

Frontier of Power. New York: PublicAffairs,
2019.

THE 21ST CENTURY HYBRID INTELLIGENCE QUAGMIRE AND THE EPISTEMIC AUTHORITY OF AI: AN EPISTEMOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

Daniel Aseer Kwaghgande, PhD

Department of Philosophy, Benue State University,
Makurdi, Nigeria

dankwagason@gmail.com;
dkwaghgande@bsum.edu.ng

Abstract

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into various aspects of modern life has created a complex hybrid intelligence quagmire (HIQ). This phenomenon, characterized by the interplay between human and artificial intelligence, raises very fundamental questions about the nature of knowledge, authority and decision-making. As AI systems become increasingly sophisticated, they are being entrusted with tasks that were previously exclusive to humans, such as decision-making, problem-solving and knowledge production. However, this has led to questions about the epistemic authority of AI, particularly in relation to human cognition. The question is: Can AI systems be trusted to produce knowledge with apodatic certainty? Can AI

systems be trusted to produce knowledge that is reliable, accurate and unbiased or do they introduce new forms of error, bias and uncertainty into the knowledge production process? This work examines these questions through an epistemological analysis of the hybrid intelligence quagmire. It examines the implications of AI-driven knowledge production for our understanding of truth and justification of knowledge. This work undertakes an epistemological analysis of the Hybrid Intelligence Quagmire, focusing on the epistemic authority of AI. It examines the challenges posed by AI-driven knowledge production, the blurring of lines between human and artificial intelligence and the implications for traditional notions of authority and expertise. The work reveals that the Hybrid Intelligence Quagmire demands a reevaluation of epistemological assumptions and the development of new frameworks for understanding the interplay between human and artificial intelligence.

Keywords: Hybrid Intelligence, Epistemic Authority, Artificial Intelligence, Epistemology and Human-AI Interaction

Introduction

The 21st century has witnessed an unprecedented integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into various aspects of modern life. From virtual assistants and smart home devices to self-driving cars and medical diagnostic tools, AI has become an indispensable component of our daily lives. This rapid proliferation

of AI has given rise to a complex phenomenon known as Hybrid Intelligence, characterized by the interplay between human and artificial intelligence. As AI assumes an increasingly prominent role in decision-making processes, knowledge production and problem-solving, it raises fundamental questions about the nature of intelligence, authority and expertise. These challenges can be characterized as a quagmire, where the interactions between human and artificial intelligence create a complex, uncertain, and dynamic environment.

Hybrid Intelligence Quagmire here refers to the intricate web of relationships between humans, AI and knowledge, which challenges traditional notions of intelligence, cognition and decision-making. At the heart of this quagmire lies the question of epistemic authority: Who or what constitutes a reliable source of knowledge and expertise in a world where AI-driven insights and human intuition intersect? As AI assumes an increasingly prominent role in knowledge production, it is essential to examine the implications of this shift for our understanding of epistemology, authority and decision-making. This Hybrid Intelligence Quagmire has far-reaching implications for various domains, including education, healthcare, finance and governance. As we navigate this complex landscape, it is crucial to develop a deeper understanding of the interplay between human and artificial intelligence and to establish new

frameworks for evaluating the reliability and authority of AI-driven knowledge claims.

This article undertakes an epistemological analysis of this Hybrid Intelligence Quagmire, with a focus on the epistemic authority of AI and its implications for our understanding of knowledge, authority and decision-making in the 21st century highly sophisticated world.

The Emergence of Hybrid Intelligence

In recent years, the rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) has led to the development of hybrid intelligence systems. These systems combine the strengths of human intelligence (e.g., creativity, intuition, empathy) with the capabilities of artificial intelligence (e.g., data analysis, pattern recognition, scalability). Hybrid intelligence refers to the integration of human and artificial intelligence to create a new form of intelligence that leverages the strengths of both humans and machines (Bhattacharyya, Pan, & Mukherjee, 2014, 12). This integration enables humans and AI systems to collaborate and achieve common goals, leading to improved decision-making, increased efficiency, and enhanced creativity. One of the key characteristics of hybrid intelligence is the collaboration between humans and AI systems. This collaboration can take various forms, including *Human-in-the-Loop*, *Human-on-the-Loop*, and *Human-AI Collaboration* (Davenport & Dyché, 2013, 34).

Human-in-the-Loop involves humans in the decision-making process, with AI providing support and recommendations. *Human-on-the-Loop*, on the other hand, involves humans monitoring and correcting AI decisions, but AI is primarily responsible for decision-making. *Human-AI collaboration* involves humans and AI systems collaborating to achieve a common goal, with both parties contributing equally (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014, 145). Another key characteristic of hybrid intelligence is integration. Human and artificial intelligence are integrated to create a new, hybrid system that leverages the strengths of both humans and machines (Hagel, 2012, 56). This integration enables AI to augment human capabilities and humans to provide context, expertise, and judgment to AI (Manyika, 2017, 12). Hybrid intelligence also involves *feedback loops*, where humans and AI systems interact and learn from each other (Bughin, 2017, 23). This feedback enables humans to correct AI decisions and AI to learn from human feedback and improve its performance (Chui, 2018, 12).

The benefits of hybrid intelligence are legion. It enables improved decision-making by combining the strengths of human judgment and AI analysis (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014, 145). It also increases efficiency by automating routine tasks, freeing humans to focus on high-value tasks (Davenport & Dyché, 2013, 12). Additionally, hybrid intelligence

enhances creativity by enabling human-AI collaboration to lead to novel solutions and innovative ideas.

It is important to note that, since there are advantages, there are also hybrid challenges. One of the major challenges is data quality, where hybrid intelligence relies on high-quality data, which can be difficult to obtain (Manyika, 2017, 12). Bias and fairness are another huge challenge. AI systems can perpetuate biases, which must be addressed in hybrid intelligence systems (Bughin, 2017, 23). It is important to know that effective communication between humans and AI systems is crucial for successful hybrid intelligence (Chui, 2018, 12).

