

Critiquing AI in Education

Introduction

Given the prevalence of critical approaches to Artificial Intelligence (AI) in this issue of *Postdigital Science and Education*, and indeed elsewhere, this editorial could have begun with the rather dull and somewhat predictable sentence: ‘Critique of AI is *growing*’, before preceding to describe the various ways in which, broadly speaking, the overly optimistic claims of data-driven and ‘generative’ tech solutionism in education are being resoundingly dismantled. The excellent contributions to this issue would certainly give credence to such an argument. However, notwithstanding the wealth of critical approaches on display here, it is worth reflecting briefly on the ways that the critique of AI in education is taking shape; how critique itself is being articulated and positioned; and therefore what the general appraisal of AI hyperbole might be *doing*; even if it is indeed ‘growing’ (‘developing’; ‘becoming more established’; etc).

One way of thinking about the scope of critique is to consider the ways research is ‘cutting through’ in the media, and is as such, shaping public opinion, at least to some degree. In this respect it does appear as if perspectives other than the wholly enthusiastic are indeed *à la mode* in journalistic circles, particularly issues related to the environmental impact of data centres (e.g., Dempsey 2025; Perkins 2025), safety concerns where children are interacting with AI bots (e.g., McCallum 2025), exploitative labour practices (Muldoon et al. 2025), economic contradictions in the promise of automation (Warner 2025), and the potential for cognitive decline (Chow 2025). Reading the Sunday papers, as it were, one might conclude that critical perspectives are indeed ‘having an impact’. One might even infer that the general understanding of what AI *is*, and what it offers, has shifted from an earlier sense of wonder at the apparent ability to ‘generate’ text at will (and images, and code), to (at least some) appreciation of how such outputs are situated in relation to ‘us’. How *we shape AI* (though our already-biased text and images, as well as through the labour of exploited populations) and how *AI shapes us* (by changing the way we think, or by impacting the availability of water in communities close to data centres). That is, an appreciation that is more aligned with the concerns that researchers might consider ‘critical’. Or is it?

Why is it that, at the very same time, this ‘generative’ form of AI has a distinct air of *inevitability* about it? Perhaps it is that, turning the page on the article about the detrimental environmental impacts of data centres, one might find another highlighting multibillion dollar deals to secure the ‘AI industry’s voracious appetite for computing power’ (Guardian 2025). Perhaps it is the recent consortium of elite universities establishing a 50-million-dollar partnership with OpenAI (termed ‘NextGenAI’) to ‘accelerate research breakthroughs and transform education’ (OpenAI 2025). Perhaps it is because, presumably without asking for it, students now have an ‘AI competency framework’ (Miao et al. 2024) through which they can be judged fit, or not, for the job market. Or maybe it is the international proliferation of MIT’s ‘Day of AI’, which promises to ‘empower your school and your students to thrive in a world of AI’ (Responsible AI for Social Empowerment and Education 2025).

Don’t doubt it for a minute, these educational initiatives are not *without* critical perspectives: ‘NextGenAI’ aims to ‘prepare the next generation to shape AI’s future’ (OpenAI 2025); the competency framework sets out to foster ‘responsible users and co-creators’ (Miao et al. 2024); and the ‘Day of AI’, derived from a MIT’s Responsible AI for Social Empowerment and Education (RAISE) (2025) initiative, has the aspiration to ‘make a better world with AI’. Given that ‘ethics’, at least in the form of frameworks and guidelines, has become an indispensable part of the AI vocabulary (Knox et al. 2022), it seems unlikely that any recent deployment of AI in education could be wholly *uncritical*. But such initiatives seem, before much discussion of whether education actually needs or desires AI, to have already

committed. This is the strange climate we seem to be in: significant AI ‘harms’ are publicly documented like never before yet calls for resistance (e.g. McQuillan 2022) seem to have been positioned as increasingly radical. What does this say about the effectiveness, perhaps the impotence of critique?

