

THE TRIPLE PARADOX OF AI-DRIVEN LEARNING TRANSFORMATION AND ITS RESOLUTION

XinXin Kang^{1,2*}, Qian Zhang¹, Lei Liu¹, Jian Yang¹, HangYu Ji¹

¹*Informatization Office, Xi'an Conservatory of Music, Xi'an 710061, Shaanxi, China.*

²*School of Contemporary Music, Xi'an Conservatory of Music, Xi'an 710061, Shaanxi, China.*

**Corresponding Author: XinXin Kang*

Abstract: AI is no longer just a tool for learning; it is becoming an active participant. This shift brings clear benefits in speed and personalization, but it also stirs up some deep-rooted problems. This paper looks at these problems as a three-sided puzzle. The first side concerns the learner's own sense of self. When AI steps in, where does the learner end and the machine begin? The second side is about knowledge. AI makes information easy to get, but does that ease come at the cost of real understanding? The third side touches on values. Education is supposed to develop whole people, but AI's logic is all about efficiency and measurement. These three tensions, the paper argues, are not accidents. They stem from learners not fully grasping AI's nature, from the fact that technology moves faster than human minds can adapt, and from a basic clash between what technology does best and what education cares about most. Solving this is not about choosing for or against AI. It is about rethinking educational goals, teaching critical habits, building a culture where humans and AI work side by side, and finding a practical balance between getting things done quickly and doing things that truly matter.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence; Learning transformation; Triple paradox; Learning subjectivity

1 INTRODUCTION

AI is entering education at a dizzying speed. We see it in tutoring systems, in personalized content feeds, and in interactive platforms. It is changing not just how we learn, but also what learning looks like and what we expect from it [1]. And then there is generative AI, the kind that can write a passable essay, generate working code, or solve a tricky math problem in seconds. That forces us to go back to a very old question: if a machine can produce knowledge, then what is the point of human learning anymore [2]?

The research out there tends to split into two camps. One camp sings the praises of AI—personalized learning, higher efficiency, more equity [3]. Call that the "empowerment" story. The other camp rings alarm bells—AI will replace thinking, disrupt classrooms, and undermine teachers [4]. Call that the "substitution" fear. But here is the thing: both sides share the same unspoken assumption. They both think technology is neutral, a blank slate, and it all comes down to how we use it.

That assumption, though, is worth questioning. Most debates focus on whether we are using AI properly. But there is a deeper question, and it is rarely asked: even if we use AI in the best possible way, does its very presence still reshape the learner, the learning process, and the ultimate value of education—in ways we cannot easily avoid? The structural tensions that arise from AI's deep involvement in learning have not really been tackled head-on [5].

This paper tries to tackle them. It proposes that AI creates a three-fold tension: touching the learner's identity, the act of knowing, and the goals of education. We will lay out these tensions, trace where they come from, and suggest some practical ways to handle them. The hope is to give researchers and educators a sharper lens for looking at learning in the age of AI.

2 THE TRIPLE PARADOX OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE DRIVING EDUCATIONAL TRANSFORMATION

2.1 The Dispersion of Subjectivity

Let us start with the most basic change AI brings. It changes the very structure of what learning is. In the old days, tools like pens, books, or even computers were just there. They were background objects, passive, obedient. You used them, and you interacted directly with the world. The learner's boundary was clear. You knew where you ended and the world began.

Generative AI blows that structure apart. This is not a passive window. It is an active "other," something with its own kind of agency [6]. When a student talks to AI, asks it for ideas, or gets feedback from it, that technology steps right into the foreground. It becomes a collaborator, a source of knowledge, a guide. So learning is no longer a direct "human-world" thing. It becomes a mediated "human-AI-world" triangle.

Now, this has two sides. On the plus side, AI can give learners solid cognitive support, helping them reach levels they could not reach alone [7]. That is valuable. But here is the catch: when AI is always there, always ready to help, the relationship changes. Slowly, it shifts from "using" to "teaming up" and then to "depending on." Along the way, the power

to make decisions drifts away from the learner and toward the algorithm [8]. Learning paths are preset, reinforced by suggestions that pop up again and again. The learner's own planning gets crowded out. Choices that used to be personal are quietly handed over. Learning turns from an active, personal act of making meaning into a passive act of following what the machine spits out. And so, the learner's boundaries get fuzzy, pushed back without anyone really noticing. In short, AI as a technological "other" can boost learning outcomes, no doubt. But it also tends to blur and scatter the learner's sense of self. That is the first inherent tension.

2.2 The Eclipse of Depth: The Covert Compression of Reflective Space by Immediate Access

The epistemological tension is perhaps the most obvious. Knowledge acquisition used to be a slow, reflective process. This process requires going through finding information, weighing it, and digesting it. Now, with AI, it is almost instant. You ask, and you get. The middle steps vanish.

