Generative Artificial Intelligence as a Collaborative Thought Partner: Rethinking Cognitive Partnership, Creativity, and Knowledge Work in the Age of Intelligent Systems

Andrea M. Wilson, Walden University, and Cheryl Burleigh, (https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2393-5477) National University, USA

Abstract

As generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) systems become increasingly integrated into scholarly, creative, and professional workflows, there is an urgent need to reconceptualize their role, not simply as tools or assistants, but as collaborative thought partners. This scholarly essay proposes a conceptual framework for understanding GenAI as a partner in cognition and creativity. The conceptual framework is grounded in sociocultural and distributed cognition theories, and situated within the context of knowledge work. We review literature on human–AI collaboration, human–machine co-creation, and on the ethical and epistemic implications of GenAI. The discussion rests on three core arguments. First, GenAI can serve as a cognitive companion beyond mere automation; second, it has the potential to enhance ideation and research productivity when designed as a partner rather than a one-way assistant; and third, it presents significant limitations and risks—including epistemic dependence, bias, and ownership dilemmas—that must be addressed. We propose a framework for responsible human–GenAI thought partnership. The framework outlines the roles of humans and AI, design conditions, and principles of high-quality collaboration. Implications for higher education, professional knowledge work, research practice, and AI governance are also explored. We recommend future empirical lines of inquiry and call for a balanced, evidence-based approach to integrating GenAI into cognitive and creative workflows.

Keywords: Cognitive partnership, distributed cognition, ethical AI use, generative artificial intelligence, human–AI collaboration. hybrid intelligence

Introduction

Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) is rapidly shifting from a novel technological innovation to an integral component of academic, creative, and professional workflows. Advances in large language models and multimodal generative systems enable new forms of intellectual support, including synthesizing scholarly literature, generating conceptual frameworks, drafting academic prose, and scaffolding reflective inquiry across disciplines (Kasneci et al., 2023; Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). Within higher education and knowledge-intensive professions, these systems are increasingly integrated into the routine practices of thinking, writing, and problem-solving, blurring the traditional boundaries between human cognition and computational assistance (Dwivedi et al., 2023).

As GenAI systems become increasingly integrated into scholarly, creative, and professional workflows, there is an urgent need to reconceptualize their role, not merely as tools or assistants, but as collaborative, machine-driven thought partners (Faraj et al., 2018; Shneiderman, 2020). This shift challenges and reflects a broader transformation in how cognition and knowledge work are understood, moving beyond instrumental accounts of AI use toward

relational models of human–AI collaboration that preserve cognitive depth (Floridi et al., 2018; Luckin et al., 2016).

GenAI systems have the capacity to play many different roles in supporting the construction of new knowledge and deepening the understanding of existing knowledge. Despite these opportunities, it remains critical to maintain a realistic view of GenAI as a machine-driven technological apparatus. Specifically, GenAI can be used as a meaningful co-creator or conversation simulator without being ascribed human qualities (Basgen, 2025; Grawitch, 2025; Liu et al., 2025). In other words, GenAI interactions and its outputs cannot and should not be used to override original human thought or as a mirror of human emotions and intentions for which it is not capable (Grawitch, 2025). Past, present, and future generations of GenAI must be viewed in the context of their non-human existence, despite the ongoing march toward humanizing these non-human entities.

Developments in GenAI capacity necessitate a deeper theoretical examination of how knowledge is jointly constructed in human–AI cognitive partnerships. When learners and scholars engage GenAI systems iteratively—prompting, evaluating, revising, and refining outputs—cognition becomes distributed across human and artificial actors, that is, thinking is shared among people, intelligent systems, and the representations they jointly produce, and is mediated by sociocultural contexts, task demands, and institutional norms (Hutchins, 1995; Vygotsky et al., 1978). In this sense, GenAI functions not merely as a repository of information but as a mediating cognitive agent that shapes reasoning processes, influences interpretive frames, and co-constructs emerging understandings through interaction with human users (Engeström, 2014; Norman, 1993).

There is growing interest in GenAI applications. Surrounding research emphasizes performance, efficiency, or ethical risk, and offers only limited theoretical grounding for understanding the cognitive and learning dynamics of sustained human–AI collaboration (Williamson & Eynon, 2020). This is problematic.

The problem: The prevalent instrumental framing of Gen AI as a productivity tool obscures the dialogic, iterative, and reflective qualities that increasingly characterize human–AI interaction (Järvelä et al., 2023; Woolley, 2025). The emphasis on performance, efficiency or ethical concerns in the discourse of GenAI obscures human agency in the interaction and directs attention away from the interplay of GenAI with human cognition. As a result, educators, researchers, and professionals often lack theoretical guidance for distinguishing responsible cognitive collaboration from uncritical reliance. The resulting lack of conceptual clarity gives rise to practical challenges and ethical concerns that warrant closer examination.

Concerns related to authorship, transparency, epistemic dependency, and skill degradation have intensified as generative systems produce increasingly fluent and persuasive outputs (Hao et al., 2025; Sidra & Mason, 2025). In scholarly contexts, unclear boundaries between human reasoning and AI-generated contributions raise questions about intellectual ownership, authorship, and research integrity (Dwivedi et al., 2023; Floridi et al., 2018; Williamson & Eynon, 2020). In educational settings, particularly teacher education and professional learning, the absence of clear frameworks risks either the rejection of potentially valuable cognitive supports or their unreflective adoption, both of which may undermine pedagogical intent and ethical practice (Amofa et al., 2025; Luckin et al., 2016; Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). There is a

lack of theoretically grounded reconceptualization of GenAI not merely as a tool, but as a collaborative thought partner whose role, limits, and ethical use are clearly articulated.

Addressing the problem: As GenAI becomes embedded in educational, research, and professional practice, educators, researchers, and professionals often lack theoretical guidance for distinguishing responsible cognitive collaboration from uncritical reliance. To address this gap, this scholarly essay brings human agency to the fore by offering a theoretically grounded reconceptualization of GenAI as a collaborative thought partner rather than a neutral or purely instrumental tool. Specifically, it articulates how generative systems can participate in iterative processes of sensemaking, ideation, and reflective inquiry alongside human actors, responding to calls to move beyond efficiency-based framings of AI toward models that account for interaction, cognition, and meaning-making (Gündöcs et al., 2025; Liu et al., 2025; Woolley, 2025).