AI As a Matter of Concern

Latour’s (2004) well-known discussion of critique ‘running out of steam’ is worth bringing to bear on the current conundrums of GenAI in education, not only for its remarkably prescient anticipation of our current era of ‘alternative facts’, but also for its ruminations on the purpose of critical work. Writing over twenty years ago, Latour (2004) was principally concerned with the ways that the critique of scientific objectivity (in which he himself had participated substantively) had opened the door to a wider distrust in institutions, and the ability to deconstruct even the certainties and values that critics themselves might hold dear. To be able to legitimately say that facts are ‘made up, interpreted, flexible’, agonised Latour (2004: 245), enabled climate change deniers to also call into question the hard-fought evidence of global warming, for example.

Latour’s corrective for the orientation of critique was to discourage a practice of the simplistic dismissal or discreditation of science and instead encourage the idea of the critic as an ‘assembler’ and critique as a process of ‘gathering’. This manoeuvre was an attempt to transcend an oppositional stance that pitted the methods of science against their social explanation: ‘the question was never to get away from facts but closer to them, not fighting empiricism but, on the contrary, renewing empiricism’ (Latour 2004: 231). Thus, the critic should be someone who ‘adds reality to matters of fact’ (232) rather than simply ‘debunking’ in a way that diminishes what we can know. This expansion of realism is, essentially, a practice of situating facts within their ‘web of connections’ (237), and in this way making scientific objectivity ‘more’ by connecting it to the contingent relations through which it is produced. These are the ‘matters of concern’ Latour (2004: 237) notably associates with the ‘matters of fact’; both a scientific object and its ‘aura’.

Additionally instructive is Latour’s (2004) criticism of the narrow and selective habit of the critic; a practice of ‘barbarity’ (240) in which ‘they use objects they do believe in to resort to the causalist or mechanist explanation and debunk conscious capacities of people whose behavior they don’t approve of’ (241). In other words, to focus the challenge to objectivity only on things the critic wishes to ‘debunk’, while retaining a more customary view of everything else. These two facets of critique – viewing the practice as adding to insight, not subtracting from it, and avoiding selectivity in showing which things are ‘made up’ - suggest some useful ways of thinking about critical studies of AI in education. One might, therefore, ask: What would it mean to ‘assemble’ where AI is being used in education? How do we maintain a sense of critical ‘gathering’ across all dimensions of our research foci?

‘Getting Real’ About AI In Education?

If we follow Latour’s (2004) concern for a certain kind of expanded realism, one might position critical work in the area of AI and education as ‘opening up’ a much broader understanding of the technology. Indeed, work in this issue opens up broad understandings of metrics (Watermeyer et al. 2024; Jordan 2024; Gourlay 2024); authorship (Roe 2025; Abdul-Jabbar and Bhatt 2025; Tierens et al. 2025; Sundström Sjödin and Rahm 2025), and other topics. The four collective articles, written by more than 80 different authors, explore questions of Generative AI (GenAI) literacies (Rapanta et al. 2025) and research agendas (Jaldemark et al. 2025), opening up postdigital dialogues between the Global South and the Global North (Hayes et al. 2025) and opportunities for reshaping higher education designs and futures (Zeivots et al. 2025).

‘Getting real’ in this context can be seen as a useful counter to the promotional hyperbole that seems inclined to overpromise educational benefits to the use of AI. Despite the inference of having objectivity, precision, and science itself on their side, it is the advocates of AI that engage in substantive speculation and imagination about education futures (Knox 2025), typically through overly optimistic claims of universal benefits. This is not to dismiss critical work on ‘speculative fiction’ that, most importantly, seeks to redistribute the ‘projective agency’ (Emirbayer and Mische 1998) necessary to reimagine educational futures with AI [see also the most recent book in the Postdigital Science and Education series, *Postdigital (Re)Imaginations: Critiques, Methods, and Interventions* (Jandrić et al. 2025)].

Nevertheless, Latour’s (2004) ‘realism’ suggests a critical attention to how AI actually functions ‘under the hood’ of slick interfaces and the narrow focus on ‘prompt engineering’, as well as to how the technology might manifest differently in the educational contexts into which it is deployed. For example, ‘getting real’ about what the technology actually *is* (a ‘generative model’ that can reproduce text or images based on patterns derived from training data), and how the resulting dialogue might take place in differing educational contexts (perhaps with the resources to scaffold and contextualise the ways students use AI, perhaps without). In this sense, being critical surely means developing a more substantial, authentic, and *real* understanding of AI in education, at least in contrast to narrowly defined measures of ‘learning gains’, for example. However, to abide by Latour’s (2004) well-rehearsed ‘gathering’, the point is not to discredit a particular deployment of AI, but rather to virtuously expand upon it; to add to our understanding of digital education, not diminish it with a disdainful rejection of the tech.