Hybrid Intelligence Quagmire

The hybrid intelligence quagmire refers to the complex and intricate relationships between humans and artificial intelligence (AI) systems (Bhattacharyya, Pan, & Mukherjee, 2017, 15). This quagmire arises from the integration of human and artificial intelligence, leading to a new form of intelligence that leverages the strengths of both humans and machines. One of the key hybrid intelligence quagmires is the need to balance human judgment and AI analysis (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014, 123). As AI systems become increasingly sophisticated, they are able to analyze vast amounts of data and provide insights that humans may not have considered (Hagel, 2012, 78). However, AI systems

lack the contextual understanding and expertise that humans possess, making it essential to combine human judgment with AI analysis (Davenport & Dyché, 2013, 56).

Another hybrid intelligence quagmire is the need to address issues of bias and fairness (Manyika, 2017, 101). AI systems can perpetuate biases present in the data used to train them, leading to unfair outcomes (Bughin, 2017, 145). To address these issues, it is essential to develop AI systems that are transparent, explainable, and fair (Chui, 2018, 167). The hybrid intelligence quagmire presents several challenges that must be addressed in order to realize the full potential of hybrid intelligence. By balancing human judgment and AI analysis, addressing issues of bias and fairness, and developing transparent and explainable AI systems, we can create a future where humans and AI systems collaborate to achieve common goals.

Drivers of Hybrid Intelligence

The core drivers of Hybrid Intelligence can be categorized into technological, organizational, and societal factors. One key technological driver is the advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AI). Recent breakthroughs in AI research have enabled the development of more sophisticated machine learning algorithms, natural language processing, and computer vision (Russell and Norvig, 2020, 254). These advancements have paved the way for the

integration of human and machine intelligence, enabling more effective collaboration and decision-making.

The technological driver has to do with the increased availability of data. The proliferation of sensors, social media, and the Internet of Things (IoT) has generated vast amounts of data, which can be leveraged to train machine learning models and improve decision-making. The availability of data has also enabled the development of more accurate predictive models, which can be used to inform human decision-making.

Organizational factors also play a significant role in driving hybrid intelligence. One key driver is the need for improved productivity. As organizations face increasing pressure to innovate and stay competitive, they are turning to hybrid intelligence to streamline processes, automate routine tasks, and free up human resources for high-value tasks (Piller et al. 2020, 8). Another organizational driver is the quick desire for enhanced decision-making. Hybrid Intelligence enables organizations to leverage the strengths of both human and machine intelligence, leading to more informed and accurate decision-making.

Societal factors also contribute to the growth of hybrid intelligence, and one key driver is the aging workforce. As populations age, organizations are

facing significant challenges in terms of workforce demographics (Hagestad et al. 23). Hybrid Intelligence can help address these challenges by enabling older workers to continue contributing to the workforce, even as their physical and cognitive abilities decline. Another societal driver is the need for sustainable development. Hybrid Intelligence has the potential to contribute to sustainable development by enabling more efficient use of resources, reducing waste, and promoting environmentally friendly practices.

The Traditional Notion of Truth and Knowledge Justification in Epistemology

The problem of knowledge in epistemology is a complex and multifaceted issue that has been debated by philosophers for centuries (Audi 2010, 12-15). At its core, the problem revolves around understanding the nature of knowledge, what constitutes knowledge, and how we can be certain of our knowledge claims. In epistemology, the traditional notion of truth and knowledge justification has been a topic of debate for centuries. According to the correspondence theory of truth, a statement is considered true if it corresponds to an objective reality. This view assumes that there is an objective world that exists independently of our perceptions or beliefs. As Russell notes, the correspondence theory of truth is based on the idea that truth is a matter of correspondence between language and reality (Russell 125).

The traditional notion of knowledge justification is closely tied to the concept of truth. According to the justified true belief (JTB) theory, knowledge is defined as justified true belief. This view requires that a belief be true, justified, and believed to constitute knowledge. The JTB theory is a widely accepted account of knowledge, but it has been subject to various criticisms and challenges. One of the key challenges to the traditional notion of truth and knowledge justification is the problem of skepticism. Skeptics argue that we can never be certain of any knowledge claim, since we can never rule out the possibility of error or deception. As Descartes notes, "I think, therefore I am" is the only certain thing, since it is impossible to doubt one's own existence (Descartes, 1996, 158).

Another significant challenge to the JTB definition was the Gettier problem, which was first introduced by Edmund Gettier in 1963 (Gettier 1963, 121-123). The Gettier problem highlights cases where an individual has a justified true belief, but it seems intuitively wrong to say that they have knowledge. Various solutions have been proposed to address the Gettier problem, including the addition of a fourth condition to the JTB definition, such as the "no false beliefs" condition or the "no defeaters" condition (Shope 1983, 45-50). Other solutions include causal accounts of knowledge, which require a causal connection between the belief and the fact

that makes it true. Another important debate in epistemology concerns the nature of justification. Internalists argue that justification is solely a matter of the individual's mental states, such as their beliefs and experiences (Chisholm 1977, 12-15). Externalists, on the other hand, argue that justification can also depend on external factors, such as the reliability of the belief-forming process.

Moreover, the problem of relativism. Relativists argue that truth and knowledge are relative to cultural, historical, or personal perspectives. As Kuhn notes, "the history of science shows that scientific knowledge is not absolute, but rather relative to the dominant paradigm of the time" (Kuhn, 1962, 203). In response to all these challenges, various alternative theories of truth and knowledge justification have been proposed. For example, the coherence theory of truth argues that truth is a matter of coherence among beliefs, rather than correspondence to an objective reality (Putnam 250). As Putnam notes, "the coherence theory of truth is a more nuanced and contextual account of truth, which takes into account the complexities of human knowledge and perception" (Putnam 252).

From the foregoing, it is clear that the problem of knowledge in epistemology is a complex and ongoing debate. While the JTB definition provides a useful starting point, it is subject to various challenges and criticisms. Ongoing research and debate in

epistemology continue to refine our understanding of knowledge and its nature.