Drawing on sociocultural learning theory, distributed cognition, hybrid intelligence, activity theory, human-centered AI, and connectivist scholarship, the essay clarifies the cognitive roles GenAI can assume and identifies the conditions under which these roles can enhance—rather than diminish—human agency and intellectual responsibility (Bell, 2011; Dellermann et al., 2019; Engeström, 2014; Hao et al., 2025; Hutchins, 1995; Järvelä et al., 2023; Rupprecht & Mayrhofer, 2024; Vygotsky et al., 1978). In doing so, it provides shared conceptual language for describing human–AI interaction and offers analytic distinctions between collaborative cognition and problematic patterns such as automation, substitution, and epistemic offloading—risks that remain persistent in human–AI partnerships (Sidra & Mason, 2025; Vaccaro et al., 2024).

By integrating these perspectives, the essay advances a framework for more intentional, transparent, and ethically informed uses of GenAI in sociotechnical environments, while establishing a foundation for future empirical investigation (Albayati, 2024; Kong et al., 2025).

Research Question: Reflecting the problem identified above—namely, the lack of theoretical guidance for distinguishing responsible cognitive collaboration from uncritical reliance—this scholarly essay is anchored by the following research question: How can GenAI be conceptualized as a collaborative thought partner that enhances human cognition, creativity, and work while maintaining ethical responsibility and epistemic integrity?

Conceptual Framework: Building directly from the problem statement and the research question above, the analytical discussion in this scholarly essay is guided by a conceptual framework that integrates complementary perspectives on how cognition, learning, and knowledge construction occur in human–AI collaborative contexts. Rather than treating GenAI as a neutral instrument, the framework positions GenAI as a mediating cognitive agent whose contributions interact dynamically with human reasoning and activity systems (Engeström, 2014; Norman, 1993). Drawing on sociocultural learning theory (Vygotsky et al., 1978), distributed cognition (Hutchins, 1995), hybrid intelligence (Dellermann et al., 2019), and connectivist perspectives (Siemens, 2005), the framework provides a theoretically grounded basis for examining how human agency, AI-generated input, and contextual conditions converge to shape collaborative thought partnerships.

Significance: , The framework developed in the present essay is useful to higher education and teacher preparation programs because it provides a foundation for designing pedagogical approaches that incorporate GenAI as a support for reflection, inquiry, and metacognitive development, preserving cognitive depth rather than serving as a shortcut for task completion. This contribution is particularly significant given emerging evidence that uncritical adoption of generative systems may undermine deep learning and reflective practice if not carefully scaffolded (Järvelä et al., 2023). By articulating clear roles for humans and AI, the scholarly essay supports instructional designs that preserve disciplinary rigor and ethical responsibility.

Furthermore, the discussions in this scholarly essay contribute to research and scholarship where there are ongoing debates surrounding authorship, transparency, and intellectual ownership because the proposed framework helps to clarify the distinct yet complementary contributions of humans and AI in knowledge production (Sidra & Mason, 2025; Vaccaro et al., 2024). For professional knowledge work, the framework offers guidance for leveraging GenAI to enhance creativity and problem-solving while mitigating risks associated with overreliance and skill erosion, concerns that have been documented in studies of hybrid intelligence systems (Gündöcs et al., 2025; Rupprecht & Mayrhofer, 2024).

At a broader theoretical level, this scholarly essay advances scholarship on human–AI collaboration by positioning GenAI as a participant in distributed cognitive systems rather than as an external aid. By integrating ethical considerations directly into the conceptual model, the scholarly essay aligns with human-centered AI approaches that emphasize fairness, accountability, and transparency (Hao et al., 2025; Xu et al., 2022). As such, the work provides a foundation for future empirical research, policy development, and system design aimed at fostering equitable and sustainable human–AI thought partnerships.

Defining Collaborative Thought Partnership

A collaborative thought partnership refers to a reciprocal cognitive relationship in which humans and artificial intelligence (AI) systems jointly participate in sensemaking, ideation, interpretation, and the iterative refinement of ideas. Unlike traditional conceptions of technology use that assume unidirectional support or task automation, a thought partnership emphasizes dialogic exchange, co-adaptation, and mutual influence over time (Basgen, 2025; Faraj et al., 2018; Shneiderman, 2020). Within this model, AI systems contribute generative capacity through large-scale synthesis, pattern recognition, and associative reasoning, while humans provide contextual awareness, disciplinary expertise, ethical judgment, and evaluative oversight, thereby preserving human responsibility for meaning-making and decision quality (Floridi et al., 2018; Woolley, 2025).

Within this framework, generative AI contributes generative capacity through synthesis, pattern recognition, and associative reasoning, while preserving human interpretive authority and ethical responsibility (Floridi, 2019). AI contributions are mediated through human sensemaking and evaluation, without displacing the human role in judgment or decision making, consistent with human-centered approaches to AI design (Shneiderman, 2020). This asymmetry distinguishes collaborative thought partnership from cognitive outsourcing or automation, reinforcing the centrality of human accountability within hybrid cognitive systems.

This definition aligns with emerging scholarship on human–AI collaboration that foregrounds interaction, dialogue, and complementarity as central to effective hybrid systems

(Dellermann et al., 2019; Vaccaro et al., 2024). Rather than replacing human cognition, GenAI can extend cognitive reach by surfacing alternative framings, challenging entrenched assumptions, and accelerating exploratory reasoning processes, particularly in complex or ill-structured problem spaces (Gündöcs et al., 2025; Norman, 1993). Such contributions are most productive when AI outputs are subjected to critical interpretation and reflective judgment by human users, reinforcing the role of human agency in guiding epistemic outcomes.

Importantly, collaborative thought partnership remains asymmetrical in agency, meaning that while both humans and AI systems contribute to cognitive activity, they do so with fundamentally different forms of authority, intentionality, and responsibility. Although AI systems may simulate reasoning or generate plausible interpretations, they lack intentionality, moral accountability, and epistemic responsibility. Human judgment, therefore, remains foundational, distinguishing collaborative thought partnership from cognitive outsourcing, automation, or the delegation of responsibility (Floridi, 2019; Williamson & Eynon, 2020). This asymmetry underscores the necessity for conceptual and ethical frameworks that clarify roles, boundaries, and responsibilities in human–AI cognitive collaboration, particularly in educational and professional contexts.

Sociocultural Learning Theory

Sociocultural learning theory provides a critical lens for understanding GenAI as a mediating artifact within cognitive activity. In sociocultural theory, a mediating artifact is a tool, symbol, or resource that shapes how individuals engage with tasks and goals by structuring attention, reasoning, and participation rather than merely transmitting information or performing tasks on behalf of the user (Vygotsky et al., 1978; Wertsch, 1998). From this perspective, learning and thinking are inherently social and culturally situated processes, emerging through interaction with tools, symbols, language, and other agents embedded within particular contexts (Engeström, 2014).

