

From Chalkboards to Chatbots: Toward a Framework of Hybrid Intelligence in Education

Shaira Rose Brillante¹, Rhea Grace Bravo², Shecaira Matilac³ & Jovenil Bacatan⁴

¹²³⁴Department of Teacher Education, UM Peñaplata College, Island Garden City of Samal, Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
<p>Article history: Published: May 2026</p> <p>Keywords: Hybrid Intelligence Cognitive Scaffolding Pedagogical Atrophy Modal Collapse AI Literacy</p>	<p>The integration of generative AI into education signals an epistemological shift from tool-based instruction to co-evolutionary partnership. Drawing on Hybrid Intelligence frameworks, this academic essay argues that AI must function as a conceptual catalyst rather than a replacement for human agency. Effective integration requires cognitive scaffolding to prevent metacognitive atrophy, process-oriented assessments to preserve academic integrity, and human-in-the-loop models that elevate educators as mentors. However, risks of pedagogical atrophy and modal collapse demand a foundational critique of AI. Sustainable AI use prioritizes meaning-making and ethical reasoning as distinctly human endeavors, ensuring technology augments rather than supplants cognition.</p>

1. Introduction

The trajectory of educational technology has transitioned from the static chalkboard to the dynamic, generative capabilities of artificial intelligence. This evolution represents more than a mere shift in instructional tools; it reflects a fundamental epistemological change in how knowledge is constructed and disseminated. While early educational technology focused on automating routine tasks, contemporary discourse has shifted toward Hybrid Intelligence, a co-evolutionary framework in which human and machine intelligence work in a synergistic loop to enhance cognitive and social learning outcomes (Cukurova, 2024; Järvelä et al., 2025). For AI to fulfill its promise, it must be integrated not as a replacement for human agency, but as a "conceptual catalyst" that augments the educator's socio-emotional and pedagogical expertise (Giangan et al., 2026).

1.1 Theoretical Foundations: Cognitive Scaffolding and Structured Collaboration

At the core of the modern AI revolution is the concept of cognitive scaffolding. AI-driven systems leverage multimodal data to provide real-time, adaptive feedback tailored to the learner's specific cognitive load (Urmeneta et al., 2024). However, a journal-level analysis requires looking beyond simple personalization toward structured collaboration. Recent frameworks suggest restricting AI use to the initial brainstorming and planning stages to mitigate the risk of cognitive anchoring, a phenomenon in which students uncritically accept AI suggestions due to a lack of domain knowledge. By positioning AI as a tool for ideation rather than execution, institutions can ensure that "meaning-making" and the synthesis of ideas remain distinctly human endeavors (Giangan et al., 2026). This approach aligns with Sustainable Development Goal 4 by fostering high-quality, inclusive educational experiences (United Nations, 2020).

1.2 Reimagining Assessment: Process over Product

A significant challenge in AI-integrated classrooms is maintaining academic integrity while leveraging technological benefits. To address this, pedagogical models are shifting toward process-oriented assessments. Rather than evaluating only a final submission, educators can require multi-stage portfolios. These portfolios include the initial AI-generated outline, subsequent human-authored drafts, and reflective transparency logs. In these logs, students must explicitly document why they chose to accept or reject specific AI suggestions, making their critical thinking visible to evaluators (Giangan et al., 2026). This transformation ensures that AI acts as a catalyst for genuine inquiry rather than a shortcut to a finished product.

1.3 The "Human-in-the-Loop" and Institutional Equity

The integration of AI necessitates a radical reimagining of the teacher-student-AI triad. Teachers are no longer just lecturers but act as "Human-in-the-Loop" participants who use AI-generated insights to identify the precise "intervention point" where a student requires human guidance (Cohn et al., 2024; Gayen, 2026). This synergy allows educators to bridge the "generation gap" by focusing on high-level mentorship (Chan & Lee, 2023). Furthermore, achieving true equity requires that universities provide institutional access to high-quality AI tools. Such access is paramount for supporting second-language and low-income learners, ensuring that the digital divide does not widen as AI becomes a standard professional tool (Giangan et al., 2026).