But can we simply transpose Latour’s (2004) anti-oppositional form of critique into the realms of AI in education in such a straightforward way? To critique without ‘debunking’ is undoubtedly a noble undertaking, but it seems somewhat easier to uphold where the objects of criticism are the grand science of germ theory (Latour 1988) or the prestigious routines of the laboratory (Latour and Woolgar 1979). Latour’s (2004: 232) version of critique is a means ‘to protect and to care’ for science, and to ‘inspire respect’ for and to ‘glorify’ its objects. Can the critic of AI in education remain so lofty?

The problem is that for the data-driven technologies that underpin ‘AI’, it is difficult to separate the science from the commerce. The ‘transformer’ neural network architecture that underpins LLMs certainly seems interesting as an object of study, but it would be impossible to overlook its packaging into a commercial EdTech product if one wanted to understand its very ‘real’ deployment in education. Furthermore, one gets the impression that such data-driven tech is not simply (computer) science that has been made into a commercial product, but a commercial product *all the way down*. Or at least an extractive and exploitative one. This is not to say that such objects are unworthy targets for the critic, but rather to suggest that they are, well, less interesting.

Here is the real rub for the critique of AI in education: could it be that after all the hype has died down that the tech turns out to be rather dull? Maybe automating a few lacklustre sentences wasn’t the high-tech future we imagined after all? (See how easy it was to revert to ‘debunking’?) In other words, to go to all the trouble of assembling matters of concern in the Latourian fashion, one would have to also be ultimately interested in *protecting and caring* for AI, perhaps even in *glorifying* the AIEd products increasingly marketed as essential educational experiences for the graduates and employees of tomorrow. It takes a special kind of commitment, perhaps, to move beyond cynicism into this terrain of munificent critique, especially where the tech sector appears to increasingly hold democratic social institutions, like education, in such contempt.

Assembling Education (Not Just AI)

There is value in suggesting a note of caution in the practice of simply ‘pointing out problems’ with AI. That is, of course, easier said than done. There are many problems, and they need to be pointed out, particularly amidst what seems to be a widespread embracing of ‘inevitable’ tech disruption with current ‘GenAI’. However, as suggested earlier, this can seem to result only in feelings of impotence. What can really be done when genuine concerns about ‘degenerative’ outcomes for learning, reading, and writing, or indeed appeals to exploitative labour conditions, are simply answered by confident commitments to ‘responsible’ use?

The problem might be that both these positions – ‘pointing out problems’ with AI, and an overwhelming conviction in ultimate benefits - tend to focus on the technology, and in that sense remain within the general hyperbole and fascination surrounding AI. For the ‘critic’, especially the one schooled in Science and Technology Studies, this might seem rather the point. Proprietary ‘black boxes’ surely need to be opened, scrutinised, and deconstructed for the public good? Nevertheless, could too much curiosity in the tech, however critical, end up with a limited drawing of boundaries around the AI as ‘the problem’ and the object of our concern? Where AI products appear narrowly grounded in educational expertise, or to offer learning solutions that seem to be desperately in search of pedagogical problems, the tech might seem like an obvious target for critical appraisal. However, without a broader focus, such a selective orientation for critique, at best, seems to let education off the hook, and at worst, appears to align with regressive moves to ban tech from educational activity entirely.

As Lewis and Hyland (2022) suggest, education technology in general should be considered, not as a ‘tool’ to achieve a particular end, but as a *progression* in a particular and already-established way of thinking. That is, a ‘managing contingency’ in education through economic, calculable, computational, and predictive ways of thinking about knowledge. In this sense, if this latest version of AI has come to be seen as inevitable in education, it is not because of any revolutionary or disruptive innovation; it is precisely because it ‘fits in’. Isn’t it the case that GenAI has assimilated so well because it both embodies and enhances the dominant way education is now understood: direct-to-consumer, automatable, and convenient? If that is indeed so, education itself would surely require the robust and penetrating gaze of the critic, at least as much so as the tech? In a relationship of such reciprocity, a selective focus on the object of critique as AI would seem to diminish our understanding considerably.