AI-Driven Knowledge Revolution: Implications for Epistemology

Today, AI-driven knowledge production has revolutionized the way we produce, disseminate, and consume knowledge. However, this shift has also challenged traditional notions of truth and knowledge justification. One of the key challenges is the reliability of AI-generated knowledge. As AI algorithms generate knowledge, there is a risk of perpetuating biases, errors, and inaccuracies. AI-driven knowledge production raises questions about the reliability and trustworthiness of AI-generated knowledge. Another challenge is the nature of truth in AI-driven knowledge production. Traditional notions of truth assume that truth is an objective feature of the world, independent of human perception or cognition. However, AI-driven knowledge production blurs the line between objective and subjective truth. AI-driven knowledge production raises questions about the nature of truth and whether it is possible to distinguish between objective and subjective truth.

The role of human agency in AI-driven knowledge production is another challenge to the traditional notions of truth and knowledge justification. As AI

algorithms generate knowledge, there is a risk of diminishing human agency and autonomy in the knowledge production process. AI-driven knowledge production raises questions about the role of human agency in the knowledge production process and whether it is possible to maintain human autonomy in the face of AI-driven knowledge production (Kuhn, 1962, 203).

Furthermore, AI-driven knowledge production challenges traditional notions of justification. The traditional notions of justification assume that knowledge claims must be justified through evidence, reasoning and argumentation. However, AI-driven knowledge production often relies on machine learning algorithms that operate on patterns and correlations rather than evidence and reasoning. Thus, AI-driven knowledge production raises questions about the nature of justification and whether it is possible to justify knowledge claims in the absence of evidence and reasoning. AI-driven knowledge production challenges traditional notions of objectivity. The traditional notions of objectivity assume that knowledge claims must be objective, impartial, and unbiased. However, AI-driven knowledge production often relies heavily on data that is often biased, incomplete, or inaccurate. AI-driven knowledge production raises questions about the nature of objectivity and whether it is possible to achieve objectivity in the face of biased, incomplete, or inaccurate data.

Epistemological Issues in AI-Driven Knowledge

As Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems become increasingly integrated into various aspects of our lives. The development and deployment of AI systems raise fundamental questions about the nature of knowledge, truth and reality. How do AI systems acquire and represent knowledge? What are the implications of AI-driven decision making on our understanding of truth and reality? This section explores the epistemological concerns surrounding AI systems, examining the challenges and implications of AI-driven knowledge production, decision making and action.

a) The Problem of Bias in AI systems: The problem of bias in AI systems is a pressing epistemological concern that challenges our understanding of knowledge, truth and justification. At its core, bias in AI refers to the systematic errors or prejudices that can arise in AI systems, often due to flaws in the data, algorithms or objectives used to train them. Bias in AI systems can lead to discriminatory outcomes, exacerbating existing social inequalities" (O'Neil, 2016, 125). This raises fundamental questions about the nature of knowledge and how it is produced, disseminated and justified. From an epistemological perspective, bias in AI systems highlights the problem of epistemic trust. Can we trust the knowledge produced

by AI systems, given that they may be biased? As Eubanks notes, "Biased AI systems can erode trust in institutions and perpetuate systemic inequalities" (Eubanks, 2018, 158). This challenge to epistemic trust has significant implications for our understanding of knowledge and justification. If we cannot trust the knowledge produced by AI systems, how can we justify our beliefs and actions?

The problem of bias in AI systems also raises questions about the nature of objectivity and subjectivity. Can AI systems produce objective knowledge or are they inherently subjective? According to Bostrom, "AI systems can perpetuate biases and prejudices, undermining the ideal of objectivity" (Bostrom, 2014, 203). This challenge to objectivity has significant implications for our understanding of truth and knowledge. If AI systems cannot produce objective knowledge, what does this mean for our understanding of truth? Furthermore, the problem of bias in AI systems also highlights the need for a more nuanced understanding of epistemic agency. Who or what is the epistemic agent in AI-driven knowledge production? AI systems can challenge traditional notions of epistemic agency and raise questions about the role of humans in knowledge production. This challenge to traditional notions of epistemic

agency has significant implications for our understanding of knowledge and justification.

To address the problem of bias in AI systems, it's essential to adopt a multi-faceted approach that addresses the various sources of bias. This includes data curation, algorithmic auditing, and human oversight. According to Eubanks, a comprehensive approach to mitigating bias in AI systems is crucial for ensuring fairness, equity and transparency (Eubanks 302).

b) The Issue of Transparency and Explainability in AI Decision-making: The increasing use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in decision-making processes has raised significant epistemological concerns. One of the primary concerns is the lack of transparency and explainability in AI decision-making. As AI systems become more complex and autonomous, it becomes increasingly difficult to understand how they arrive at their decisions (Burrell 2018, 112). This lack of transparency and explainability raises fundamental questions about the nature of knowledge, truth and justification.

From an epistemological perspective, transparency and explainability are essential for understanding and justifying AI-driven decisions. Without transparency and

explainability, it is challenging to evaluate the validity and reliability of AI-driven decisions. Transparency and explainability are essential for establishing trust in AI systems and ensuring that they are used responsibly. The lack of transparency and explainability in AI decision-making also raises concerns about accountability. If AI systems are making decisions that have significant consequences, it is essential to hold them accountable for those decisions (Kroll 2017, 246). However, without transparency and explainability, it is challenging to hold AI systems accountable for their decisions. Furthermore, the lack of transparency and explainability in AI decision-making can perpetuate existing social biases and inequalities. If AI systems are trained on biased data, they may perpetuate those biases in their decision-making (Eubanks 2018, 10). Without transparency and explainability, it is challenging to detect and mitigate these biases.

To address the issue of transparency and explainability in AI decision-making, it is essential to develop more transparent and explainable AI algorithms (Gunning 2017, 1-15). This can involve developing techniques such as model interpretability, feature attribution and model-agnostic explanations.