Cognitive development does not occur in isolation but is mediated through external supports that scaffold reasoning, reflection, and meaning-making. These mediational means operate within broader activity systems that include rules, community norms, and divisions of labor, all of which influence how tools are interpreted and used (Engeström, 2014). Contemporary extensions of sociocultural theory further emphasize regulation and coordination across individuals and tools as central to learning in complex, technology-rich environments (Järvelä et al., 2023).

When GenAI functions as a mediating artifact, it can support socially shared regulation of learning by prompting reflection, offering feedback, and modeling alternative reasoning pathways during collaborative activity (Hadwin et al., 2018; Järvelä et al., 2023). Within collaborative thought partnerships, AI-generated responses operate as dialogic stimuli that invite negotiation, critique, and iterative refinement rather than serving as authoritative answers. This use aligns with sociocultural views that highlight co-construction, guided participation, and regulation as central mechanisms of learning and development (Rogoff, 1995; Wertsch, 1998).

At the same time, sociocultural theory underscores the importance of intentional mediation. Mediating artifacts enable and constrain cognition, but they do not independently determine learning outcomes. Their influence depends on how they are framed, regulated, and taken up within activity (Vygotsky et al., 1978; Wertsch, 1998). Accordingly, human actors must actively shape how GenAI tools are introduced, interpreted, and integrated into cognitive

processes. Without such intentional mediation, GenAI risks functioning as an unexamined authority rather than a scaffold for reflective, socially situated learning. This reinforces the central role of human judgment and responsibility within human–AI collaborative cognition.

Distributed Cognition

Distributed cognition theory further extends the conceptualization of human–AI collaboration by locating cognition not within a single individual but across people, artifacts, representations, and environments that collectively perform cognitive work. From this perspective, reasoning emerges from interactions among system components rather than residing solely in the human mind (Hollan et al., 2000; Hutchins, 1995). Cognitive activity is therefore understood as system-level performance, shaped by the coordination of internal mental processes and external tools. Within this framework, human–AI partnerships can be conceptualized as distributed cognitive systems in which tasks such as information synthesis, hypothesis generation, and scenario exploration are dynamically shared across human and artificial agents.

GenAI contributes to distributed cognition by rapidly processing large volumes of information, identifying patterns across data sources, and generating representations that humans subsequently evaluate, contextualize, and refine. This division of cognitive labor allows humans to allocate greater attention to interpretation, judgment, and context-sensitive decision making, while AI systems support exploratory breadth and representational efficiency (Hao et al., 2025; Hutchins, 1995; Norman, 1993). When used reflectively, GenAI can thus enhance system-level cognition without displacing human sensemaking or responsibility.

At the same time, distributed cognition raises critical concerns related to epistemic responsibility and accountability. Because cognitive outcomes emerge from the interaction of multiple system components, authorship and responsibility may become obscured if human oversight is not explicitly maintained (Floridi, 2019; Williamson & Eynon, 2020). Distributed cognition theory does not imply distributed moral agency; rather, it reinforces the need to clearly distinguish functional contributions from ethical responsibility. Maintaining clarity regarding human accountability within distributed human–AI systems is therefore essential for ethical scholarship, research integrity, and professional practice.

Hybrid Intelligence and Connectivist Perspectives

Hybrid intelligence frameworks emphasize the complementary strengths of humans and intelligent systems, arguing that more robust cognitive and decision-making outcomes emerge when tasks are deliberately allocated according to respective capabilities. Within this perspective, artificial intelligence systems excel at computation, large-scale pattern recognition, and generative synthesis, while humans retain strengths in contextual understanding, ethical reasoning, creativity, and value-based judgment (Dellermann et al., 2019; Shneiderman, 2020). Hybrid intelligence does not seek to replace human cognition but to enhance it through carefully designed human–AI collaboration that preserves human agency and responsibility (Kong et al., 2025).

Connectivist perspectives further reinforce this framing by conceptualizing knowledge as emerging from networks of human and technological nodes rather than residing solely within individual minds. From a connectivist standpoint, learning and meaning-making occur through the formation, navigation, and evaluation of connections across people, information sources, and digital systems (Bell, 2011; Siemens, 2005). Within such epistemic networks, GenAI functions

as one node among many, contributing to knowledge construction through interaction, pattern surfacing, and relational linkage rather than through epistemic authority.

Together, hybrid intelligence and connectivist theories provide a strong theoretical rationale for positioning GenAI as a collaborative thought partner that augments, rather than supplants, human cognition. This combined framing supports intentional human–AI collaboration in which generative systems expand cognitive reach while humans retain responsibility for interpretation, judgment, and ethical decision making within complex educational, research, and professional contexts.

GenAI in Knowledge Work and Creativity

Within knowledge-intensive and creative domains, the integration of GenAI reflects a broader shift toward hybrid and distributed forms of cognition, in which thinking is enacted across humans, technologies, and representational systems rather than confined to individual minds (Hollan et al., 2000; Hutchins, 1995). Professionals and scholars increasingly engage with AI systems during early ideation, conceptual modeling, drafting, and reflective revision, incorporating AI-generated prompts, alternatives, and representations into their reasoning processes (Dwivedi et al., 2023; Faraj et al., 2018). These practices parallel collaborative intellectual processes traditionally associated with human peers, indicating that contemporary cognitive work is becoming more dialogic, iterative, and systemically distributed.

Conceptualizing GenAI as a collaborative thought partner within this framework helps clarify both its affordances and limitations. While generative systems can accelerate exploratory reasoning, surface alternative framings, and expand the space of possible ideas, they lack intentionality, values, and moral accountability. Responsibility for meaning-making, interpretation, and ethical judgment, therefore, remains fundamentally human (Burleigh & Wilson, 2024, 2026; Floridi, 2019; Shneiderman, 2020) while simultaneously preserving adequate cognitive depth in the interaction is essential. Taken together, the theoretical lenses outlined in this section—sociocultural mediation, distributed cognition, hybrid intelligence, and connectivist perspectives—establish a coherent foundation for examining GenAI as a collaborative thought partner in research, education, and professional practice, rather than as a substitute for human cognition or responsibility.