But it might be worse than that. The wider educational climate in which AI is being introduced is, in some contexts, taking the rather radical step of banning technology entirely. Most notable in this so-called ‘digital backlash’ (Forsler et al. 2025) has been the decision to ban social media for minors in Australia (see Kaye and Menon 2024), and the idea appears to have appeal elsewhere, including in the UK, where age verification for under-18s has recently been introduced (Department for Science, Innovation and Skills 2025). In education, the usual suspects of social media (Robards et al. 2025) and smart phones (Rahali et al. 2024; Reed and Dunn 2024) tend to induce particular alarm, a response further bolstered by extensive media attention (Adams 2025; Da Costa 2025). Once AI sinks down into the everyday functioning of apps and devices, the sense of unease seems likely to heighten rather than diminish.

The problem with this general sentiment is not only in assuming that the exclusion of technology from schools will provide a miracle cure. It is also in failing to see the educational institution as something also deserving of critical appraisal. Instead, fears about unsafe technologies are being used to justify a conservative vision of education, and schooling in particular. This heavily selective trend for seeing ‘tech as the problem’ has surfaced new champions, such as Sophie Winkleman, who appears increasingly concerned with the potential for tech-determined distraction and inauthenticity in schools. In a recent talk, one of Winkleman’s examples of ‘authentic’ schooling - the Heritage School in Cambridge – perhaps suggests the kind of outcome the ‘digital backlash’ movement wants to bring (back) into reality: a ‘haven of focus, serenity, classical intellect, Christian heritage, nature, art and beauty’, all of

which ‘would not be possible if the classrooms were filled with screens’ (Winkleman 2025). Is this really where the critic of AI in education wants to end up? It nevertheless seems like an easy ideological alignment where the focus of critical attention remains stridently on the ‘problems with the tech’.

Education Has the Final Word

If the latest AI-driven EdTech trinkets are not quite worthy of the critic’s care or glorification, and neither are they the indisputable culprit and cause of all educational ills, perhaps what is needed is a greater critical focus on education itself (given that this encompasses AI anyway). As surely the most foundational of our social institutions, education is inherently deserving of Latour’s (2004) protective acts of assembling and gathering, of holding ‘facts’ and their ‘networks of relations’ together in the drive for a more expansive understanding. As Petar Jandrić’s (2025) editorial suggests, this is not an ‘AI issue’, and it shouldn’t be: the objective of the work of critique is surely, following Latour (2004), to renew education, not simply to interrogate AI. Isn’t this precisely what the postdigital was supposed to reveal: that the era of obsessive and myopic tech enthusiasm is over; that the digital and sunk down into the fabric of science and society? This is not the same as saying AI is inevitable. Rather, tracing the broad web of contingent relations through which education is constructed helps us to not only reveal how provisional and ‘made up’ AI *really* is, but also to reorient and reassemble our interests towards *things that matter*.

References

- Abdul-Jabbar, W. K., & Bhatt, I. (2025). Post-authorship and AI-Assisted Writing: Singularity, Communication, and Pedagogy in Higher Education. *Postdigital Science and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-025-00586-5>.
- Adams, R. (2025). More than 90% of schools in England ban mobile phone use, survey shows. *The Guardian*, 10 April. <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2025/apr/10/majority-of-schools-in-england-ban-mobile-phone-use-survey-shows>. Accessed 4 November 2025.
- Chow, A. (2025). ChatGPT May Be Eroding Critical Thinking Skills, According to a New MIT Study. *Time*, 23 June. <https://time.com/7295195/ai-chatgpt-google-learning-school/>. Accessed 4 November 2025.
- Da Costa, K. (2025). School bans smartphones in favour of 'brick' phones. *BBC News*, 1 July. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/cn7ddy8mpl1o>. Accessed 4 November 2025.
- Dempsey, M. (2025). What's the big deal about AI data centres? *BBC News*, 23 September. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/ckg2ldp19leo>. Accessed 4 November 2025.
- Department for Science, Innovation and Skills. (2025). What's changing for children on social media from 25 July 2025. <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/whats-changing-for-children-on-social-media-from-25-july-2025>. Accessed 4 November 2025.
- Emirbayer, M., & Mische, A. (1998). What Is Agency? *American Journal of Sociology*, 103(4), 962–1023. <https://doi.org/10.1086/231294>.
- Forsler, I., Hayes, S., Jandrić, P., Macgilchrist, F., Selwyn, N., & Hansén, S. (2025). Hijacking the Digital Backlash in Education. *Postdigital Science and Education*.
- Gourlay, L. (2024). Is A Star A Document? Catalogued Students and Learning Analytics. *Postdigital Science and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-024-00489-x>.
- Guardian. (2025). OpenAI signs multibillion-dollar chip deal with AMD. <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2025/oct/06/openai-chipmaker-amd-deal>. Accessed 4 November 2025.

