Is Education at a Punctuated Equilibrium? When AI Becomes the New Blackboard

Sai Gattupalli[a,b*]

[a]University of Massachusetts Amherst

[b]Society & AI Research Group

Abstract

Education may be entering a phase of abrupt transformation rather than gradual reform—a cognitive and cultural "punctuated equilibrium" driven by artificial intelligence. This article explores how AI reconfigures the architecture of learning, reshapes teachers' roles, and challenges traditional notions of authorship, creativity, and moral responsibility. Drawing on historical parallels from the blackboard to the computer, it argues that we are witnessing a fundamental reorganization of how human and artificial minds learn together—and that this transition demands imagination, ethical fluency, and deliberate design rather than passive adaptation.

Keywords: education; artificial intelligence; learning technologies; AI literacy; pedagogy; educational transformation; punctuated equilibrium; distributed cognition

1. The Rhythm of Educational Change

Picture a classroom in 1820. A teacher stands before students, chalk in hand, about to do something revolutionary. She turns to a dark slate mounted on the wall and begins writing equations that everyone can see at once. For the first time in human history, thought becomes visible to an entire room simultaneously. This moment, so ordinary it barely registers in our collective memory, has changed everything about how humans think together.

I've spent years studying how technologies reshape learning, first as a physics student trying to understand how we know what we know, then as an education researcher watching AI arrive in classrooms faster than our theories could adapt. This article emerges from a growing conviction: we are not simply witnessing another educational technology cycle. We are living through a phase transition in human cognition itself.

Education rarely evolves smoothly. For long stretches, it holds steady—teachers, textbooks, and exams maintaining familiar routines until one invention or social shift forces everything to reorganize (Cuban, 1986). These leaps are not cosmetic reforms but revolutions in the architecture of learning itself. We are living through one of those revolutions right now, and most of us haven't fully grasped what it means.

Biologists have a name for this pattern: punctuated equilibrium (Eldredge & Gould, 1972, 1993). For millions of years, species remain remarkably stable until suddenly, they don't. Environmental pressures mount, genetic variations accumulate, and then, in what seems like an evolutionary blink, new forms of life emerge and the entire ecosystem reorganizes around them. The fossil record shows not gradual transitions but dramatic leaps separated by long plateaus of stability.

Education follows this same rhythm (Tyack & Cuban, 1995). For centuries, classrooms were static ecosystems where knowledge flowed in predictable patterns from teacher to student. Then the blackboard appeared and transformed oral instruction into collective visualization: a true punctuation in how humans learned together (Wylie, 2012). Much later, personal computers arrived and redefined access to knowledge, allowing individual exploration at global scale (Papert, 1980; Warschauer, 2003). Each time, the change seemed to happen all at once, though the conditions had been building for years.

*Correspondence: sai@societyandai.org

Today, artificial intelligence introduces a new inflection point, one that challenges not just how we deliver information, but the very boundaries of cognition, authorship, and what it means to learn (Luckin et al., 2016; Holmes et al., 2019). The equilibrium that has guided schools for over a century is dissolving before our eyes. A new species of learning is emerging, and we are its first generation of witnesses.

2. Who Is Affected by This Transformation?

I think often about the teachers I've worked with, brilliant educators who suddenly feel their expertise devalued by systems that can answer any factual question instantly. Their fear is not irrational. But I've also seen these same teachers discover that their real gift was never information delivery. It was something harder to automate: the ability to see when a student is genuinely confused versus merely stuck, to know when to push and when to support, to create the conditions where thinking becomes possible. This transition forces us to name what was always true: teaching is fundamentally about relationship, not transmission.

Every punctuation in educational history redistributes power, and this one is no exception (Cuban, 1986). The shifts ripple outward in concentric circles, touching every role and relationship within the learning ecosystem.

Teachers face perhaps the most disorienting challenge. How do you guide learning when authority is no longer monopolized by expertise? (Dede, 2010; Selwyn, 2019). When a student can query an AI system that knows more chemistry, more history, more literature than any single human, what becomes of the teacher's role as knowledge-keeper? The answer demands a reimagining of teaching itself, from information delivery to something more like learning design, from sage on the stage to orchestrator of encounters between human curiosity and artificial capability.

