered adaptive learning systems can create a "digital trip" where students are limited to a narrow range of learning pathways, restricting their agency and autonomy⁴⁸. Additionally, AI-driven feedback systems can perpetuate a culture of standardization, where students are judged solely on their ability to conform to predetermined standards⁴⁹.

Moreover, the use of AI in education raises concerns about the potential for bias and discrimination. AI systems can perpetuate existing biases and stereotypes, particularly if they are trained on biased data sets⁵⁰. This can result in AI-powered learning tools that are less effective for certain groups of students, exacerbating existing inequalities.

To mitigate these risks, educators and researchers must prioritize transparency, accountability, and equity in the development and deployment of AI-powered learning tools. This includes ensuring that AI systems are designed to promote agency, autonomy, and creativity, rather than simply reproducing existing power dynamics⁵¹.

Again, the intersection of philosophy and AI in education demands critical examination. Ethical concerns surrounding autonomy, bias, and privacy must be addressed. Epistemological questions about knowledge representation, Intelligence, and learning require careful consideration. Metaphysical implications for human nature, free will, and reality necessitate philosophical reflection.

Ultimately, educators and policymakers must engage with philosophical perspectives, prioritizing critical pedagogy, existentialism, and post humanism. By doing so, we can ensure that AI-based educational technologies promote equitable, inclusive, and human-centered learning experiences.

The intersection of philosophy and artificial intelligence in education presents a complex and multifaceted landscape. As AI becomes increasingly Integrated into educational settings, it is crucial that we consider the philosophical implications of this technology on teaching, learning, and the very notion of education itself.

Through this examination, we have seen that AI raises important questions about the nature of knowledge, intelligence, and cognition. It challenges traditional notions of pedagogy and forces us to re-evaluate the role of teachers and students in the learning process.

Moreover, the intersection of philosophy and AI in education highlights the need for a critical and nuanced approach to technological integration. We must prioritize transparency, accountability, and equity in the development and deployment of AI-powered learning tools.

Indubitably, the future of education in the age of AI depends on our ability to thoughtfully navigate these philosophical complexities. By engaging in ongoing critical discourse and reflection, we can ensure that AI is harnessed in ways that promote inclusive, equitable, and transformative learning experiences for all.

Furthermore, the Intersection of philosophy and AI in education highlights the need for a reevaluation of the purposes and values of education. As AI assumes increasingly complex tasks, we must consider what it means to be human and what values we want to prioritize in our educational systems.

Again, the intersection of philosophy and AI in education underscores the importance of interdisciplinary collaboration. Philosophers, educators, computer scientists, and policy makers must work together to develop AI-powered learning tools that are grounded in a deep understanding of human learning and development.

In brief, the intersection of philosophy and AI in education presents a rich and complex landscape of questions, challenges, and opportunities. By engaging with these issues in a thoughtful and nuanced manner, we can ensure that AI is used to enhance and augment human learning, rather than simply automate or replace it.

Recommendations

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in education has sparked intense debate among philosophers, educators, and technologists. As AI-based educational technologies become increasingly prevalent, it is essential to critically examine the philosophical implications of this intersection. This paper recapitulates the key concerns and recommendations for future directions in philosophical inquiry.

Metaphysical implications of AI-driven educational technologies are equally profound. AI challenges traditional notions of human nature and identity, and its impact on educational relationships and ontology requires philosophical analysis. The philosophy of technology provides a critical framework for evaluating AI-driven educational innovations.

To advance our understanding of this complex landscape, philosophers must engage in interdisciplinary collaborations with AI researchers, educators, and policymakers. Empirical-philosophical research, conceptual analysis, and case studies are essential methodologies for investigating AI's impact on education.

Future directions for philosophical inquiry include:

1. Developing AI-specific ethical frameworks and examining AI's impact on educational values.

2. Investigating AI's influence on epistemic agency and knowledge representation.
3. Analyzing AI's implications for human identity and educational relationships.
4. Evaluating AI-driven educational innovations through the philosophy of technology.

By exploring these future directions, philosophers can provide critical insights into the complex intersection of AI and education. This will inform the development of AI-driven educational technologies that prioritize human values and promote equitable learning experiences.