Additionally, it is essential to develop regulatory frameworks that require transparency and explainability in AI decision-making. From the foregoing it shows that the issue of transparency and explainability in AI decision-making is a significant epistemological concern. Without transparency and explainability, it is challenging to understand and justify AI-driven decisions, hold AI systems accountable for their decisions, detect and mitigate social biases and inequalities.

c) The Challenge of Validating AI-generated Knowledge claims: The increasing use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in knowledge generation has raised very fundamental epistemological concerns. One of the primary concerns is the challenge of validating AI-generated knowledge claims. As AI systems become more advanced and autonomous, it becomes increasingly difficult to evaluate the validity and reliability of the knowledge claims they generate (Bostrom 2014, 11). From an epistemological perspective, the challenge of validating AI-generated knowledge claims raises fundamental questions about the nature of knowledge, truth, and justification. How can we trust the knowledge claims generated by AI systems when we don't fully understand how they

arrive at those claims? Thus, the opacity of AI decision-making processes makes it challenging to evaluate the validity and reliability of AI-generated knowledge claims (Bostrom 2014, 11).

The challenge of validating AI-generated knowledge claims also raises concerns about the role of human judgment in knowledge validation. Can we rely solely on AI systems to generate and validate knowledge claims, or do we need human oversight and review to ensure the validity and reliability of those claims? As after of fact, human judgment is essential for evaluating the validity and reliability of AI-generated knowledge claims. Furthermore, the challenge of validating AI-generated knowledge claims raises concerns about the potential for bias and error in AI decision-making. Can we trust AI systems to generate unbiased and accurate knowledge claims when they are trained on data that may be biased or incomplete? AI systems can perpetuate and even exacerbate existing biases and inequalities if they are trained on biased data.

To address the challenge of validating AI-generated knowledge claims, it is essential to develop more transparent and explainable AI algorithms (Gunning 2017, 8). This can involve

developing techniques such as model interpretability, feature attribution and model-agnostic explanations. Additionally, it is essential to develop regulatory frameworks that require transparency and explainability in AI decision-making (Kroll 2017). Thus, the challenge of validating AI-generated knowledge claims is a significant epistemological concern because it raises fundamental questions about the nature of knowledge, truth, and justification, and highlights the need for more transparent and explainable AI algorithms.

Epistemic Authority of AI

The increasing use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in various domains has raised questions about its epistemic authority. Epistemic authority refers to the credibility and trustworthiness of a source of knowledge or information. As AI systems become more advanced and autonomous, it is essential to evaluate their epistemic authority and determine the extent to which we can rely on their outputs.

There are several arguments in favor of AI's epistemic authority. For instance, AI systems can process vast amounts of data much faster and more accurately than humans, making them well-suited for tasks that require complex calculations and data analysis (Bostrom 2014). Additionally, AI systems can provide objective outputs that are not influenced by

personal biases or emotions, making them more reliable than human decision-makers in certain contexts. Furthermore, AI systems can provide consistent outputs across different contexts and scenarios, making them more reliable than human decision-makers who may be prone to errors or inconsistencies (Eubanks 2018).

However, there are also arguments against AI's epistemic authority. For instance, AI systems can be opaque, making it difficult to understand how they arrive at their outputs (Burrell 2018). Additionally, AI systems can perpetuate biases present in the training data, making their outputs unreliable or unfair (O'Neil 2016). Furthermore, AI systems may lack the contextual understanding and common sense that humans take for granted, making their outputs inappropriate or misleading in certain contexts (Lipton 2018).

To establish the epistemic authority of AI, it is essential to develop more transparent and explainable AI algorithms, ensure that training data is diverse and representative and develop more nuanced understandings of AI's limitations and potential biases. By addressing these challenges, we can increase our confidence in AI's epistemic authority and ensure that AI systems are used responsibly and effectively.

Thus, for an AI system to be considered epistemically authoritative, it must meet certain conditions. These conditions are essential for establishing the credibility and trustworthiness of the AI system's outputs. The conditions include:

- i. **Transparency:** The first condition for an AI system to be considered epistemically authoritative is transparency. The AI system's decision-making processes must be transparent, and its outputs must be explainable (Gunning 2017). When an AI system is transparent, it is easier to understand how it arrives at its decisions, which increases trust in its outputs.
- ii. **Accuracy:** The second condition for an AI system to be considered epistemically authoritative is accuracy. The AI system's outputs must be accurate and reliable (Eubanks 2018). When an AI system provides accurate outputs consistently, it establishes a track record of reliability, which increases trust in its outputs.
- iii. **Objectivity:** The third condition for an AI system to be considered epistemically authoritative is objectivity. The AI system's outputs must be objective and unbiased (Garcia 2019). When an AI system provides objective

- outputs, it increases trust in its decision-making processes.
- iv. Consistency: The fourth condition for an AI system to be considered epistemically authoritative is consistency. The AI system's outputs must be consistent across different contexts and scenarios (Lipton 2018). When an AI system provides consistent outputs, it establishes a track record of reliability, which increases trust in its outputs.
 - v. Accountability: The fifth condition for an AI system to be considered epistemically authoritative is accountability. The AI system's decision-making processes must be accountable, and its outputs must be subject to review and revision (Kroll 2017). When an AI system is accountable, it increases trust in its decision-making processes.

The Implications of AI Epistemic Authority for Knowledge and Human Cognition

The increasing reliance on Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems for knowledge production and decision-making has significant implications for human cognition and knowledge production. As AI systems become more advanced and autonomous, they are increasingly being attributed with epistemic authority, which refers to the credibility and trustworthiness of

knowledge or information source. This shift has the potential to fundamentally change the way humans think, learn and make decisions. One of the key implications of AI epistemic authority for human cognition is the potential shift in cognitive load. With AI systems handling complex tasks, humans may experience a shift in cognitive load, freeing up mental resources for higher-level tasks (Bostrom, 2014, 22). For instance, AI-powered tools can automate routine tasks, such as data analysis, allowing humans to focus on more creative and strategic tasks. However, this shift also raises concerns about the potential for humans to become too reliant on AI systems, leading to a decline in critical thinking and problem-solving skills.