1.4 Epistemological Risks: Atrophy and Modal Collapse

Despite the benefits, a judicious use of AI must confront the risks of pedagogical atrophy and modal collapse. Pedagogical atrophy occurs when educators lose their core instructional repertoire through over-reliance on automated systems (McBride et al., 2025; Mouta et al., 2023). For students, the risk of "modal collapse" suggests a homogenization of academic thought, where original

intellectual exploration is replaced by algorithmically preferred styles (Bozkurt, 2025). If AI handles the "heavy lifting" of critical thought, students may suffer a decline in metacognitive agency, losing the ability to independently monitor and regulate their mental processes (Järvelä et al., 2025). To prevent this, AI literacy must include a foundational "critique of AI," empowering users to maintain a critical distance from the "black box" (Bearman & Ajjawi, 2023; Popenici, 2023).

2. Conclusion

The shift from chalkboard to algorithm is fundamentally epistemological: it transforms not only instruction, but what it means to know and learn. Hybrid Intelligence promises co-evolutionary partnership, not automated teaching. Realizing these potential demands deliberate design; scaffolding that preserves metacognitive agency, assessments that valorize process, and equitable access. Yet risks persist, pedagogical atrophy, modal collapse, and eroded critical distance. The path forward rejects technological determinism. Educators, researchers, and policymakers must cultivate AI literacy that includes both technical fluency and robust critique. Only then can AI serve not as a replacement for human intellect, but as a mirror reflecting the uniquely human capacities for meaning-making, creativity, and ethical judgment.

References

- [1] Bearman, M., & Ajjawi, R. (2023). Learning to work with the black box: Pedagogy for a world with artificial intelligence. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 54(5), 1160-1173.
- [2] Bozkurt, A. (Ed.). (2025). Algorithmically manufactured minds: Generative and agentic AI in a time of post-truth, reconfiguration of student agency and death of critical pedagogy. *Open Praxis*, 17(2), 206-210.
- [3] Chan, C. K. Y., & Lee, K. K. (2023). The AI generation gap: Are Gen Z students more interested in adopting generative AI such as ChatGPT in teaching and learning than their Gen X and millennial generation teachers?. *Smart learning environments*, 10(1), 60.
- [4] Cohn, C., Snyder, C., Fonteles, J. H., TS, A., Montenegro, J., & Biswas, G. (2025). A multimodal approach to support teacher, researcher and AI collaboration in STEM+ C learning environments. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 56(2), 595-620.
- [5] Cukurova, M. (2025). The interplay of learning, analytics and artificial intelligence in education: A vision for hybrid intelligence. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 56(2), 469-488.
- [6] Gayen, L. (2026). Reimagining Student–Teacher Relationships in AI-Integrated Classrooms: Challenges and Opportunities. *Siddhanta's International Journal of Advanced Research in Arts & Humanities*, 15-29.
- [7] Giangan, A. M., Utbo, P. M., Dela Cerna, R., & Bacatan, J. (2026). Augmentation, Not Replacement: Defining the Role of AI in Student Writing. *JENER Journal of Empirical and Non-Empirical Research*, 2(5), 586–587. <https://doi.org/10.4898/jener.v2i5.a71>
- [8] Järvelä, S., Zhao, G., Nguyen, A., & Chen, H. (2025). Hybrid intelligence: Human–AI coevolution and learning. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 56(2), 455.
- [9] McBride, M., Thumlert, K., & Nolan, J. (2025). ‘Hands Off’ Learning: The Artifice Of Educating In An Algorithmic Age. *Digital Culture & Education*, 16(1).
- [10] Mouta, A., Torrecilla-Sánchez, E. M., & Pinto-Llorente, A. M. (2024). Design of a future scenarios toolkit for an ethical implementation of artificial intelligence in education. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29(9), 10473-10498.
- [11] Popenici, S. (2023). The critique of AI as a foundation for judicious use in higher education. *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching*, 6(2), 378-384.
- [12] United Nations. (2020). Sustainable Development Goal 4: Quality education. UN
- [13] Urmeneta, A., & Romero, M. (2024). Creative applications of artificial intelligence in education. URL: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/> (date of access: 12.02. 2025).