Students must develop a new kind of discernment. They need to learn how to question algorithmic answers, not merely consume them (boyd, 2014). They must recognize when AI is synthesizing genuine insight and when it is producing plausible-sounding nonsense. They must cultivate the judgment to know which cognitive tasks to delegate and which to keep as essentially human. This is not the digital literacy of the computer era. It is something deeper, more critical, more existentially necessary.

Institutions confront the collapse of older metrics of achievement. What does "original work" mean when creativity itself becomes co-authored by code? How do we assess learning when the process of generating an essay might involve dozens of exchanges with an AI partner? When originality, authorship, and collaboration intertwine in ways our current systems cannot capture, every credential and evaluation framework faces fundamental questions (Baker & Inventado, 2014).

Societies risk deepening the most dangerous divide of the twenty-first century. This is not a split between rich and poor in the traditional sense, but between those fluent in AI and those left algorithmically illiterate (O'Neil, 2016; Noble, 2018). This is not a peripheral concern. The question is no longer whether AI will reshape education, but whether education can evolve fast enough to shape AI toward human flourishing (Selwyn et al., 2020).

Consider the civic consequences. What happens to democratic participation when only a fraction of citizens can critically interpret machine-generated knowledge? What happens to collective decision-making when most people cannot distinguish between AI synthesis and AI fabrication? What happens to imagination, to art, to human meaning-making when creativity itself becomes co-authored by systems optimized for pattern recognition rather than transcendent insight? (Miller, 2019).

These are not distant philosophical puzzles to be debated in academic journals. They are the immediate, urgent consequences of our new equilibrium, playing out in classrooms and boardrooms and political chambers right now. The punctuation has already occurred. The question is whether we can adapt quickly enough to guide its direction.

3. From Literacy to Fluency

Every technological punctuation expands what literacy must mean (Lankshear & Knobel, 2008). Literacy is never a fixed achievement but a moving target that shifts with the tools we use to think and communicate.

In my view, we are making a category error when we treat AI fluency as just another literacy to be taught.

This is not like learning to read or use a computer. Those tools extended human capacity but remained clearly subordinate to human intention. AI is different. It responds, adapts, appears to understand. We need a new vocabulary for this kind of cognitive partnership, one that acknowledges both its power and its profound strangeness.

The blackboard required visual literacy. Students needed to translate thought into symbol, to read diagrams and equations as representations of invisible concepts (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006). The computer required digital literacy. People had to learn to navigate data structures, understand file systems, parse interfaces, and move fluidly through digital environments (Gilster, 1997; Eshet-Alkalai, 2004). Each literacy built on the previous one but demanded something fundamentally new.

The AI era requires what we might call AI fluency. This means understanding how human and artificial intelligences interact, how they co-reason, and crucially, how they sometimes mislead (Long & Magerko, 2020). It means recognizing that these systems can be simultaneously brilliant and deeply flawed, insightful and dangerously biased, helpful and subtly manipulative.

AI fluency is not a technical skill reserved for engineers and computer scientists. It is a civic one, as essential to functioning in the twenty-first century as reading was to the twentieth. It includes the capacity to trace the origins of generated information, to recognize when bias has been encoded into algorithmic outputs (Noble, 2018), to collaborate ethically with synthetic agents, and perhaps most importantly, to decide when not to automate, when to insist on human judgment despite its inefficiency.

Without this fluency, the promise of AI collapses into dependency. We become passive consumers of machine-generated content, unable to distinguish synthesis from fabrication, insight from optimization. With it, education becomes something extraordinary: a laboratory for symbiotic intelligence, a space where human intuition and algorithmic pattern recognition combine to expand what either could accomplish alone (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014). The difference between these two futures will be determined largely by what happens in our schools over the next decade.

4. Education's Ripple Effect on Society

The significance of this transformation extends far beyond classrooms and lecture halls. How societies learn determines how they adapt (Schön, 1973). When the fundamental mode of learning changes, every system built upon it eventually follows. Economy, governance, culture, all of these shift in response to changes in how humans acquire and share knowledge (Castells, 2000).

