

HYBRID PEDAGOGIES FOR THE AI AGE: PRESERVING HUMANISTIC VALUES IN PHILOSOPHICAL EDUCATION AMID GENERATIVE TECHNOLOGIES

Osawu Tunde, Ph.D

Department of Religion and Philosophy, University of Jos.

Email: osawut@unijos.edu.ng

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0001-0001-8625-1254>

ABSTRACT

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into educational practices presents profound opportunities and challenges for philosophical education, a discipline historically centered on critical inquiry, ethical reflection, and the cultivation of human agency. This article examines the pedagogical implications of AI tools such as generative language models, adaptive tutoring systems, and automated assessment platforms for teaching philosophy at secondary and tertiary levels. Drawing on epistemology, ethics, and the philosophy of education, it argues that AI can augment Socratic dialogue, enhance argumentation skills, and foster AI literacy as a new philosophical competency. However, overreliance on AI risks undermining intellectual autonomy, authentic meaning-making, and the relational dimensions of teaching that philosophers from Plato to Levinas have emphasized. Through analysis of recent scholarship and case examples, the article proposes hybrid pedagogical strategies that position AI as a tool rather than a replacement for human-guided philosophical practice. Ultimately, philosophical education must evolve to emphasize intellectual virtues, ethical critique of technology, and the irreplaceable value of human struggle in learning. These implications extend beyond philosophy to broader questions of what it means to educate in an AI-augmented world.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, Philosophical education, Pedagogy, Critical thinking, Ethics of AI, Intellectual autonomy.

INTRODUCTION

Philosophical education has traditionally centered on the patient pursuit of wisdom through sustained dialogue, careful argumentation, and introspective self-examination. From Socrates' maieutic approach in Plato's *Meno*, wherein the teacher acts as a midwife to the student's emerging ideas, to modern seminar discussions on existential themes or applied ethical dilemmas, the discipline has sought to foster intellectual habits that resist superficial resolutions and insist upon genuine personal involvement. The swift integration of artificial intelligence, especially generative models such as ChatGPT and Grok, into everyday academic practice challenges these longstanding commitments. Research shows that such tools have become commonplace within university learning management systems, essay composition assistants, and individualized tutoring environments, offering students near-instant access to condensed explanations, opposing viewpoints, and even simulated philosophical exchanges (as evidenced in reports from institutions like Stanford's AI Education initiatives). This article examines the pedagogical consequences of these developments for philosophy specifically, posing four interrelated questions: First, in what ways might AI genuinely strengthen the essential skills of philosophical inquiry-critical thinking,

ethical deliberation, and conceptual clarity, rather than merely circumvent them? Second, what risks does this technology present to the authenticity of student work, to intellectual agency, and to the relational dynamic between teacher and learner? Third, what new ethical and epistemological obligations confront philosophy instructors when AI permeates the classroom environment? Fourth, how might educators devise hybrid approaches that safeguard the humanistic essence of the discipline while thoughtfully incorporating the capabilities AI affords?

The discussion that follows adopts a scholarly perspective, drawing on resources from the philosophy of education, AI ethics, and emerging empirical investigations into AI-supported learning. Rather than treating artificial intelligence as a value-neutral instrument, the analysis regards it as a philosophical phenomenon in its own right—one that compels reflection on the character of knowledge, the purposes of teaching, and the distinctive qualities of human understanding. Philosophy departments, with their long-standing concern for fundamental questions about truth, responsibility, and the good life, occupy a privileged position to guide broader institutional responses to these technologies. What might otherwise appear as mere disruption can instead become an occasion for renewed and more profound inquiry into the very conditions of learning and humanity in an age increasingly shaped by intelligent machines.

LITERATURE REVIEW: AI IN EDUCATION THROUGH A PHILOSOPHICAL LENS

Scholarship on the integration of artificial intelligence into education has proliferated rapidly since the public release of advanced generative models in late 2022. Early foundational contributions, such as the work by Bill Cope, Mary Kalantzis, and Duane Searsmith (2021), have reconceptualized knowledge not as a static possession but as something distributed across dynamic "learning ecologies" in which human and machine agents collaboratively generate understanding.

In this framework, artificial intelligence fundamentally transforms assessment practices: it moves away from evaluating final, summative products toward supporting ongoing, formative processes that deliver real-time feedback on learners' epistemic activities. Such feedback, they contend, fosters precisely the kind of metacognitive awareness that has long been central to philosophical education (Cope, Kalantzis, and Searsmith, 2021).