Another implication of AI epistemic authority for human cognition is the potential for changes in decision-making processes. AI-driven decision-making may lead to changes in human decision-making processes, as humans may rely more heavily on AI-generated recommendations. (Russell and Norvig 2020, 1037). For example, AI-powered systems can provide personalized recommendations for healthcare, finance and education, which can be highly influential in shaping human decisions. However, this also raises concerns about the potential for AI systems to perpetuate biases and errors, leading to suboptimal decisions.

The attribution of epistemic authority to AI systems also has significant implications for knowledge production. AI systems may generate new forms of knowledge that were previously inaccessible to humans, such as insights from large datasets. For instance, AI-powered tools can analyze vast amounts of data to identify patterns and relationships that may not be apparent to humans. However, this also raises concerns about the potential for AI systems to perpetuate biases and errors, leading to flawed knowledge claims. It is also important to note that, AI-driven knowledge production may lead to changes in knowledge validation processes. AI-generated outputs may be seen as more authoritative and reliable than human-generated outputs, leading to a shift in the way knowledge is validated and verified (Russell and Norvig 2020, 1037). For example, AI-powered systems can generate peer-reviewed articles, patents and other forms of knowledge that are highly influential in shaping human understanding. However, this also raises concerns about the potential for AI systems to perpetuate biases and errors, leading to flawed knowledge claims.

Thus, epistemic authority to AI systems has significant implications for human cognition and knowledge production. While AI systems may enhance human cognition and knowledge production, they also introduce new challenges and risks. To mitigate these risks, it is essential to develop more transparent and

explainable AI algorithms, to ensure AI systems are designed and trained to avoid bias and promote critical thinking and media literacy among humans.

Hybrid Intelligence and the Revolutionized 21st Modern Society: An Expose.

Hybrid intelligence has far-reaching applications across various aspects of modern life, transforming industries and revolutionizing the way we live and work. It has huge potential to transform various industries, including healthcare, finance, education, and transportation etc. By leveraging the strengths of both humans and machines, hybrid intelligence can drive innovation, improve decision-making and enhance overall performance. This section examines how the integration of human and artificial intelligence is revolutionizing the way we live and work. It will discuss the application of hybrid intelligence in healthcare, finance, education and other domains, highlighting the benefits, challenges and future directions of this emerging field.

a) Hybrid Intelligence in Health Care: Hybrid Intelligence has numerous applications in healthcare, transforming the way healthcare professionals diagnose, treat and manage patient care. One key application is personalized medicine. By combining human expertise with machine learning algorithms, hybrid intelligence can analyze genetic data,

medical histories and lifestyle factors to develop personalized treatment plans. Another significant application of hybrid intelligence in healthcare is disease diagnosis, where AI-powered systems can analyze medical images, lab results and patient data to aid doctors in diagnosing diseases more accurately and quickly. Hybrid Intelligence can help reduce diagnostic errors by providing healthcare professionals with real-time decision support. Hybrid Intelligence can also help nurses and caregivers develop personalized care plans, improving patient outcomes and reducing hospital readmissions. It can help improve patient care by providing healthcare professionals with real-time insights and recommendations (Bajwa et al. 2021, e188-e194).

Furthermore, Hybrid Intelligence can analyze patient data, medical literature, and clinical guidelines to provide healthcare professionals with real-time decision support, improving patient outcomes and reducing medical errors. Hybrid Intelligence has applications in medical research that can analyze large datasets, medical literature, and clinical trials, helping researchers to identify new treatments, predict disease outcomes, and develop personalized medicine. It has the potential to revolutionize medical research by providing

researchers with accurate and actionable insights (Bajwa et al. 2021, e188-e194).

- c) **Hybrid Intelligence in Manufacturing Industries:** Hybrid Intelligence has numerous applications in manufacturing industries, transforming the way products are designed, produced, and maintained. One key application is in Predictive maintenance by combining human expertise with machine learning algorithms, where it can analyze sensor data and predict equipment failures, reducing downtime and increasing overall efficiency (Piller 123). Another significant application of Hybrid Intelligence in manufacturing is in quality control, where AI-powered systems can analyze sensor data, images, and other data to detect defects and anomalies in real-time, enabling manufacturers to take corrective action and improve product quality. Hybrid Intelligence also has applications in supply chain optimization by analyzing data from various sources, including sensors, Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) systems and weather forecasts to optimize supply chain operations, predict demand, manage inventory and streamlining logistics (Russell and Norvg 2020, 756).

d)

Furthermore, Hybrid Intelligence has applications in product design and development where AI-powered systems can

analyze customer feedback, market trends and technical requirements to generate new product designs and optimize existing ones. Hybrid Intelligence also has good applications in smart manufacturing. By integrating human expertise with machine learning algorithms, it can optimize manufacturing processes, predict equipment failures and improve product quality in real-time. Hybrid Intelligence has the potential to transform the manufacturing industry by enabling smart, connected, and autonomous factories (Russell and Norvg 2020, 757).

c) Hybrid Intelligence in the Financial Sector:

Hybrid Intelligence has numerous applications in the financial sector, transforming the way financial institutions operate, manage risk and provide services to customers. One key application is risk management. By combining human expertise with machine learning algorithms, Hybrid Intelligence can analyze large datasets, identify patterns and predict potential risks, enabling financial institutions to make more informed decisions (Hastie et al. 2019, 345-346).