Literature Review

The literature on GenAI has expanded rapidly across fields including education, human–computer interaction, organizational studies, and cognitive science. This section synthesizes key strands of scholarship relevant to understanding GenAI as a collaborative thought partner, with particular attention to knowledge work, creative practice, cognitive augmentation, and ethical and epistemic concerns. Collectively, this body of research underscores both the promise and the complexity of sustained human–AI collaboration.

GenAI in Knowledge and Creative Work

A growing body of research documents the integration of GenAI into knowledge-intensive and creative tasks such as academic writing, instructional design, software development, and strategic planning. Studies indicate that GenAI systems are frequently used to support early-stage ideation, outline generation, synthesis of large information sets, and iterative revision (Sidra & Mason, 2025). Unlike traditional automation tools, generative systems invite dialogic interaction, enabling users to refine prompts, critique outputs, and co-evolve ideas across multiple exchanges.

Research in organizational and educational contexts suggests that these iterative interactions can enhance productivity and cognitive engagement when users retain active control over meaning-making processes. Vaccaro et al. (2024) argue that the value of AI in knowledge work lies not in replacing human judgment, but in expanding the space of possible interpretations and solutions available to human collaborators. Similarly, Woolley (2025) highlights the potential of GenAI to contribute to collective intelligence by supporting exploratory reasoning and collaborative sensemaking. Together, these findings point toward a shift in how cognitive labor is organized, with AI increasingly embedded as an interactive participant rather than a background tool.

Human–AI Co-Creation and Cognitive Augmentation

Scholarship on human–AI co-creation emphasizes the importance of role differentiation, task structure, and iterative feedback in achieving effective collaboration. Empirical studies of hybrid intelligence systems demonstrate that performance gains are most pronounced when humans and AI systems contribute complementary capabilities rather than duplicating effort (Gündöcs et al., 2025; Kong et al., 2025; Liu et al., 2025). In these contexts, AI systems often serve as generators of alternatives, pattern identifiers, or rapid synthesizers, while humans assume responsibility for evaluation, contextualization, and decision-making.

Cognitive augmentation research further suggests that GenAI can support higher-order thinking by offloading routine cognitive demands and enabling users to focus on interpretation and strategy. However, scholars caution that augmentation is not inherently beneficial and depends heavily on how systems are designed and used. Rupprecht and Mayrhofer (2024) emphasize that hybrid intelligence requires intentional orchestration to ensure that AI contributions enhance, rather than erode, human expertise. Without such orchestration, the boundary between augmentation and substitution can become blurred, raising concerns about diminished critical engagement and dissolution of cognitive depth.

Ethical and Epistemic Considerations in Human–AI Collaboration

As GenAI becomes more deeply embedded in cognitive work, ethical and epistemic concerns have emerged as central themes in the literature. One prominent concern involves epistemic dependence, in which users may rely on AI-generated outputs without sufficient critical evaluation. Scholars note that the linguistic fluency and apparent coherence of generative systems can obscure underlying inaccuracies or biases, increasing the risk of uncritical acceptance, for example, in scholarly writing where AI-generated text may appear authoritative despite weak evidentiary grounding (Dwivedi et al., 2023; Floridi et al., 2018).

Authorship and transparency of contributions represent additional challenges, particularly in academic contexts where norms of attribution, originality, and intellectual contribution are

foundational. When the role of AI in idea generation, drafting, or synthesis is unclear, assessments of authorship and responsibility become complicated, potentially undermining trust in scholarly work (Burleigh & Wilson, 2024; Williamson & Eynon, 2020; Wilson & Burleigh, 2025). Bias and fairness also remain persistent concerns, as generative systems reflect and may amplify patterns present in their training data, raising questions about representation, equity, and epistemic justice across educational and professional settings (Floridi, 2019; Floridi et al., 2018).

Collectively, these ethical and epistemic challenges underscore the necessity of conceptual and practical frameworks that foreground human accountability, explicit verification practices, and reflective judgment in human–AI collaboration. Addressing issues of dependence, transparency, and bias is therefore not peripheral but central to ensuring that generative AI supports responsible knowledge construction rather than diminishing scholarly and professional integrity.

Conceptual Framework Application: GenAI as a Collaborative Thought Partner

Building on the theoretical foundations established in the preceding sections, the following section applies the conceptual framework to examine generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) as a collaborative thought partner in knowledge-intensive, creative, and scholarly contexts. Rather than advancing empirical claims, this analysis demonstrates how sociocultural learning theory, distributed cognition, hybrid intelligence, and connectivist perspectives jointly illuminate the mechanisms, affordances, and limitations of sustained human–AI collaboration. Drawing on Vygotsky et al.'s (1978) sociocultural theory and Hutchins's (1995) work on distributed cognition, the section situates GenAI within iterative cycles of dialogic engagement and cognitive mediation, emphasizing that meaning making and reasoning emerge through interaction with tools and representations rather than through isolated cognition (Engeström, 2014; Norman, 1993; Wertsch, 1998). At the same time, the framework foregrounds asymmetrical agency; as Floridi (2019) argues, while artificial systems may contribute functionally to cognition, ethical responsibility and judgment remain irreducibly human (Burleigh & Wilson, 2024, 2026; Shneiderman, 2020). This application illustrates the explanatory value of the framework and prepares the ground for subsequent discussion of implications for research, education, and professional practice.

Human–GenAI collaboration unfolds through iterative cycles of prompting, generation, evaluation, and revision, in which knowledge is co-constructed through sustained dialogic engagement rather than linear information retrieval. Within these cycles, human intent initiates interaction, GenAI produces candidate responses, and humans critically evaluate, refine, and reframe those outputs through successive exchanges. This recursive process reflects broader shifts toward distributed, dialogic, and mediated cognition in contemporary knowledge work (Hutchins, 1995; Norman, 1993).

Conceptualizing GenAI as a collaborative thought partner highlights how cognitive activity emerges through interaction rather than unilateral tool use. Rather than functioning as an autonomous decision-maker, GenAI provides provisional representations that invite interpretation, critique, and further inquiry. This framing aligns with sociocultural and distributed cognition perspectives, which emphasize that thinking is shaped through engagement with mediating artifacts embedded in activity systems (Engeström, 2014; Vygotsky et al., 1978).

Beyond Tool Use: GenAI as Cognitive Companion

When positioned as a cognitive companion, GenAI can support metacognitive processes by prompting reflection, surfacing implicit assumptions, and enabling the reframing of complex or ill-structured problems. Through dialogic interaction, AI-generated responses function as externalized representations that users can interrogate, revise, or reject, thereby supporting reflective sensemaking rather than passive consumption (Burleigh & Wilson, 2024, 2026; Shneiderman, 2020). This use extends beyond instrumental efficiency and situates GenAI within higher-order cognitive activity, particularly when human users retain evaluative and ethical oversight.