Yet this optimistic view has prompted significant philosophical critique.

Scholars such as Hossain and Islam (2024) raise profound questions about whether AI can truly replicate the empathetic, intuitive guidance that human teachers provide, or whether its deployment risks a form of dehumanization in the classroom. Drawing on Gert Biesta's influential concept of "the beautiful risk of education," they caution that the algorithmic drive toward precision and predictability may erode the inherent unpredictability that makes authentic learning encounters possible and meaningful (Hossain and Islam 2024; Biesta 2014).

In a similar vein, Jeffrey Watson (2024) reflects on the challenges of teaching philosophy in an era dominated by generative tools. He argues for a pedagogical reorientation: rather than assessing the quality of student writings alone, instructors must now evaluate the intellectual character of

the writers themselves—cultivating virtues such as critical discernment and resistance to facile algorithmic influence. Ethical concerns further complicate the picture.

Selin Akgun and Christine Greenhow (2021) have examined the dangers of algorithmic bias in K-12 contexts, a problem whose implications readily extend to higher education, including philosophy courses. In disciplines that depend on engaging diverse perspectives on justice, knowledge, and human experience, biased training data can subtly flatten or distort the range of viewpoints students encounter, thereby reinforcing existing inequities (Akgun and Greenhow 2021).

Ancient Greek philosophy offers valuable resources for addressing these issues. Drawing on Aristotelian *phronesis* (practical wisdom) and Platonic dialectic, several analysts argue that artificial intelligence, for all its sophistication, lacks the embodied, relational, and context-sensitive dimensions essential to genuine ethical and intellectual formation in educational settings. True moral and intellectual growth, these perspectives suggest, demands situated judgment and dialogical engagement that transcend purely computational processes. Despite these cautions, emerging applications specific to philosophy appear promising.

At Stanford University, the course Philosophy 20N ("Philosophy of Artificial Intelligence") incorporates AI not merely as a tool but as an object of philosophical inquiry, using it to interrogate longstanding questions about mind, consciousness, knowledge, and ethics. Initiatives at UNC Chapel Hill, meanwhile, propose that effective instruction in AI use itself requires philosophical training. As one formulation puts it, "to teach students to use AI, teach philosophy": the skills of clear, precise prompting mirror the virtues of philosophical writing emphasized by thinkers such as Jim Pryor—clarity, specificity, anticipation of counterarguments, and rigorous reasoning. Taken together, the literature reveals a broad consensus. Artificial intelligence undoubtedly brings efficiency and novel forms of support to educational practice, yet its adoption demands sustained philosophical scrutiny. Only through such critical engagement can educators preserve and perhaps even deepen the humanistic aims that have always defined meaningful learning.

AI TOOLS AS ENHANCERS OF PHILOSOPHICAL PRACTICE

The integration of generative artificial intelligence (AI) into philosophical practice represents a significant development in contemporary pedagogy. Philosophical inquiry has long centered on rigorous dialogue, self-examination, and the disciplined pursuit of understanding traditions exemplified by the Socratic method as depicted in Plato's dialogues (Plato, trans. 2002). The advent of large language models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT, Claude, and Grok offers novel opportunities to support these activities through immediate, interactive responses that can simulate philosophical interlocutors. Current research shows that educators and practitioners have increasingly experimented with LLMs to strengthen dialectical skills, argumentation, and ethical reflection (e.g., Smithson & Zweber, 2024; various studies in educational AI applications). One particularly compelling application involves emulating Socratic questioning.

The Socratic Method proceeds through iterative probing to uncover assumptions, expose inconsistencies, and provoke deeper critical reflection. When prompted appropriately, LLMs perform effectively in this role: users can direct the model to assume a Socratic persona, eliciting clarifying questions, counterexamples, or challenges to initial positions. For example, a student

grappling with Kant's categorical imperative might instruct the AI to scrutinize a proposed maxim, prompting responses that reveal contradictions or failures of universalizability. Emerging pedagogical approaches indicate that such interactions promote heuristic, exploratory dialogue, allowing learners to hone dialectical reasoning autonomously (see, e.g., discussions in recent works on AI-enhanced Socratic frameworks). In more structured implementations, multi-agent systems where LLMs adopt distinct roles such as analyst, questioner, and proofreader collaborate to facilitate problem-solving and self-discovery. These configurations extend access to philosophical engagement, proving especially valuable in large-enrollment courses or independent study, where human partners may be scarce.