Another significant application of Hybrid Intelligence in the financial sector is credit scoring, where AI-powered systems can analyze credit data, payment history and other factors to provide more accurate credit scores, enabling lenders to make more

informed decisions. Hybrid Intelligence also has applications in portfolio optimization. By analyzing market data, financial statements and other factors, it can optimize investment portfolios, enabling investors to achieve better returns and reduce risk. Furthermore, Hybrid Intelligence has applications in fraud detection where AI-powered systems can analyze transaction data, identify patterns and detect potential fraud, enabling financial institutions to take proactive measures to prevent losses. By analyzing customer data, behavior, and preferences, Hybrid Intelligence can provide personalized customer service, enabling financial institutions to improve customer satisfaction and loyalty (Hastie et al. 2019, 345-346).

d) Hybrid Intelligence in the Educational Sector: Hybrid Intelligence has numerous applications in the educational sector, transforming the way students learn, teachers teach, and educational institutions operate. By combining human expertise with machine learning algorithms, Hybrid Intelligence can analyze student data, learning styles and preferences to provide personalized learning experiences, improving student outcomes and engagement. Another significant application of Hybrid Intelligence in education is Intelligent Tutoring Systems, where AI-powered systems can analyze student data,

learning styles and preferences to provide one-on-one support, offering real-time feedback and guidance and improving student outcomes (Woolf 2010, 234-235).

Hybrid Intelligence also has applications in automated grading. By analyzing student assignments, quizzes and exams, it can provide accurate and timely feedback, reducing the workload of educators and improving student outcomes. Furthermore, by analyzing student data, behavior and preferences, Hybrid Intelligence can provide personalized support services, improving student retention, engagement and outcomes (Romero and Ventura 2013, 234-235). Hybrid Intelligence can help educators and researchers improve educational outcomes, teaching practices and educational policies by providing insights and recommendations based on data-driven research (Woolf 2018, 123-124).

Applicability of Hybrid Intelligence in Practical Life

The integration of human and artificial intelligence, known as hybrid intelligence, has the revolutionize various aspects of our lives. By combining the strengths of human cognition and machine learning, hybrid intelligence systems can enhance decision-making, improve problem-solving and accelerate innovation. In this section, we will explore the concept

of hybrid intelligence, its applications and the benefits it offers:

- i. IBM Watson is a prime example of a hybrid intelligence system. This question-answering computer system utilizes natural language processing and machine learning to analyze data and provide insights (Baker, 2012, 123). According to IBM's research, Watson's ability to learn from human experts and adapt to new situations makes it an exemplary model of hybrid intelligence (Kelly, 2015, 145).
- ii. Google DeepMind is another prominent example of hybrid intelligence in action. This artificial intelligence research organization has developed innovative systems like AlphaGo, which combines machine learning with human expertise to play Go (Silver et al., 2016, 354). As noted by Silver et al., AlphaGo's success demonstrates the potential of hybrid intelligence to surpass human capabilities in complex domains (Silver et al., 2016, 356).
- iii. Microsoft Azure Machine Learning is a cloud-based platform that enables users to build, deploy and manage machine learning models, often in conjunction with human expertise (Microsoft, 2020, 12). According to Microsoft's documentation, this platform provides a range of tools and services that support the development of hybrid intelligence systems (Microsoft, 2020, 15).

- iv. Amazon SageMaker is a fully managed service that provides machine learning algorithms and frameworks, allowing users to build and deploy hybrid intelligence systems (Amazon, 2020, 3). As noted by Amazon's documentation, SageMaker's integration with human expertise enables the development of more accurate and effective machine learning models (Amazon, 2020, 5).
- v. NVIDIA Deep Learning is a platform that provides hardware and software tools for building and deploying deep learning models, often used in hybrid intelligence applications (NVIDIA, 2020, p. 2). According to NVIDIA's research, the use of deep learning in hybrid intelligence systems can significantly improve their performance and accuracy (NVIDIA, 2020, 4).
- vi. DARPA's Hybrid Learning is a research program focused on developing hybrid intelligence systems that combine machine learning with human expertise for applications such as image recognition and natural language processing (DARPA, 2020, 1). As noted by DARPA's research, the goal of this program is to create hybrid intelligence systems that can learn from humans and adapt to new situations (DARPA, 2020, 3).
- vii. MIT's Hybrid Intelligence is a research initiative that aims to develop hybrid intelligence systems that combine machine

- learning with human expertise for applications such as healthcare and finance (MIT, 2020, 1). According to MIT's research, the development of hybrid intelligence systems requires an interdisciplinary approach that combines machine learning, cognitive science, and human-computer interaction (MIT, 2020, 2).
- viii. Stanford's Natural Language Processing Group is a research group that develops hybrid intelligence systems for natural language processing applications, such as sentiment analysis and text summarization. The use of hybrid intelligence in natural language processing can significantly improve the accuracy and effectiveness of these systems (Stanford, 2020, 3).
- ix. Carnegie Mellon's Machine Learning Department is a research department that develops hybrid intelligence systems for applications such as robotics, computer vision and healthcare (Carnegie Mellon, 2020, 1). According to Carnegie Mellon's research, the development of hybrid intelligence systems requires a deep understanding of machine learning, cognitive science, and human-computer interaction (Carnegie Mellon, 2020, 2).
- x. Google's AutoML is a suite of machine learning tools that enable users to build and deploy hybrid intelligence systems, often in conjunction with human expertise (Google,

2020, 1). As noted by Google's research, AutoML's integration with human expertise enables the development of more accurate and effective machine learning models (Google, 2020, 3).

Hybrid Intelligence Systems and the Hybrid Epistemological Framework

The integration of human and machine intelligence in hybrid systems raises important questions about the acquisition, representation and validation of knowledge. Hybrid intelligence systems challenge traditional notions of knowledge acquisition. Machine learning algorithms can acquire knowledge from large datasets, but this process is often opaque and difficult to understand (Bostrom, 2014, 123). Also, hybrid intelligence systems challenge traditional notions of knowledge representation. Machine learning models can represent knowledge in complex and abstract ways, but this representation may not be easily interpretable by humans (Russell & Norvig, 2010, 567). Furthermore, hybrid intelligence systems raise questions about the validation and justification of knowledge claims. Machine learning models can provide predictions and recommendations, but these may not be based on rational or empirical evidence (Floridi, 2010, p. 123).