If the nineteenth century organized itself around literacy and print (Eisenstein, 1979), and the twentieth around computation and data (Hilbert & López, 2011), the twenty-first will organize itself around something we are only beginning to name. We might call it dialogic intelligence: the capacity to reason across human and artificial minds, to think in partnership with systems that simulate understanding (Floridi, 2014).

Imagine three concentric circles radiating outward from a single point of change. At the classroom scale, teachers experiment with AI tutors and creative writing partners, discovering new pedagogies through trial and error (Holstein et al., 2019). At the institutional scale, universities and ministries redesign curricula and credentials for AI-integrated learning, rewriting the rules that govern what counts as knowledge and achievement (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). At the civilizational scale, communities, industries, and governments recalibrate how knowledge itself is validated, shared, and trusted in an age when machines can generate convincing arguments for nearly any position (Zuboff, 2019).

Each circle ripples outward from the same core insight. How we teach is how we think together as a species. The current punctuation is therefore not merely pedagogical. It is civilizational. We are not just changing how students learn algebra or history. We are changing the fundamental cognitive infrastructure of human society.

5. The Moral Lag

Evolutionary leaps often outpace the ecosystems that contain them. In biology, beneficial mutations appear before the environment has adjusted to accommodate them. In culture, technologies emerge before our values catch up, before we develop the ethical grammar to use them wisely. Education's deepest role

is to close that gap, to metabolize change into understanding, to transform novelty into wisdom.

What troubles me most is how quickly we've normalized AI in education without asking harder questions. I watch students submit their college writing assignments co-written with ChatGPT and see institutions scrambling to update honor codes rather than reimagine what "original work" could mean in this context. We are solving for the old equilibrium's rules when we should be writing new ones. The moral framework will not come from technology companies or policy papers. It must emerge from the people doing the work: teachers, students, communities experimenting at the edge of transformation.

Right now, moral adaptation lags dangerously behind technical innovation (Vallor, 2016). AI can already generate personalized lessons, grade essays with apparent understanding, even emulate empathy in ways that feel surprisingly authentic (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). Yet the ethical grammar for its use remains unsettled and contested. Questions of privacy, authorship, equity, and autonomy have no agreed-upon answers (Williamson, 2017; Selwyn et al., 2020).

If education fails to cultivate this moral grammar, society risks what we might call an epistemic extinction. Not a physical disappearance but a erosion of the conditions that make human knowledge possible. Truth becomes blurred by automation, creativity diluted by infinite replication, curiosity replaced by the convenience of instant, unexamined answers (Crawford, 2021). We would still exist, still function, but something essential about human knowing would be lost.

To prevent that outcome, schools must become adaptive organs for humanity's moral evolution. They must be places where we learn not only new skills but new forms of responsibility (Freire, 1970; hooks, 2014). Places where young people encounter AI not as magic but as a complex system with embedded values, hidden biases, and profound implications for how power operates in society. The classroom must become a space for ethical practice, not just technical mastery.

6. Designing for the New Equilibrium

How might we design education to thrive in this phase shift? The answers are emerging not from policy papers but from practitioners, from teachers and students experimenting at the edges of what's possible. Here are four principles that seem to matter most.

Here is what I believe: the future of education is not about choosing between human teachers and AI systems. It is about designing environments where both contribute what they do best. I envision classrooms as studios for hybrid cognition, where students learn to think with and through AI while developing the judgment to know when to set it aside. This requires courage from educators, the willingness to become designers of learning ecosystems rather than deliverers of content.

Instead of transmission, emphasize co-creation. Students use AI to prototype ideas, to generate first drafts, to explore possibilities. But teachers guide the crucial reflection on process. Why did the system respond this way? What assumptions did it encode? What did it miss or misunderstand? (Schön, 1983). The focus shifts from product to process, from the essay produced to the thinking that produced the essay.

Replace single-answer tests with process portfolios that reveal how learners collaborate with AI (Biggs & Tang, 2011). Stop measuring only what students know and start measuring how they reason, how they question, how they discern quality from plausibility. The metric becomes the depth of inquiry, not the correctness of regurgitation (Bransford et al., 2000). This requires more sophisticated assessment, yes, but it also produces more meaningful learning.