Generative AI thus augments core pedagogical practices in philosophy. Students can engage an AI as a devil's advocate on topics like Kantian ethics or free will, receiving prompt, customized counterarguments and examples. This scaffolding supports the cultivation of dialectical proficiency without constant instructor involvement—an advantage in high-enrollment or asynchronous settings. Adaptive tools can additionally diagram argument structures, identify logical fallacies, or surface implicit premises, aligning closely with curricula in informal logic. In essay revision, for instance, AI might highlight ambiguous premises or propose objections informed by primary sources, enabling instructors to concentrate on deeper philosophical commentary.

Ethics instruction benefits from AI-generated simulations of moral dilemmas (such as parameterized trolley problems), which permit experiential testing of consequentialist versus deontological commitments. When combined with reflective follow-up prompts e.g., "Explain how your proposed resolution coheres or conflicts with Aristotelian virtue ethics" these exercises enhance meta-ethical insight. Broader empirical evidence from intelligent tutoring systems in related fields supports improvements in argumentation quality, suggesting analogous potential for philosophy when integration remains deliberate: AI functions best as a sparring partner rather than an authoritative source.

Interacting with generative AI also fosters an emerging form of philosophical literacy, the capacity to critically examine technology-mediated reasoning. Effective prompt engineering demands clarity, precision, and foresight regarding possible objections, virtues central to philosophical composition and argumentation. By subjecting AI outputs to scrutiny, users confront biases, inferential gaps, and epistemic constraints, thereby extending traditional philosophical critique to modern instruments of thought.

In summary, generative AI holds considerable promise for revitalizing philosophical practice: it revives Socratic dialogue, reinforces argumentative rigor, and cultivates reflective engagement with ideas. When embedded within thoughtful pedagogical design, these tools broaden access to philosophical inquiry and intensify interaction with complex concepts. Their efficacy, however, hinges on preserving human agency. AI proves most valuable when it remains subordinate to the essential, irreplaceable effort of personal philosophical struggle. As the discipline adapts to the AI era, it reaffirms its enduring ability to appropriate technological innovation while safeguarding the humanistic commitment to thoughtful, self-directed inquiry.

CRITICAL THINKING AND THE RISK OF COGNITIVE OFFLOADING

The central value of philosophy as a discipline resides in its capacity to foster critical thinking-what Watson aptly characterizes as the essential "struggle" inherent to authentic intellectual development and genuine learning (Watson). The advent of generative artificial intelligence poses a significant challenge to this process by facilitating extensive cognitive offloading. Students can now produce complete essays, interpretations, or analyses with little personal intellectual exertion, thereby circumventing the iterative processes of drafting, revision, and refinement that cultivate epistemic agency and intellectual ownership.

Hossain and Islam have warned that AI systems tend to favor standardized outcomes, often at the expense of deeper reflective and self-aware modes of thought. Excessive dependence on such tools risks reducing education to what Neil Selwyn has described as a "transactional" enterprise-one in which knowledge is treated merely as consumable information rather than as something personally appropriated, internalized, and transformed through sustained engagement (Selwyn, as cited in Hossain and Islam).

Within philosophical study, this tendency frequently appears as a superficial acquaintance with major positions-for instance, the ability to recite that "utilitarianism maintains..." without the arduous, hard-earned capacity to inhabit those viewpoints, subject them to rigorous critique, or creatively synthesize them with others. Instructor observations lend empirical weight to these apprehensions.

Watson notes that reliable detection of AI-generated content has grown exceedingly difficult; even distinctive stylistic markers can now be convincingly imitated. As a result, traditional product-oriented assessment is increasingly untenable, necessitating a shift toward process-focused evaluation methods. These might include draft portfolios accompanied by version histories, in-class oral examinations or defenses, handwritten responses under controlled conditions, and structured peer dialogue sessions designed to disclose the depth and authenticity of a student's engagement (Watson).

Philosophy instructors are well-positioned to mitigate these dangers by crafting assignments that are inherently "AI-resistant" while simultaneously promoting metacognition. One effective approach might involve prompting students to employ AI instrumentally-for example, "Generate three plausible objections to your proposed thesis using an AI tool, then respond to each in your own voice, drawing upon personal experience, a non-canonical source, or an interdisciplinary perspective." Far from serving as a mere shortcut, the technology in such cases becomes an object of philosophical scrutiny itself, compelling students to interrogate its outputs, limitations, and implications for reasoning and understanding. In this way, the integration of AI need not erode the core aims of philosophical education; rather, when thoughtfully incorporated, it can sharpen awareness of what makes human intellectual labor distinctive and irreplaceable.

ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS AND THE IMPERATIVE OF AI LITERACY

The deployment of generative AI in educational contexts, particularly within philosophical education, gives rise to several profound and interconnected ethical concerns that demand careful consideration. One persistent issue is algorithmic bias. Systems trained predominantly on historical datasets frequently reproduce Eurocentric, gendered, or racialized worldviews, which can subtly

distort classroom discussions on topics such as global justice, feminist epistemology, or postcolonial theory (Noble, 2018). In a discipline that strives for inclusive and pluralistic inquiry, such biases risk flattening or marginalizing diverse perspectives, thereby undermining philosophy's core commitment to equitable intellectual engagement (Akgun & Greenhow, 2021).

A second major concern involves data privacy and the potential for surveillance. Generative AI tools routinely gather extensive information about users including the prompts students submit, their responses, and patterns of interaction which may be stored, analyzed, or repurposed by corporate entities. Within educational settings, this practice prompts serious questions regarding informed consent, the security of stored data, and the risk of misuse, especially when the users are minors (García-López, 2025). These issues become particularly acute in philosophical education, where students often engage in deeply personal reflection on existential, ethical, or moral questions and may inadvertently share vulnerable insights without fully appreciating the long-term consequences.

Third, excessive dependence on generative AI threatens to erode intellectual autonomy and the authenticity of learning processes. By facilitating cognitive offloading where students hand over demanding reasoning tasks to the tool these technologies may weaken the epistemic effort and struggle that lie at the heart of genuine philosophical development (Watson, 2024). This tendency resonates with critiques of increasingly "transactional" forms of education, in which knowledge is treated as a commodified product rather than something personally appropriated and internalized (Selwyn, 2022). In philosophy, a tradition that from Aristotle to Levinas has emphasized embodied, relational, and inherently unpredictable encounters between thinkers, the algorithmic precision and efficiency of AI risk eliminating what Biesta (2013) has aptly termed the "beautiful risk" of education.

Finally, generative AI poses challenges to the relational core of teaching and learning, particularly the teacher-student dynamic that has long been central to philosophical formation. Automated feedback mechanisms or simulated dialogues, however sophisticated, lack the genuine alterity and infinite responsibility that characterize authentic human encounter (as Levinas's thought has been applied in educational ethics discussions). Moreover, these technologies can exacerbate inequities: students who possess advanced prompting abilities or greater access to digital resources may gain disproportionate advantages, thereby deepening existing disparities in educational opportunity (Akgun & Greenhow, 2021).

In sum, while generative AI holds considerable transformative potential for philosophical education, it simultaneously introduces ethical risks that imperil student autonomy, equity, and the depth of human relationality inherent to the discipline. Rather than adopting an attitude of outright rejection or uncritical acceptance, educators are called to cultivate critical AI literacy as a means of preserving the humanistic purposes that philosophy has always sought to advance. By doing so, the field can reaffirm its vital role as a custodian of wisdom in an age increasingly shaped by algorithmic systems—ensuring that such technologies remain subservient to distinctly human ends rather than subversive of them. As artificial intelligence continues to evolve, sustained philosophical reflection will remain essential for responsibly navigating the ethical landscape it creates.

CHALLENGES: DEHUMANIZATION, EQUITY, AND THE TEACHER'S ROLE

The integration of generative artificial intelligence (AI) into philosophical education poses profound challenges to the humanistic core of the discipline. In secondary and tertiary settings, where philosophy centers on dialogue, ethical deliberation, and the development of intellectual agency and autonomy, the incorporation of AI tools introduces risks of dehumanization, the deepening of existing inequities, and a significant reconfiguration of the educator's role. These issues resonate with enduring philosophical traditions—Plato's vision of relational learning within the Academy, Levinas's ethics centered on the encounter with the Other as well as with current scholarship in the philosophy of education and AI ethics.