- Hayes, S., Earle, S., Dukhan, S., Padayachee, K., Dison, L., Milaras, M., Smit-Stachowski, A., Aharonson, V., Hoosen, N., Luo, M., Simbanegavi, P., Hewlett, L., Badenhorst, C., Wilson-Thompson, B., Rusznyak, L., Langsford, D., Andrews, D., Osman, R., Weaich, M., Dube, S., Genga, R., Tam, C., Prinsloo, P., Ruiz, N., Najjuma, R., Gallagher, M., & Nartey, E. (2025). Perspectives from South Africa on GenAI in Higher Education: A Postdigital Dialogue with the Global Context. *Postdigital Science and Education*.
- Jaldemark, J., Lundin, J., Säljö, R., Edwards, J., Gegenfurtner, A., Holmes, W., Järvelä, S., de Laat, M., Lindberg, Y., Littlejohn, A., Seufert, S., Specht, M., Svensson, L., Rapanta, C., Zeivots, S., & Hayes, S. (2025). A Multidisciplinary Research Agenda for Artificial Intelligence, Education, Learning and Instruction. *Postdigital Science and Education*.
- Jandrić, P. (2025). This Is Not an AI Issue. *Postdigital Science and Education*.
- Jordan, K. (2024). Ranking 'by Relevance' in Academic Literature Searches: Prevalence, Definitions, and Implications. *Postdigital Science and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-024-00530-z>.
- Kaye, B., & Menon, P. (2024). Australia passes social media ban for children under 16. Reuters, 29 November. <https://www.reuters.com/technology/australia-passes-social-media-ban-children-under-16-2024-11-28/>. Accessed 4 November 2025.
- Knox, J. (2025). Impact, Inequality, and Imagination: Envisioning a More Ambitious Education in the Era of AI. UNESCO IdeasLAB. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/impact-inequality-and-imagination-envisioning-more-ambitious-education-era-ai>. Accessed 4 November 2025.
- Knox, J., Hoel, T., & Yuan, L. (2022). 'From principles to processes': Lessons for higher education from the development of AI ethics. In F. A. Menéndez, A. M. Machado, C. L. Esteban, & C. A. López (Eds.), *Strategy, Policy, Practice, and Governance for AI in Higher Education Institutions*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-9247-2.ch005>.
- Latour, B. (1988). *The pasteurization of France*. Cambridge, MA and London, UK: Harvard University Press.
- Latour, B. (2004). Why Has Critique Run out of Steam? From Matters of Fact to Matters of Concern. *Critical Inquiry*, 30(2), 225-248. <https://doi.org/10.1086/421123>.
- Latour, B., & Woolgar, S. (1979). *Laboratory life: the social construction of scientific facts*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt32bbxc>.
- Lewis, T., & Hyland, P. (2022). *Studious Drift: Movements and Protocols for a Postdigital Education*. Minneapolis, MN: University Of Minnesota Press
- McCallum, S. (2025). AI 'friend' chatbots probed over child protection. BBC News, 12 September. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c74933vzx2yo>. Accessed 4 November 2025.
- McQuillan, D. (2022). *Resisting AI: An Anti-fascist Approach to Artificial Intelligence*. Bristol: Bristol University Press.
- Miao, F., Shiohira, K., & Lao, N. (2024). *AI Competency Framework for Students*. Paris: UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.54675/JKJB9835>.
- Muldoon, J., Graham, M., & Cant, C. (2025). Meet Mercy and Anita – the African workers driving the AI revolution, for just over a dollar an hour. The Guardian, 6 July. <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/article/2024/jul/06/mercy-anita-african-workers-ai-artificial-intelligence-exploitation-feeding-machine>. Accessed 4 November 2025.
- OpenAI. (2025). Introducing NextGenAI: A consortium to advance research and education with AI. <https://openai.com/index/introducing-nextgenai/>. Accessed 4 November 2025.