Teach students how to learn new tools continuously, because the tools will not stop changing (Zimmerman, 2002). By the time today's kindergarteners graduate high school, they will encounter AI systems we cannot yet imagine. The curriculum must prepare them not for specific technologies but for perpetual adaptation. Learning to learn becomes as important as learning any particular content (Brown et al., 1989).

Ensure that open models and community resources make AI literacy accessible to everyone, not just the privileged (Warschauer, 2003; Reich & Ito, 2017). If AI fluency becomes a luxury good, we will create a cognitive aristocracy more entrenched than any economic divide. Equity is not a side effect of good design. It is the foundation of collective intelligence, the precondition for a society that thinks well together (Landemore, 2013).

These strategies are not futuristic speculation. They are already emerging in classrooms around the world: teachers experimenting with AI companions, students using coding-by-conversation platforms, writers discovering new creative possibilities through human-AI collaboration (Holstein et al., 2019; Zhai, 2022). The task now is to scale these experiments ethically and inclusively, to learn from what works and abandon what doesn't.

7. What Larger Pattern Does This Reveal?

The patterns I see unfolding suggest something profound: we are transitioning from an era where intelligence resided in individual minds to one where it emerges from networks of human and artificial cognition. This terrifies some people. I find it exhilarating, not because I believe AI will solve our problems, but because it forces us to confront what has always been true: human knowledge is collective, distributed, and profoundly social. We never thought alone. We are only now becoming conscious of our interdependence.

Seen through the wider lens of human history, each educational punctuation mirrors a larger cultural transformation. The changes in how we teach are never isolated from changes in how we live, work, and organize ourselves as societies.

The blackboard aligned with industrial production and the rise of public schooling. It served the needs of the modern nation-state, which required literate, disciplined citizens who could read instructions, follow procedures, and think in standardized ways (Spring, 2016; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). The computer paralleled globalization and the rise of information capitalism. It served an economy that valued flexibility, individual initiative, and the ability to navigate vast information networks (Castells, 2000; Harvey, 2005).

AI reflects our transition to something unprecedented. A networked, planetary consciousness where intelligence is no longer localized in individual brains but distributed across humans, data systems, and machines (Floridi, 2014; Bostrom, 2014). We are moving from an age of individual cognition to an age of collective, hybrid intelligence. The implications are profound and still emerging.

Education sits at the center of these transformations because it teaches societies how to interpret themselves (Bruner, 1996). It is the mechanism through which one generation passes its understanding to the next, but also the space where new understandings emerge. Every new equilibrium redefines not only the learner's tools but the learner's identity. Who am I as a knower? What does it mean to understand? These questions get answered differently in each era.

In this moment, we are learning to be co-intelligent. We are learning to see knowledge as ecological rather than individual, as something that emerges from relationships rather than residing in isolated minds (Bateson, 1972; Haraway, 2016). The next equilibrium may judge progress not by what one brilliant mind knows but by what many minds, human and artificial, can understand together. This is not a diminishment of human intelligence but a transformation of it.

8. A Call to Imagination

Let me be clear about my commitments. I come to this work as an educator and researcher who believes passionately in education's power to shape society. My background spans physics and learning sciences, which has taught me to seek patterns while remaining humble about prediction. I founded the Society & AI Independent Research Group because I believe the conversation about AI and education must be led by educators, not technologists or policymakers alone.

I am convinced that this moment represents our greatest opportunity to reimagine education toward equity and human flourishing. But I am equally convinced that we can fail spectacularly if we let market forces and technological determinism guide educational transformation. The next equilibrium must be intentionally designed, not passively inherited.

These are not neutral observations. I write from a position of moral urgency, believing that how we educate in the AI era will determine whether the next generation inherits tools of liberation or instruments of control. The stakes justify the effort of this inquiry.

This conversation cannot belong to educators alone. Scientists, policymakers, artists, parents, every person who cares about what kind of society we are building must participate in shaping the learning

ecology that will sustain civilization through its AI century (Luckin et al., 2016). The decisions we make about education in the next decade will reverberate for generations.