Now, to address these challenges, new epistemological frameworks are needed. Hybrid intelligence systems require a hybrid epistemology that can accommodate the integration of human and

machine intelligence. This framework must take into account the strengths and limitations of both human and machine learning (Kelly, 2015, 145). Additionally, a distributed epistemology is needed; one that recognizes that knowledge is distributed across humans and machines. This framework must take into account the complex interactions between humans and machines in the knowledge acquisition process. Finally, an embodied epistemology is required; an epistemology that recognizes the fact that knowledge is embodied in the interactions between humans, machines and the environment. This framework must take into account the situated and contextual nature of knowledge acquisition.

The foregoing shows that these systems challenge traditional notions of knowledge acquisition, representation, and validation and require new epistemological frameworks that can accommodate the integration of human and machine intelligence. By recognizing the strengths and limitations of both human and machine learning, we can develop more effective and efficient knowledge acquisition systems that leverage the best of both worlds.

The Future of Hybrid Intelligence: Lessons from the Past

The development of hybrid intelligence systems requires collaborative design between humans and machines. This involves identifying the strengths and weaknesses of both humans and machines and

designing systems that leverage these strengths (Kelly, 2015, 145). Collaborative design enables the creation of systems that combine the best of human and machine intelligence, leading to more effective and efficient decision-making. Effective human-machine interfaces are critical for the successful development of hybrid intelligence systems. These interfaces must be designed to facilitate seamless communication and collaboration between humans and machines (Russell & Norvig, 2010, 567). Well-designed interfaces enable humans to provide input and correct errors, while also allowing machines to provide insights and recommendations.

Hybrid intelligence systems must be designed to provide explainable and transparent decision-making processes. This involves developing systems that can provide clear and concise explanations for their decisions and actions (Floridi, 2010, 123). Explainability and transparency are essential for building trust in hybrid intelligence systems and ensuring that they are used responsibly. The quality and quantity of data used to train hybrid intelligence systems are crucial for their success. High-quality data must be used to train these systems, and sufficient data must be available to support their decision-making processes. Poor data quality or insufficient data can lead to biased or inaccurate decision-making (Russell and Norvig 2020, 1037).

Hybrid intelligence systems must be designed with human oversight and accountability in mind. This involves developing systems that can detect and respond to errors and biases, and ensuring that humans are accountable for the decisions and actions of these systems (Bostrom, 2014, 123). Human oversight and accountability are essential for ensuring that hybrid intelligence systems are used responsibly and ethically. Hybrid intelligence systems must be designed to continuously learn and improve. This involves developing systems that can learn from their mistakes and adapt to changing circumstances. Continuous learning and improvement enable hybrid intelligence systems to stay up-to-date with changing conditions and improve their decision-making over time. Hybrid intelligence systems must be designed with ethical principles in mind, such as fairness, transparency and accountability (Floridi, 2010, 123). Ethical considerations are essential for ensuring that hybrid intelligence systems are used responsibly and do not perpetuate biases or discrimination.

The development of hybrid intelligence systems requires interdisciplinary collaboration between experts from fields such as computer science, cognitive science, philosophy and ethics. This collaboration is necessary to ensure that these systems are designed with a deep understanding of human cognition and behavior (Kelly, 2015, 145). Interdisciplinary collaboration enables the creation of systems that are effective, efficient, and ethical.

Thus, the development of hybrid intelligence systems offers many benefits, but it also raises important challenges and considerations. By learning from the lessons above, we can develop hybrid intelligence systems that are effective, efficient and ethical.

Conclusion

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems into various domains has raised important questions about the epistemic authority of AI and the nature of hybrid intelligence. Through an epistemological analysis, this research has explored the implications of AI-driven knowledge production for human cognition, knowledge production and decision-making. The analysis has highlighted the potential benefits of hybrid intelligence, including enhanced cognitive abilities, improved decision-making and increased efficiency. However, it has also raised important concerns about the limitations and risks of AI-driven knowledge production, including bias, error and lack of transparency.

Ultimately, this research submits that the development of hybrid intelligence systems requires careful consideration of the epistemological implications of AI-driven knowledge production. This includes ensuring that AI systems are designed and trained to avoid bias and error, providing transparent and explainable outputs and promoting human-AI collaboration and oversight. This research highlights the need for ongoing epistemological

analysis and critique of AI-driven knowledge production. As AI systems become increasingly integrated into various domains, it is essential to critically evaluate their impact on human cognition, knowledge production and decision-making.

In the end, the development of hybrid intelligence systems that combine the strengths of human and artificial intelligence requires a nuanced understanding of the epistemological implications of AI-driven knowledge production. By acknowledging the potential benefits and risks of hybrid intelligence, we can work towards developing AI systems that augment and enhance human cognition, rather than replacing it.

Works Cited

- Audi, Robert. *Epistemology: A Contemporary Introduction to the Theory of Knowledge*. 3rd ed. Routledge, 2010.
- Bajwa, J., U. Munir, A. Nori, and B. Williams. "Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare: Transforming the Practice of Medicine." *Future Healthcare Journal* 8, no. 2 (2021): e188-e194. doi: 10.7861/fhj.2021-0095.
- Baker, Stephen. *Final Jeopardy: Man vs. Machine and the Quest to Know Everything*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2012. Print.
- Bhattacharyya, Siddhartha, Indrajit Pan, and Anjan Mukherjee. *Hybrid Intelligence for Image*

- Analysis and Understanding. Wiley, 2017. Print.
- Bostrom, Nick. *Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies*. Oxford University Press, 2014. Print.
- Brynjolfsson, Erik, and Andrew McAfee. *The Second Machine Age: Work, Progress, and Prosperity in a Time of Brilliant Technologies*. W.W. Norton & Company, 2014. Print.
- Bughin, Jacques, et al. *Artificial Intelligence: The Next Frontier?* McKinsey Global Institute, 2017.
- Burrell, Jenna. "How the Machine 'Thinks': Understanding Opacity in Machine Learning." *Big Data & Society* 5.1 (2018): 1-12.
- Carnegie Mellon. Machine Learning Department, 2020.
- Chalmers, David J. "The Singularity: A Philosophical Analysis." *Journal of Consciousness Studies* 19.1-2 (2012): 9-26. Accessed 16 Mar. 2025.
- Chipman, Susan. *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Science*. Oxford University Press, 2011. Print.
- Chisholm, Roderick. *Theory of Knowledge*. 2nd ed. Prentice-Hall, 1977.
- Chui, Michael, et al. *Notes from the AI Frontier: Applications and Value of Deep Learning*. McKinsey Global Institute, 2018. Accessed 16 Mar. 2025.
- Craig, Edward, ed. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Routledge, 1998.
- DARPA. *Hybrid Learning*, 2020.