Such interactions are most effective when humans actively regulate the collaboration, determining how AI contributions are incorporated into reasoning processes. Without intentional framing of each collaborative task, there is a risk that AI outputs may be treated as authoritative rather than provisional, undermining critical engagement (Floridi, 2019) and weakening cognitive depth in the final work product. Conceptualizing GenAI as a cognitive companion, therefore, reinforces the importance of human agency and responsibility in guiding how AI mediates thinking.

Creativity and Ideation

In creative and ideational contexts, GenAI can expand cognitive possibility spaces by generating analogies, scenarios, and cross-domain associations that provoke new lines of thought. These generative contributions often function as cognitive provocations, encouraging users to explore alternatives they may not have independently considered. Research on human–AI co-creation suggests that such provocations are most valuable when they are treated as starting points for inquiry rather than finished products (Dellermann et al., 2019).

Importantly, creative augmentation through GenAI remains dependent on human judgment. While AI can produce novel combinations and patterns, humans are responsible for evaluating relevance, coherence, and contextual appropriateness. This division of cognitive labor reflects hybrid intelligence frameworks, which emphasize complementarity rather than substitution in human–AI collaboration (Burleigh & Wilson, 2024, 2026; Liu et al., 2025; Shneiderman, 2020).

Research and Scholarly Productivity

Within research and scholarly practice, GenAI supports activities such as literature exploration, conceptual modeling, and iterative drafting. When used transparently and reflectively, these affordances can enhance productivity by accelerating exploratory phases of research while preserving intellectual ownership and scholarly accountability (Dwivedi et al., 2023; Williamson & Eynon, 2020). GenAI can assist scholars in identifying patterns across bodies of literature, testing alternative conceptual framings, and refining arguments through iterative feedback.

However, these benefits depend on sustained human oversight. Scholars must remain responsible for verifying sources, ensuring conceptual coherence, and making final interpretive decisions. Transparent disclosure and critical engagement are therefore essential to maintaining research integrity when GenAI is integrated into scholarly workflows (Floridi et al., 2018).

Limitations and Boundaries of Thought Partnership

Despite its affordances, GenAI remains constrained by limitations including shallow reasoning, lack of situational understanding, and susceptibility to generating plausible but inaccurate information. These constraints underscore that GenAI does not possess epistemic responsibility, intentionality, or moral judgment. As a result, collaborative thought partnership is inherently asymmetrical, with humans retaining accountability for outcomes and decisions (Floridi, 2019).

Recognizing these limitations is essential for avoiding uncritical reliance on AI-generated outputs. Rather than diminishing the value of GenAI, acknowledging its boundaries clarifies the conditions under which it can function as a productive cognitive partner. Sustained human oversight, reflective judgment, and ethical awareness are therefore foundational to responsible human–AI collaboration across educational, research, and professional contexts.

Framework for Responsible Human–GenAI Thought Partnership

A responsible human–GenAI thought partnership rests on a set of foundational principles that guide how humans and generative systems collaborate in cognitive and creative work. Central to this framework is the preservation of human agency and cognitive depth. Humans must remain the primary decision makers who interpret, evaluate, and ultimately determine the value, appropriateness, and application of AI-generated ideas. This principle aligns with human-centered and ethical AI scholarship, which emphasizes that responsibility, judgment, and accountability cannot be delegated to artificial systems (Burleigh & Wilson, 2024, 2026; Floridi, 2019; Shneiderman, 2020). Transparency further supports responsible collaboration, both in how AI systems are understood to function and in how AI contributions are disclosed in academic, educational, and professional contexts (Burleigh & Wilson, 2024; Williamson & Eynon, 2020; Wilson & Burleigh, 2025).

Responsible partnership also relies on complementarity, meaning that humans and AI systems contribute distinct but interdependent strengths to the collaborative process. Hybrid intelligence frameworks suggest that optimal outcomes emerge when tasks are deliberately allocated according to their respective capabilities, with AI supporting large-scale synthesis and pattern recognition, while humans retain contextual understanding, ethical reasoning, and value-based judgment (Dellermann et al., 2019). Ethical awareness constitutes an additional pillar of the framework, requiring sustained attention to bias, fairness, epistemic integrity, and the social consequences of AI-mediated cognition (Floridi et al., 2018).

Within this framework, humans and AI serve complementary roles that ensure the integrity of the collaboration and uphold the quality and intellectual depth of the final product. Ultimately, the human remains responsible for the depth of knowledge demonstrated in the outcome. First, the human acts as a curator, selecting relevant information, crafting and refining prompts, and setting the scope and direction of interaction. This role requires an understanding of both the affordances and limitations of GenAI systems. Second, humans function as evaluators, critically assessing the accuracy, coherence, and relevance of AI-generated outputs. This evaluative stance is essential for preventing epistemic dependence and uncritical acceptance of AI-produced content (Dwivedi et al., 2023). Third, humans serve as integrators, synthesizing AI contributions with their own reasoning, disciplinary expertise, and ethical judgment. Through integration, meaning is co-constructed rather than outsourced, reflecting sociocultural and

distributed cognition perspectives on mediated learning (Engeström, 2014; Hutchins, 1995). Finally, humans act as reflective practitioners, examining assumptions, monitoring for bias, and considering the broader implications of incorporating AI into cognitive or creative work. Reflection enables continuous refinement of both human reasoning and strategies for engaging with AI (Schön, 1984).

GenAI systems also perform several important roles within this collaborative relationship. As synthesizers, they combine diverse strands of information, literature, or concepts into provisional representations that support rapid exploration of complex domains. As provocateurs, generative systems introduce alternative framings or unexpected possibilities that challenge users' assumptions and expand the cognitive space for reasoning, a function often associated with creative co-creation rather than automation (Dellermann et al., 2019). When functioning as explainers, AI systems articulate underlying logic, generate clarifications, or provide simplified explanations that can support understanding, particularly in early sensemaking stages. In addition, GenAI can act as a scenario builder, generating hypothetical situations or alternative models that allow humans to explore implications, test ideas, and reason through possible futures. Across these roles, AI contributions remain provisional and subject to human interpretation and judgment.