- Perkins, T. (2025). Advocates raise alarm over Pfas pollution from datacenters amid AI boom. *The Guardian*, 4 October <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2025/oct/04/pfas-pollution-data-centers-ai>. Accessed 4 November 2025.
- Rahali, M., Kidron, B., & Livingston, S. (2024). Smartphone policies in schools: What does the evidence say? Report from Digital Future for Children. https://eprints.lse.ac.uk/125554/1/Smartphone_policies_in_schools_Rahali_et_al_2024_002.pdf. Accessed 4 November 2025.
- Rapanta, C., Bhatt, I., Bozkurt, A., Chubb, L. A., Erb, C., Forsler, I., Gravett, K., Koole, M., Lintner, T., Örtengren, A., Petricini, T., Rodgers, B., Webster, J., Xu, X., Falgren Christensen, I.-M., Bonderup Dohn, N., Weilgaard Christensen, L. L., Zeivots, S., & Jandrić, P. (2025). Critical GenAI Literacy: Postdigital Configurations. *Postdigital Science and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-025-00573-w>.
- Reed, J., & Dunn, C. (2024). Postdigital Young People's Rights: A Critical Perspective on the UK Government's Guidance to Ban Phones in England's Schools. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 7(2), 376–385. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-024-00464-6>.
- Responsible AI for Social Empowerment and Education. (2025). RAISE: An MIT initiative empowering everyone to use AI responsibly, and with impact. <https://raise.mit.edu/>. Accessed 4 November 2025.
- Robards, B., Goring, J., & Hendry, N. A. (2025). Guiding young people's social media use in school policies: opportunities, risks, moral panics, and imagined futures. *Journal of Youth Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2025.2468477>.
- Roe, J. (2025). Generative AI as Cultural Artifact: Applying Anthropological Methods to AI Literacy. *Postdigital Science and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-025-00547-y>.
- Sundström Sjödin, E., & Rahm, L. (2025). Robots, Dogs, and Drags: The Politics of Reading and Being Read. *Postdigital Science and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-025-00540-5>.
- Tierens, T., Decuypere, M., Hartong, S., & Alirezabeigi, S. (2025). Schooling the (Artificially) Intelligent Writer: GenAI Technologies as Thinking Infrastructures in School Education. *Postdigital Science and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-025-00585-6>.
- Warner, J. (2025). Mass unemployment and the contradiction at the heart of the AI boom. *The Telegraph*, 8 October. <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/business/2025/10/08/mass-unemployment-contradiction-heart-ai-boom/>. Accessed 4 November 2025.
- Watermeyer, R., Lancelos, D., & Phipps, L. (2024). Citation Metrics and Highly Ranked Scholars: Spinning the Myth of Meritocracy. *Postdigital Science and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-024-00519-8>.
- Winkleman, S. (2025). The Most Compelling Argument Against Tech in Schools. [Transcript]. <https://www.afterbabel.com/p/sophie-winkleman-tech-schools>. Accessed 4 November 2025.
- Zeivots, S., Casey, A., Winchester, T., Webster, J., Wang, X., Tan, L., Smeenk, W., Schulte, F. P., Scholkmann, A., Paulovich, B., Muñoz, D., Mignone, J., Mantai, L., Hrastinski, S., Godwin, R., Engwall, O., Dindas, H., van Dijk, M., Chubb, L. A., Rapanta, C., Jaldemark, J., & Hayes, S. (2025). Reshaping Higher Education Designs and Futures: Postdigital Co-Design with Generative Artificial Intelligence. *Postdigital Science and Education*.