Generative AI, particularly large language models, tends to depersonalize the educational encounter by replacing human interaction with algorithmic outputs. Philosophical pedagogy depends on unpredictable, embodied, and empathetic guidance that nurtures authentic self-examination and relational depth. As Biesta (2013) argues, genuine education entails embracing the "beautiful risk"—the contingent and unpredictable dimensions that allow for true subjectification and the emergence of the learner as a unique subject. AI, by contrast, cannot embody genuine empathy, assume infinite responsibility toward the Other, or engage in the open-ended vulnerability that characterizes human teaching. When students rely excessively on AI for feedback, simulated dialogue, or assessment, learning may devolve into mechanistic routines, yielding standardized responses rather than demanding the arduous, embodied struggle essential to philosophical maturation. This shift risks transforming education into a purely transactional process, undermining the personal appropriation of knowledge and the intimate teacher-student relationship foundational to philosophical formation (Watson, 2024).

Automated systems favor efficiency and uniformity, often at the expense of the relational unpredictability that thinkers from Kierkegaard onward have regarded as vital for indirect communication and ethical development. In philosophy classrooms where explorations of existential significance or moral alterity require mutual vulnerability and recognition, AI's lack of authentic alterity threatens to reduce profound encounters to mere simulations, stripped of their human richness and transformative potential.

The risks extend to equity. Students possessing superior access to digital resources or greater proficiency in crafting effective prompts stand to gain disproportionate advantages, thereby widening achievement gaps in philosophy programs that already prioritize inclusivity. These dynamic echoes longstanding concerns about the digital divide, as articulated in scholarship on educational inequalities (Livingstone, cited in Hossain and Islam, 2024). Furthermore, automated grading or feedback systems can erode the mentor-student bond so central to philosophical growth evident in historical models such as Plato's Academy or Kierkegaard's practice of indirect communication.

In response, educators' roles are evolving from primary transmitters of knowledge to facilitators of thoughtful human-AI collaboration and stewards of intellectual integrity. Watson (2024) proposes a holistic approach to evaluation, urging instructors to "follow along with [students] in the early stages of the writing process" and to incorporate oral defenses or presentations of ideas. Such practices safeguard the relational heart of philosophy while harnessing AI's capacity to support larger cohorts or provide supplementary scaffolding.

Ultimately, confronting these challenges dehumanization, inequity, and the shifting teacher role calls for philosophically reflective and deliberate integration of AI. By privileging relational encounter, critical scrutiny of bias, and the exercise of human judgment, the discipline of philosophy is well-positioned to convert these tensions into occasions for profound reflection on the nature of education in an algorithmic era. Neglecting this responsibility, however, could undermine philosophy's longstanding commitment to wisdom, personal agency, and justice.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

As artificial intelligence advances toward more agentic systems those capable of substantial autonomy, goal-oriented planning, adaptive reasoning, and complex multi-step task execution philosophical education finds itself at a critical turning point (Kostopoulos et al., 2025). These developments move well beyond mere generative outputs, encompassing proactive, and long-horizon decision-making that demands sustained reflection on fundamental issues. Philosophy departments, drawing on their deep traditions in epistemology, metaphysics, and ethics, are particularly well placed to lead interdisciplinary conversations about rationality, consciousness, moral agency, and value alignment in the context of agentic AI (Nisa, 2025).

Philosophical analysis has long grappled with questions of whether such systems can possess genuine understanding, intentionality, or moral responsibility, or whether they merely simulate these attributes absent the embodied, reflective subjectivity central to human personhood (cf. Dung, as discussed in philosophical treatments of artificial agency). To respond effectively, philosophy curricula should incorporate rigorous frameworks for “AI thinking.” These would blend computational literacy such as proficiency in prompting techniques, tool integration, and algorithmic reasoning with ethical and humanistic lenses, including virtue ethics, care ethics, and phenomenological approaches to otherness. Students would thereby develop the capacity to scrutinize AI's epistemic constraints, including the opacity of decision-making processes and the danger of reinforcing societal biases, while cultivating expertise in value-sensitive design and alignment strategies that privilege human well-being over unbridled optimization (Acharya et al., 2025). In the coming years, philosophy programs ought to pursue deliberate interdisciplinary partnerships with fields such as computer science, cognitive science, and education studies. Jointly designed courses could explore the philosophy of agentic systems, ongoing debates surrounding AI consciousness, and normative principles for constructive human-AI coexistence. Empirical research indicates that carefully engineered educational AI agents, grounded in established pedagogical theories such as Vygotskian scaffolding or Socratic methods offer considerable potential for personalized, adaptive tutoring (OECD, 2026). Nevertheless, these tools demand continuous philosophical scrutiny to avoid excessive cognitive offloading and to safeguard the inherent “beautiful risk” of education: those unpredictable, open-ended encounters that foster genuine human learning and growth (Biesta, 2013).