High-quality human–AI collaboration depends on specific conditions that support accuracy, ethical practice, and meaningful co-construction of knowledge. Collaboration begins with well-designed prompts that clearly articulate goals, constraints, and desired forms of reasoning, shaping the direction and quality of AI responses. Once interaction begins, iterative refinement is essential; through dialogue, humans adjust prompts, redirect the system, and progressively refine outputs. Explicit validation processes are also necessary to ensure accuracy and contextual appropriateness, including verification of sources, cross-checking of claims, and evaluation of internal coherence (Floridi, 2019; Williamson & Eynon, 2020; Wilson & Burleigh, 2025). Clear role delineation helps maintain boundaries between human cognition and machine learning, reducing the risk of overreliance and reinforcing transparency. Throughout the process, ethical considerations must remain central, guiding collaboration toward responsible, equitable, and trustworthy outcomes.

Together, these principles, roles, and conditions establish a comprehensive framework for responsible human–GenAI thought partnership. The framework emphasizes mutual contribution while ensuring that human judgment, ethical reasoning, and contextual expertise remain central to all cognitive and creative processes involving generative artificial intelligence.

Implications

Conceptualizing GenAI as a collaborative thought partner carries important implications across higher education, professional knowledge work, research and scholarship, and governance. Rather than treating GenAI as a neutral tool or productivity aid, this framing foregrounds the relational, ethical, and epistemic dimensions of human–AI collaboration, emphasizing the need for intentional design and human oversight (Burleigh & Wilson, 2024, 2026; Floridi, 2019; Shneiderman, 2020). Additionally, when engaging GenAI as a collaborative partner, care must be taken to avoid assigning GenAI human traits which extend its contributions beyond the capacity of the machine. The implications outlined below highlight how institutions and individuals may need to recalibrate practices, norms, and policies to support responsible and meaningful cognitive partnership.

Implications for Higher Education

Instructional uses of GenAI should emphasize reflective engagement, critical evaluation, and maintenance of cognitive depth, while maintaining student responsibility for interpretation, authorship, and meaning-making (Vygotsky et al., 1978; Williamson & Eynon, 2020; Wilson & Burleigh, 2025) to include critical understanding of how generative systems produce outputs, where limitations arise, and how bias or error may be introduced (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). Students must be supported in developing the capacity to critically evaluate AI-generated content, assess its relevance and accuracy, and integrate it thoughtfully into their own reasoning processes.

Educators play a central role in modeling transparent and reflective engagement with GenAI, demonstrating how AI can function as a mediating artifact that supports inquiry without substituting for learning, judgment, or accountability (Engeström, 2014). Pedagogical approaches that integrate GenAI into inquiry-based learning, collaborative problem solving, and reflective writing may therefore support deeper learning when accompanied by explicit expectations for human oversight and ethical responsibility.

Implications for Professional Knowledge Work

Hybrid intelligence models offer significant opportunities for innovation, without delegating professional judgment or ethical accountability to AI systems (Dellermann et al., 2019; Floridi, 2019). In professional knowledge work, GenAI can enhance exploratory reasoning, scenario generation, and synthesis across complex information environments, enabling practitioners to engage more effectively with uncertainty and complexity. When positioned as a thought partner, GenAI may support strategic planning, design thinking, and problem framing by expanding the space of possible interpretations and solutions (Burleigh & Wilson, 2024, 2026; Liu et al., 2025; Shneiderman, 2020).

At the same time, professionals must remain attentive to the risks of overreliance, particularly when AI-generated outputs are treated as authoritative rather than provisional. Sustaining professional expertise, therefore, depends on reflective practices that foreground human interpretation, contextual understanding, and ethical reasoning alongside AI-supported cognitive augmentation.

Implications for Research and Scholarship

GenAI can support ideation and drafting, while maintaining clear boundaries around authorship, transparency, and epistemic responsibility (Burleigh & Wilson, 2024; Floridi et al., 2018; Williamson & Eynon, 2020). In research and scholarly contexts, this stance underscores the need for explicit norms governing disclosure and documentation of AI contributions (Williamson & Eynon, 2020; Wilson & Burleigh, 2025). As GenAI becomes increasingly involved in activities such as literature exploration, conceptual modeling, and iterative drafting, scholarly communities will need to clarify expectations regarding attribution, originality, and intellectual ownership (Dwivedi et al., 2023). Transparency in how GenAI is used supports research integrity by enabling reviewers and readers to assess the provenance of ideas and the role of human judgment in the knowledge production process (Wilson & Burleigh, 2025). Importantly, scholars remain accountable for argumentation, theoretical positioning, and ethical grounding, regardless of the extent to which generative systems are used in the research process.

Beyond disclosure, the thought partnership framework reinforces the responsibility of scholars to retain control over interpretation, argumentation, and theoretical positioning. While GenAI may assist in generating alternatives or refining language, scholars remain accountable for the coherence, originality, and ethical grounding of their work (Floridi et al., 2018). Institutions, journals, and professional associations may therefore need to update guidelines and training to reflect the evolving nature of scholarly cognition in AI-mediated environments (Burleigh & Wilson, 2024, 2026).

Implications for Governance

Human-centered AI governance frameworks emphasize accountability and oversight, in contrast to models that treat AI systems as autonomous decision makers (Floridi et al., 2018; UNESCO, 2021). From a governance perspective, understanding GenAI as a collaborative thought partner highlights the need for policies and institutional structures that preserve human agency within distributed cognitive systems. Governance frameworks should therefore extend beyond technical risk management to address epistemic practices, role clarity, and responsibility allocation in AI-mediated work (Burleigh & Wilson, 2024, 2026; Shneiderman, 2020). This includes establishing expectations for verification, transparency, and ethical review, as well as supporting professional development that prepares individuals to engage critically and responsibly with generative systems. Aligning governance with the realities of human–GenAI collaboration is essential for fostering innovation while safeguarding trust, equity, and accountability.

Future Research Directions

Future research should examine how sustained engagement with GenAI influences cognitive development, professional judgment, and reflective practice across educational and leadership contexts. In teacher education and leadership preparation, in particular, there is a need to understand how repeated interaction with GenAI as a collaborative thought partner shapes reasoning habits, pedagogical decision-making, and ethical dispositions over time. Existing research on AI in education has largely emphasized short-term performance or adoption patterns, leaving the longer-term developmental consequences of human–AI collaboration underexplored (Williamson & Eynon, 2020; Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019).