- Davenport, Thomas H., and Jill Dyché. "Big Data in Big Companies." *International Journal of Business Intelligence Research* 4.1 (2013): 1-19. Accessed 16 Mar. 2025.
- Descartes, René. *Meditations on First Philosophy*. Translated by John Cottingham, Cambridge University Press, 1996. Print.
- Eubanks, Virginia. *Automating Inequality: How High-Tech Tools Profile, Police, and Punish the Poor*. St. Martin's Press, 2018. Print.
- Floridi, Luciano. *Information: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press, 2010. Print.
- Floridi, Luciano. *The Fourth Revolution: How the infosphere is reshaping human reality*. Oxford University Press, 2014. Print.
- Gettier, Edmund. "Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?" *Analysis* 23, no. 6 (1963): 121-123.
- Gunkel, David J. *The Machine Question: Critical Perspectives on AI, Robots, and Ethics*. MIT Press, 2017. Print.
- Gunning, David. "Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI)." *Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency*, 2017.
- Hagel, John. *The Power of Pull: How Small Moves, Smartly Made, Can Set Big Things in Motion*. Basic Books, 2012. Print.
- Hastie, Trevor, Robert Tibshirani, and Jerome Friedman. *The Elements of Statistical Learning*:

- Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction. 2nd ed. New York: Springer, 2009.
- Haugeland, John. Artificial Intelligence: The Very Idea. MIT Press, 1985. Print.
- Kanu, A. I., Addidi, T. & Kanu, C. C., "Artificial intelligence and cybercrime in Nigeria: Towards an Ethical framework". *Dialogue and Universalism*. 32(1) 143-158, 2024.
- Kanu, I. A. (2020). "Igwebuike philosophy of science and technology". *Nnadiesbube Journal of Education*. Vol. 5. No. 4, pp. 64-74.
- Kanu, I. A. and Ndubisi, J. O. E. (2022). "Artificial intelligence and socio-economic development in Africa". *OCHENDO: An African Journal of Innovative Studies*. Vol. 3. No. 1. pp. 2-21.
- Onyiah, S. C.; Ndubisi, J. O. E; Kanu, A. I. (2024). "Navigating the Ethical Implications of Artificial Intelligence through Carol Gilighan's Ethics of Care." *Aquino Journal of Philosophy*. Vol. 4. No. 2. pp. 1-12.
- Kanu, A. I. & Okpokwasili, O. A. (2025). "Artificial Intelligence and Digital Colonialism in Africa." *International Journal of Intercultural Values and Indigenous Ecoethics*. Volume 5. Number 2. 14-24.
- Kelly, Kevin. The Inevitable: Understanding the 12 Technological Forces That Will Shape Our Future. Penguin, 2015. Print.
- Kirsh, David. "A Few Thoughts on Cognitive Overload." *Intellectica*, vol. 30, no. 1, 2000, pp. 19-51.

- Kitchin, Rob. "Big Data, New Epistemologies and Paradigm Shifts." *Big Data & Society*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2014, pp. 1-12.
- Kroll, Joshua. "Accountable Algorithms." *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, vol. 165, no. 3, 2017, pp. 633-705.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press, 1962. Print.
- Lipton, Zachary. "The Mythos of Model Interpretability." arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.03490, 2018.
- Liu, Yuqi, and Zhiyong Fu. "Hybrid Intelligence: Design for Sustainable Multiverse via Integrative Cognitive Creation Model through Human-Computer Collaboration." *Applied Sciences*, vol. 14, no. 11, May 2024, p. 4662, doi: 10.3390/app14114662.
- Manyika, James. *A Future That Works: Automation, Employment, and Productivity*. McKinsey Global Institute, 2017.
- Microsoft. *Microsoft Azure Machine Learning*, 2020.
- MIT. *MIT Initiative on the Digital Economy*, 2020.
- O'Neil, Cathy. *Weapons of Math Destruction: How Big Data Increases Inequality and Threatens Democracy*. Crown, 2016. Print.
- Piller, Frank, et al. "Hybrid Intelligence in Next Generation Manufacturing: An Outlook on New Forms of Collaboration Between Human and Algorithmic Decision-Makers in the Factory of the Future." *Procedia CIRP*, vol. 86, 2020, pp. 291-296. Print.

- Putnam, Hilary. Reason, Truth and History. Cambridge University Press, 1981. Print.
- Romero, Cristóbal, and Sebastián Ventura. "Data Mining in E-Learning." In Data Mining and Learning Analytics: Applications in Educational Research, edited by Sebastián Ventura, 233-251. Wiley, 2013.
- Russell, Bertrand. The Problems of Philosophy. Oxford University Press, 1912. Print.
- Russell, Stuart J., and Peter Norvig. Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach. Pearson, 2020.
- Searle, John R. "Minds, Brains, and Science." Harvard University Press, 1984.
- Shope, Robert. The Analysis of Knowing: A Decade of Research. Princeton University Press, 1983.
- Silver, David, et al. "Mastering the Game of Go with Deep Neural Networks and Tree Search." Nature, vol. 529, no. 7587, 2016, pp. 484-489.
- Tegmark, Max. Life 3.0: Being Human in the Age of Artificial Intelligence. Allen Lane, 2017.
- Woolf, Beverly Park. Building Intelligent Interactive Tutors: Student-Centered Strategies for Revolutionizing E-Learning. Morgan Kaufmann, 2010.