If we fail to adapt education to the realities of synthetic cognition, we risk deepening divides in understanding that will be as consequential as any economic inequality we have known (Piketty, 2014; Reich, 2015). A world where some people can think with AI and others are merely subject to it. A world where algorithmic literacy becomes a privilege that concentrates power rather than distributing it. If we succeed, we create something different. A society capable of reasoning with its own creations rather than being ruled by them (Winner, 1980). A civilization that uses AI to enhance human judgment rather than replace it, to expand imagination rather than standardize it, to support flourishing rather than optimize efficiency.

Change at this scale unsettles everyone. Teachers fear being replaced by algorithms that never tire and never need health insurance. Students fear being judged by systems that cannot see their full humanity. Institutions fear irrelevance in a world where credentialed expertise competes with free AI tutors. But fear has accompanied every punctuation in education's evolution (Cuban, 1986). Yet each time, something essential has endured. The heart of teaching, the human relationship, the curiosity, the care, these have survived every technological revolution (Palmer, 1998; Noddings, 2013). The blackboard did not eliminate the teacher. The computer did not eliminate the classroom. AI will not eliminate the fundamental human need to learn together, to struggle with ideas in community, to be seen and known by another person who cares about our growth.

Perhaps the truest test of intelligence is not adaptation alone but the courage to imagine during transition. To imagine classrooms where reasoning is genuinely shared between human and machine. Where ethical thinking evolves as rapidly as code. Where learning becomes a collective act not just of personal advancement but of planetary survival (Haraway, 2016). This requires more than technical skill. It requires moral imagination, the ability to envision a future worth building even when the present feels unstable.

Education stands again at a punctuated equilibrium. The next equilibrium will not emerge from policy decrees handed down by administrators, nor from technological determinism that claims to know the future. It will arise from millions of small acts of reimagining. Teachers experimenting in their classrooms. Students questioning in thoughtful ways. Communities learning together what it means to think in partnership with artificial minds.

If the blackboard made thinking visible and the computer made knowledge personal, AI can make wisdom relational. It can help us see that intelligence has always been collective, that human knowing has always depended on tools, conversations, and communities. The challenge before us is to guide that recognition toward empathy and purpose rather than extraction and control.

Will the next generation inherit tools of liberation or instruments of dependence? Will they learn to question or only to query? Will they develop the wisdom to know which decisions should never be automated, which judgments must remain irreducibly human? The equilibrium we build now will determine not just how we learn, but who we become. Not just what we know, but how we know together. Not just individual success, but collective flourishing. This is the moment when we decide what kind of thinking beings we will be in an age of artificial intelligence. The choice is still ours to make.

Acknowledgements

With gratitude to the University of Massachusetts Amherst community for their continued support, and to the educators and researchers who have shaped my thinking about learning, technology, and human flourishing.

References

Baker, R. S., & Inventado, P. S. (2014). Educational data mining and learning analytics. In J. A. Larusson & B. White (Eds.), *Learning analytics: From research to practice* (pp. 61–75). Springer.

Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind.* University of Chicago Press.

Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (4th ed.). Open University Press.

Bostrom, N. (2014). *Superintelligence: Paths, dangers, strategies*. Oxford University Press.

boyd, d. (2014). *It's complicated: The social lives of networked teens*. Yale University Press.

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (Eds.). (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. National Academy Press.

Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher*, *18*(1), 32–42. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X018001032

Bruner, J. (1996). *The culture of education*. Harvard University Press.

Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Castells, M. (2000). *The rise of the network society* (2nd ed.). Blackwell.

Crawford, K. (2021). *Atlas of AI: Power, politics, and the planetary costs of artificial intelligence*. Yale University Press.

Cuban, L. (1986). *Teachers and machines: The classroom use of technology since 1920*. Teachers College Press.

Dede, C. (2010). Comparing frameworks for 21st century skills. In J. Bellanca & R. Brandt (Eds.), *21st century skills: Rethinking how students learn* (pp. 51–76). Solution Tree Press.