Longitudinal and design-based studies are especially needed to investigate how regular human–AI interaction influences professional identity formation, metacognitive regulation, and reflective capacity. GenAI develops at a speed unattainable by human development, underscoring the need for longitudinal research that takes into account the changes in the GenAI system over time and the influence of those system changes on the outcome (Burleigh & Wilson, 2024, 2026; Wilson & Burleigh, 2025). Sociocultural and distributed cognition perspectives suggest that tools used consistently within activity systems may fundamentally reshape how individuals reason and learn (Engeström, 2014; Hutchins, 1995). Empirical research examining how GenAI-mediated reflection affects teacher learning, leadership decision making, and mentoring practices over extended periods would therefore make an important contribution to the field.

Additional research should also explore design features and pedagogical conditions that support equitable, ethical, and transparent use of GenAI. Human-centered AI scholarship emphasizes that system design, role clarity, and institutional framing significantly influence

whether AI augments or undermines human agency (Burleigh & Wilson, 2024, 2026; Shneiderman, 2020). Studies examining prompt design, feedback mechanisms, disclosure practices, and scaffolds for critical evaluation could inform the development of instructional and professional models that promote responsible hybrid intelligence (Dellermann et al., 2019).

Future research should further investigate how GenAI functions within hybrid intelligence models across professional sectors, including education, healthcare, organizational leadership, and STEM-related fields. Comparative studies examining how cognitive labor is distributed between humans and AI in different professional contexts may clarify conditions under which collaboration enhances judgment versus when it risks overreliance or deskilling (Floridi et al., 2018). Such work would help refine theoretical models of collaborative thought partnership across domains.

Finally, there is a need for focused inquiry into the implications of GenAI for virtual STEM learning environments and mentoring contexts. Recent mapping studies of AI research in higher education have highlighted the rapid expansion of AI-enabled learning environments, while also revealing a limited attention to equity, epistemic integrity, and professional learning contexts, such as mentoring and supervision (Hong et al., 2025; Liu & Ling, 2025). These gaps are particularly salient in virtual and AI-mediated STEM education, where learners increasingly rely on simulated or algorithmically generated representations, raising concerns related to verification, safety, and accountability (Williamson & Eynon, 2020).

Conclusion

This scholarly essay advances a conceptual framework that positions GenAI as a collaborative thought partner that preserves cognitive depth in human understanding rather than a neutral tool or autonomous agent. Drawing on sociocultural learning theory, distributed cognition, hybrid intelligence, and connectivist perspectives, the framework reframes human–AI interaction as a relational, mediated, and dialogic process in which cognition is co-constructed through iterative engagement (Engeström, 2014; Hutchins, 1995; Vygotsky et al., 1978). This synthesis responds to growing calls in the literature for greater conceptual clarity regarding how GenAI reshapes knowledge work, learning, and professional practice beyond short-term performance gains or instrumental efficiency (Dwivedi et al., 2023; Williamson & Eynon, 2020).

By foregrounding asymmetrical agency, the framework clarifies that while GenAI can meaningfully contribute to ideation, synthesis, and exploratory reasoning, ethical responsibility, epistemic judgment, and interpretive authority remain fundamentally human. This distinction is critical for addressing concerns related to authorship, integrity, and accountability that accompany the increasing integration of generative systems into scholarly and professional workflows (Floridi, 2019; Floridi et al., 2018). Conceptualizing GenAI as a mediating artifact within distributed cognitive systems further underscores that learning and reasoning are shaped not only by technological capability but also by how tools are framed, regulated, and taken up within activity systems (Engeström, 2014; Wertsch, 1998).

Importantly, GenAI represents a transformative shift in human cognition, creativity, and knowledge work, reshaping how ideas are generated, refined, and evaluated across educational, scholarly, and professional contexts. By conceptualizing GenAI as a collaborative thought partner, this scholarly essay offers a lens for understanding how humans and machines jointly construct knowledge through dialogic, mediated, and iterative interaction rather than through substitution or automation (Hutchins, 1995; Norman, 1993). Responsible design and use—

grounded in ethical awareness, epistemic integrity, transparency, and human oversight—are essential to ensuring that generative systems augment rather than diminish human agency (Burleigh & Wilson, 2024; Floridi, 2019; Shneiderman, 2020; Wilson & Burleigh, 2025).

The framework also contributes to ongoing debates in higher education, professional knowledge work, and AI governance by articulating conditions under which human–GenAI collaboration can remain both productive and ethically grounded. Rather than advocating for either prohibition or uncritical adoption, the scholarly essay emphasizes intentional design, reflective practice, and clear role delineation as central to responsible collaboration, aligning with emerging governance frameworks that prioritize accountability, fairness, and human oversight (Floridi et al., 2018; UNESCO, 2021).

This work is conceptual in nature and does not claim empirical generalizability. Its contribution lies in offering an integrative framework that can guide future empirical research, pedagogical design, professional learning, and institutional policy. As GenAI becomes increasingly embedded in teacher education, leadership preparation, research practice, and virtual learning environments, such frameworks are necessary to ensure that technological innovation supports—rather than undermines—human judgment, professional identity, and ethical responsibility.

By centering human agency within distributed and hybrid cognitive arrangements, the framework establishes a foundation for advancing research, education, and professional practice in an era increasingly characterized by the emergence of GenAI. Understanding GenAI as a collaborative thought partner that can only function within the bounds of its machine-driven system provides a principled and forward-looking lens for navigating the evolving relationship between humans and intelligent systems. Throughout the collaborative process, the distinction between human and machine must be maintained. AI should not be treated as human or assigned human traits; it is a tool that operates through pattern recognition and probabilistic output, not consciousness or intent. Keeping AI in its proper place preserves human responsibility, judgment, and accountability within the collaboration.