References

- Anderson, J. R., et al. (2014). Cognitive tutoring: An approach to personalized learning. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 26(3), 251-266.
- Baker, R. S. (2016). Stupid tutoring systems, Intelligent humans. *Journal of Educational Data Mining*, 8(1), 1-24.
- Baker, R. S. (2016). Stupid tutoring systems, intelligent humans. *Journal of Educational Data Mining*, 8(1), 1-24.
- Bieler, D. (2018). *The teacher's craft: A study of pedagogy and the work of teaching*. Routledge
- Biesta, G. (2013). *The beautiful risk of education*. Routledge.
- Biesta, G. (2015). *Beyond Learning: Democratic education for a human future*. Routledge
- Biesta, G. (2015). *The beautiful risk of education*. Paradigm Publishers.
- Biesta, G. (2017). *The rediscovery of teaching*. Routledge
- Bostrom, N. (2014). *Super intelligence: Paths, dangers, strategies*. Oxford University Press.
- Burbules, N. C. (2016). The Limits of Educational Technology in G. Biesta, M. A. Peters, & T. Osberg (Eds.), *The beautiful risk of education* (pp. 147-162). Routledge.
- Caliskan, A., Bryson, J. J., & Narayanan, A. (2017). Semantics derived automatically from language corpora contain human-like biases. *Science*, 356(6334), 183-186.
- Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. A. (2019). *The costs of connection: How data colonizes human life*. Stanford University Press
- Dreyfus, H. L. (1979). *What computers can't do: The limits of artificial reason*. Harper & Row
- Dreyfus, H. L. (1992). *What computers still can't do: A critique of artificial reason*. MIT Press
- Dziuban, C. D., Moskal, P. D., & Williams, R. L. (2018). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Learning and Instruction*, 55, 151-161.
- Ford, M. (2015). *Rise of the robots: Technology and the threat of a jobless future*. Basic Books
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. Harper & Row.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum
- Giroux, H. A. (2011). *Zombie politics and culture in the age of casino capitalism*. Peter Lang Publishing
- Gunkel, D. J. (2018). *Robot rights*. MIT Press

- Gunkel, D. J. (2018). *Robot rights*. MIT Press
- Harding, S. (2015). *Objectivity and diversity: Another logic of scientific research*. University of Chicago Press
- ibid.
- Kohn, A. (2000). The case against gold stars, incentive plans, A's, and other bribes. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81(6), 417-424.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*, University of Chicago Press
- Kurzweil, R. (2005). *The singularity is near: When humans transcend biology*. Penguin
- Kurzweil, R. (2005). *The singularity is near: When humans transcend biology*. Penguin
- Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory*, Oxford University
- Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., & Forcier, L. B. (2016). *Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education*. Pearson
- Mayer, R. E. (2017). Using multimedia to support learning. *Jou Psychology*, 109(3), 351-365.
- Journal of Educational
- McCarthy, J. (1956). The proposal for the 1956 Dartmouth Summer Research Project on Artificial Intelligence,
- Mendez, J., et al. (2019). Real-time feedback in online learning environments. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 50(4), 419-433.
- O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*, Crown.
- Peters, M. A. (2016). Technological pedagogy And the digital university. In N. C. Burbules & T. A. Callister (Eds.), *Universities in the flux of time* (pp. 147-162). Routledge
- Rose, D. (2014), *Enchanted objects: Design, human desire, and the Internet of things*. Scribner
- Rose, D. (2014). *Enchanted objects: Design, human desire, and the Internet of things*. Scribner
- Russell, S. (2019). *Human compatible: Artificial intelligence and the problem of control*. Viking
- Russell, S. J., & Norvig, P. (2010). *Artificial intelligence: A modern appresch*. Prentice Hall
- Searle, J. R. (1980). Minds, brains, and programs. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 3(3), 417–424. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X00005756>
- Selinger, E. (2012). The ethics of everyday life: Moral reasoning in the digital age. In R. Rosenberger & P. Verbeek (Eds.), *The moral status of technical artifsets* (pp. 159-176). Springer.
- Selwyn, N. (2019). Should schools be worried about AI? *Journal of Educational Philosophy*, 41(2), 155-170.
- Selwyn, N. (2019). What's the problem with learning analytics? *Learning, Media and Technology*, 44(1), 1-12
- Slade, S., & Prinsloo, P. (2013). Learning analyties: Ethical issues and dilemmas. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 57(10), 1510-1529,
- Stengers, L. (2010). *Cosmopolitics I*. University of Minnesota Press.

- Turkle, S. (2015). *Reclaiming conversation: The power of talk in a digital age*. Penguin Books
- Verbelen, K. (2018). AI in education: A human-centered approach. *Journal of Educational Technology Development and Exchange*, 10(1), 1-12.
- Warschauer, M, & Matuchniak, T. (2010). New technology and digital worlds: Analyzing evidence of equity in access, use, and outcomes. *Review of Research in Education*, 34(1), 179-225,
- Winch, P. (1998). *The idea of a social science and its relation to philosophy*. Routledge
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. Public Affairs
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of Power*. PublicAffairs