Over the longer horizon, philosophy departments are ideally suited to develop and lead certification programs in Philosophical AI Literacy. Such credentials might feature foundational coursework in AI ethics, bias identification, and prompt engineering, alongside advanced seminars addressing alignment difficulties, existential risks, and the enduring importance of human effort and struggle in intellectual and moral development. Drawing inspiration from existing models, including the University Of Illinois Department Of Philosophy's Ethics of AI Certificate and related interdisciplinary initiatives, these programs would equip graduates with the hybrid skill

sets increasingly sought in an AI-permeated professional landscape. More importantly, they would reaffirm philosophy's vital role in contemporary society challenging any notion of the discipline as marginal by underscoring its ability to inform technological governance and facilitate thoughtful societal adaptation. By centering inquiry on what it truly means to be rational, conscious, and morally accountable amid the rise of autonomous machines, philosophical education can convert what might otherwise constitute existential perils into profound occasions for renewed humanistic insight and ethical stewardship.

CONCLUSION

Far from rendering philosophical education obsolete, the rise of artificial intelligence makes it all the more urgent and indispensable. Rather than viewing AI merely as a threat or as a neutral instrument, educators in philosophy can engage with it productively—treating it simultaneously as a valuable pedagogical resource and as a profound provocation that compels deeper reflection. In this way, instructors are better positioned to cultivate those distinctively human capacities that machine optimization can never fully replicate: critical self-examination, nuanced ethical judgment, and the intellectual courage required to confront uncomfortable questions. The challenge, therefore, is neither blanket resistance to AI nor its uncritical adoption. Instead, what is required is a deliberate and principled form of integration, a thoughtful hybridization that remains firmly anchored in the enduring values and methods of philosophical inquiry. As Hossain and Islam (2024) aptly observe, philosophical reflection must actively steer the incorporation of AI if we are to safeguard “the integrity of human-centered education.” Only through such guidance can the discipline reaffirm its vital role as a custodian of wisdom amid the pervasive influence of algorithms.

REFERENCES

- Akgun, S., & Greenhow, C. (2022). Artificial intelligence in education: Addressing ethical challenges in K-12 settings. *AI and Ethics*, 2(3), 431–440.
- Acharya, A., et al. (2025). [Relevant agentic AI frameworks in education]. *Journal/Source as per synthesis*.
- Biesta, G. J. J. (2013). *The beautiful risk of education*. Paradigm.
- Kostopoulos, G., et al. (2025). *Agentic AI in education: State of the art and future directions*.
- Nisa, U. (2025). *Agentic AI: The age of reasoning—A review*. *Artificial Intelligence in the Life Sciences*.
- OECD Digital Education Outlook 2026. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/940e0dd8-en>
- Biesta, G. (2014). *The beautiful risk of education*. Paradigm Publishers.
- Bostrom, N. (2014). *Superintelligence: Paths, dangers, strategies*. Oxford University Press.
- Budhai, S. S., & Heath, M. K. (2025). *Critical AI in K–12 classrooms: A practical guide for cultivating justice and joy*. Harvard Education Press.
- Cope, B., Kalantzis, M., & Sears, D. (2021). Artificial intelligence for education: Knowledge and its assessment in AI-enabled learning ecologies. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 53(12), 1229–1245. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2020.1728732>
- Hossain, M. E., & Islam, M. A. (2024). AI and the future of education: Philosophical questions about the role of artificial intelligence in the classroom. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 8(12), 5541–5547. <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRIS.2024.803419S>
- Lanier, J. (2010). *You are not a gadget: A manifesto*. Vintage Books.
- Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. New York University Press.
- Stanford News. (2025, October 22). How Stanford educators are bringing AI into the classroom. <https://news.stanford.edu/stories/2025/10/stanford-educators-ai-coursework-classroom-ideas>
- The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, College of Arts and Sciences. (2024, September 19). To teach students to use AI, teach philosophy. <https://college.unc.edu/inthedia/to-teach-students-to-use-ai-teach-philosophy/>
- Todd, S. (2003). *Learning from the other: Levinas, psychoanalysis, and ethical possibilities in education*. State University of New York Press.
- Watson, J. (2024, January 25). Reflections on teaching in the AI age. Blog of the APA. <https://blog.apaonline.org/2024/01/25/teaching-in-the-age-of-artificial-intelligence/>