References

Albayati, H. (2024). Investigating undergraduate students' perceptions and awareness of using ChatGPT as a regular assistance tool: A user acceptance perspective study. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 6,* 100203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100203

Amofa, B., Kamudyariwa, X. B., Fernandes, F. A. P., Osobajo, O. A., Jeremiah, F., & Oke, A. (2025). Navigating the complexity of generative artificial intelligence in higher education: A systematic literature review. *Education Sciences, 15*(7), 826. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15070826

Basgen, B. (2025, April 9). *AI as a thought partner in higher education*. EDUCAUSE Review. https://er.educause.edu/articles/2025/4/ai-as-a-thought-partner-in-higher-education

Bell, F. (2011). Connectivism: Its place in theory-informed research and innovation in technology-enabled learning. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 12*(3), 98–118. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ920745.pdf

Burleigh, C., & Wilson, A. M. (2024). Generative AI: Is authentic qualitative research data collection possible? *Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 53*(2), 89-115. https://doi.org/10.1177/00472395241270278

Burleigh, C., & Wilson, A. M. (2026). Automating academia: Implications of GenAI use in doctoral research and online mentoring. *Journal of Online Mentoring*, *1*, 1–40. https://doi.org/10.5590/JOM.2026.1.1000

Dellermann, D., Ebel, P., Söllner, M., & Leimeister, J. M. (2019). Hybrid intelligence. *Business & Information Systems Engineering, 61*(5), 637–643. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-019-00595-2

Dwivedi, Y. K., Kshetri, N., Hughes, L., Slade, E., Jeyaraj, A., Kar, A., Baabdullah, A., Koohang, A., Raghavan, V., Ahuja, M., Albanna, H., Albashrawi, M., Al-Busaidi, A., Balakrishnan, J., Barlette, Y., Basu, S., Bose, I., Brooks, L., Buhalis, D., Carter, L., & Wright, R. (2023). So what if ChatGPT wrote it? Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI. *International Journal of Information Management, 71*, 102642. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642

Engeström, Y. (2014). *Learning by expanding: An activity-theoretical approach to developmental research* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Faraj, S., Pachidi, S., & Sayegh, K. (2018). Working and organizing in the age of the learning algorithm. *Information and Organization, 28*(1), 62–70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infoandorg.2018.02.005

Floridi, L. (2019). Translating principles into practice of digital ethics: Five risks of being unethical. *Philosophy & Technology, 32*, 185-193. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-019-00354-x

Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., Luetge, C., Madelin, R., Pagallo, U., Rossi, F., Schafer, B., Valcke, P., & Vayena, E. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society. *Minds and Machines, 28*(4), 689–707. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5

Grawitch, M. (2025). *When AI acts human–but lacks humanity.* Psychology Today. https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/a-hovercraft-full-of-eels/202510/when-ai-acts-human-but-lacks-humanity

Gündöcs, D., Horvath, S., & Dörfler, V. (2025). Uncovering the dynamics of human–AI hybrid performance: A qualitative meta-analysis of empirical studies. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 205,* 103622. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2025.103622

Hadwin, A. F., Järvelä, S., & Miller, M. (2018). Self-regulation, co-regulation, and shared regulation in collaborative learning environments. In D. H. Schunk, & J. A. Greene (Eds.), *Handbook of Self-Regulation of Learning and Performance* (2nd ed., pp. 83–106). Routledge.

Hao, C., Uusitalo, S., Figueroa, C., Smit, Q. T. S., Strange, M., Chang, W. T., Ribeiro, M. I., Kouomogne Nana, V., Tielman, M.L., & de Boer, M.H.T. (2025). A human-centered perspective on research challenges for hybrid human artificial intelligence in lifestyle and behavior change support. *Frontiers in Digital Health*, *7*,1544185. https://doi.org/10.3389/fdgth.2025.1544185

Hollan, J., Hutchins, E., & Kirsh, D. (2000). Distributed cognition: Toward a new foundation for human–computer interaction research. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction, 7*(2), 174–196. https://doi.org/10.1145/353485.353487

Hong, T. T. M., Tung, N. T. T. & Thanh, N. T. P. (2025). Mapping artificial intelligence research in higher education toward sustainable development. *Discover Sustainability,* 6, 1240. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-025-02162-0

Hutchins, E. (1995). *Cognition in the wild*. Bradford Books.

Järvelä, S., Nguyen, A., & Hadwin, A. (2023). Human and artificial intelligence collaboration for socially shared regulation in learning. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 54, 1057–1076. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13325

Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., Stadler, M., & Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences, 103*, 102274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274

Kong, X., Fang, H., Chen, W., Xiao, J., & Zhang, M. (2025). Examining human–AI collaboration in hybrid intelligence learning environments: Insights from the Synergy Degree Model. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 12*, Article 821. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-05097-z

Liu, W., & Ling, J. (2025). Mapping the landscape of AI research in higher education. *International Journal of e-Collaboration, 21*(1), Article 42. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJeC.394818

Liu, Y., Yang, Y., & Xu, H. (2025). From humans to AI: Understanding why AI is perceived as the preferred co-creation partner. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *16*, 1695532. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1695532

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

Norman, D. A. (1993). *Things that make us smart: Defending human attributes in the age of the machine*. Basic Books.

Rogoff, B. (1995). Observing sociocultural activity on three planes: Participatory appropriation, guided participation, and apprenticeship. In J. V. Wertsch, P. del Río, & A. Álvarez (Eds.), *Sociocultural Studies of Mind* (pp. 139–164). Cambridge University Press.

Rupprecht, P., & Mayrhofer, W. (2024). Hybrid intelligence - An approach towards the symbiosis of artificial and human creativity and interaction in the design and innovation process in SMEs. *Creativity, Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, *125,* 38-42. http://doi.org/10.54941/ahfe1004718

Schön, D. A. (1984). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action.* Basic Books.

Shneiderman, B. (2020). Human-centered artificial intelligence: Reliable, safe & trustworthy. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction, 36*(6), 495–504. https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2020.1741118

Sidra, S., & Mason, C. (2025). Generative AI in Human-AI Collaboration: Validation of the Collaborative AI Literacy and Collaborative AI Metacognition Scales for Effective Use. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction*, 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2025.2543997

Siemens, G. (2005). Connectivism: A learning theory for the digital age. *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning, 2*(1), 3–10. https://www.itdl.org/Journal/Jan_05/article01.htm

UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence*. UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000381137

Vaccaro, M., Davis, G., & Malone, T. W. (2024). When combinations of humans and AI are useful. *Nature Human Behaviour, 8*, 2293-2303. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-024-02024-1

Vygotsky, L. S., Cole, M., John-Steiner, V., Scribner, S., & Souberman, E. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Wertsch, J. V. (1998). *Mind as action*. Oxford University Press.

Williamson, B., & Eynon, R. (2020). Historical threads, missing links, and future directions in AI in education. *Learning, Media and Technology, 45*(3), 223–235. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1798995

Wilson, A., & Burleigh, C. (2025). Research integrity in the era of generative artificial intelligence. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice, 15*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.5590/JERAP.2025.15.2054

Woolley, A. W. (2025). Generative AI and collaboration: Opportunities for collective intelligence. *Journal of Organization Design,* 1-6. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41469-025-00199-z

Xu, W., Gao, Z., & Ge, L. (2022). New research paradigms and agenda of human factors science in the intelligence era. *arXiv*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2208.12396

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), Article 39. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0