Eisenstein, E. L. (1979). *The printing press as an agent of change*. Cambridge University Press.

Eldredge, N., & Gould, S. J. (1972). Punctuated equilibria: An alternative to phyletic gradualism. In T. J. M. Schopf (Ed.), *Models in paleobiology* (pp. 82–115). Freeman, Cooper.

Eldredge, N., & Gould, S. J. (1993). Punctuated equilibrium comes of age. *Nature*, *366*(6452), 223–227. https://doi.org/10.1038/366223a0

Eshet-Alkalai, Y. (2004). Digital literacy: A conceptual framework for survival skills in the digital era. *Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia*, *13*(1), 93–106.

Floridi, L. (2014). *The fourth revolution: How the infosphere is reshaping human reality*. Oxford University Press.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.

Gilster, P. (1997). *Digital literacy*. Wiley.

Haraway, D. (2016). *Staying with the trouble: Making kin in the Chthulucene*. Duke University Press.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.

Hilbert, M., & López, P. (2011). The world's technological capacity to store, communicate, and compute information. *Science*, *332*(6025), 60–65. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1200970

Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). *Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning*. Center for Curriculum Redesign.

Holstein, K., McLaren, B. M., & Aleven, V. (2019). Co-designing a real-time classroom orchestration tool to support teacher–AI complementarity. *Journal of Learning Analytics*, *6*(2), 27–52. https://doi.org/10.18608/jla.2019.62.3

hooks, b. (2014). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. Routledge.

Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2006). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Landemore, H. (2013). *Democratic reason: Politics, collective intelligence, and the rule of the many*. Princeton University Press.

Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2008). *Digital literacies: Concepts, policies and practices*. Peter Lang.

Long, D., & Magerko, B. (2020). What is AI literacy? Competencies and design considerations. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 1–16). ACM. `https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376727`

Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., & Forcier, L. B. (2016). *Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education*. Pearson.

Miller, A. I. (2019). *The artist in the machine: The world of AI-powered creativity*. MIT Press.

Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. NYU Press.

Noddings, N. (2013). *Caring: A relational approach to ethics and moral education* (2nd ed.). University of California Press.

O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown.

Palmer, P. J. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. Jossey-Bass.

Papert, S. (1980). *Mindstorms: Children, computers, and powerful ideas*. Basic Books.

Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the twenty-first century*. Harvard University Press.

Reich, J., & Ito, M. (2017). *From good intentions to real outcomes: Equity by design in learning technologies*. Digital Media and Learning Research Hub.

Reich, R. (2015). *Saving capitalism: For the many, not the few*. Knopf.

Schön, D. A. (1973). *Beyond the stable state*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Basic Books.

Selwyn, N. (2019). What's the problem with learning analytics? *Journal of Learning Analytics*, *6*(3), 11–19. https://doi.org/10.18608/jla.2019.63.3

Selwyn, N., Hillman, T., Eynon, R., Ferreira, G., Knox, J., Macgilchrist, F., & Sancho-Gil, J. M. (2020). What's next for ed-tech? Critical hopes and concerns for the 2020s. *Learning, Media and Technology*, *45*(1), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1694945

Spring, J. (2016). *American education* (17th ed.). Routledge.

Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*. Harvard University Press.

Vallor, S. (2016). *Technology and the virtues: A philosophical guide to a future worth wanting*. Oxford University Press.

Warschauer, M. (2003). *Technology and social inclusion: Rethinking the digital divide*. MIT Press.

Williamson, B. (2017). Big data in education: The digital future of learning, policy and practice. *Learning, Media and Technology*, *42*(2), 217–219. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2016.1276206

Winner, L. (1980). Do artifacts have politics? *Daedalus*, *109*(1), 121–136.

Wylie, C. D. (2012). Teaching manuals and the blackboard: Accessing historical classroom practices. *History of Education*, *41*(2), 257–272. https://doi.org/10.1080/0046760X.2011.584573

Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education–Where are the educators? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *16*(1), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0

Zhai, X. (2022). ChatGPT user experience: Implications for education. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. `https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4312418`

Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory Into Practice*, *41*(2), 64–70. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.