This is convenient, no question. Research even shows that working with AI for feedback can make students more engaged and better at solving complex problems [9-10]. But look at how students actually use AI. Two patterns stand out. One is the passive user. They take whatever AI gives them, never questioning it. Their reflective space shrinks, and they fall into a habit of "outsourcing" their thinking. The other is the critical user. They treat AI as a thinking partner, check its output, and pick what is useful. This can actually deepen reflection and make the technology empowering.

But even critical users face a more subtle risk. Embodied cognition tells us that thinking is rooted in our physical interaction with the world [11]. The messy path from confusion, through trial and error, to sudden insight. That is the stuff of deep understanding. It takes time. It takes mental elbow room. It is inefficient, yes, but that inefficiency is precisely what generates meaning and internalizes knowledge. Cognitive psychology backs this up: a bit of difficulty in learning actually helps long-term memory and true comprehension. Generative AI, however, skips all that struggle by offering ready-made answers. It cuts directly into the cognitive space learners need for independent thought [12]. Learning becomes "disembodied." Even critical users, because they did not wrestle with the raw material, may end up less deeply engaged in constructing knowledge. So we end up with a structural tension: instant access versus genuine depth.

2.3 The Transfer of Meaning: The Potential Displacement of Educational Authenticity by Efficiency Logic

Then there is the value dimension. Here, we run into a fundamental mismatch between how AI operates and what education is really about. Technology's internal logic naturally favors efficiency, measurability, and predictability. Education, at its core, is about nurturing independent thinkers, people with sound judgment and human sensitivity.

AI-powered systems track behavior, map knowledge states, and recommend optimal paths [13]. Research confirms that such personalization can boost efficiency. But it rests on a big assumption: that everything worth measuring can be measured. And that assumption skews things. Traits like test scores are easy to quantify and get attention. Traits like values, aesthetic taste, and critical spirit are hard to quantify and get sidelined. Some scholars use the term "spiritual charm" to capture those unique, personal imprints that education leaves on a person. When efficiency becomes the ruling logic, that "spiritual charm" is at risk of fading away [14].

This pushes us to confront a difficult question. In an age where efficiency is king, how do we hold on to the humanistic, soul-shaping mission of education [15]? Technology is not the villain here. But if we do not think critically about its internal logic, education may unintentionally give up its core purpose. At bottom, the axiological tension reflects a deep antagonism between the efficiency principle of the technological world and the formative principle of the educational world.

3 THE GENERATION MECHANISM OF THE TRIPLE PARADOX

These three tensions are not random. They are not simply caused by bad user behavior. Drawing on the philosophy of technology, we can trace them to three levels: the learner's own limitations, the mismatch in timing, and a fundamental value conflict.

3.1 Learners' Insufficient Technological Rationality and Lack of Critical Awareness

Most learners today do not really understand AI's dual nature. One side of the coin is comfort. AI is so convenient that it creates a mental safe zone. Students accept its output without much thought, avoiding the hard work of independent thinking. The other side is that formal training on how to collaborate with AI critically is largely absent. Students rely on instinct and habit, without a clear grasp of AI's limits, its operational logic, or the ethical rules that should guide its use. How learners perceive and use AI directly affects how intense these tensions become. Weak critical awareness amplifies the negative effects. Ontologically, learners get carried along, and their boundaries dissolve. Epistemologically, they swallow AI output whole, and their reflective space shrinks. Axiologically, they follow algorithmic suggestions blindly, and their autonomy slips away without a fight.

3.2 The Asynchrony Bet: On Technological Iteration Speed and Cognitive Adaptation Pace

AI improves at a breakneck pace. But human cognition, learning habits, and educational systems change at a much slower tempo. This mismatch makes the inherent contradictions worse. First, AI gets embedded in learning environments quickly,

but learners have not yet adjusted their thinking to fit this new reality. A mature collaborative model is still a distant goal. Second, while AI produces instant content, students struggle to draw a clear line between their own thinking and tool assistance. Rational, disciplined usage habits have not formed. Third, as algorithmic recommendations become more and more precise, prolonged reliance means that learners' ability to plan and explore on their own gets little exercise and keeps weakening. Technology always races ahead, while educational practice and individual cognition lag behind. The negative effects of the three tensions, then, keep amplifying.

3.3 The Conflict Between Data-Quantification Logic and the Humanistic Goals of Education

The deepest reason these tensions persist is the structural clash between the mathematical-quantification logic that powers AI and the humanistic goals that guide education. AI depicts learning states, recommends paths, and evaluates outcomes through data collection, model computation, and statistical patterns. But core educational goals, for example, critical thinking, creativity, values, aesthetic sensibility, which are qualitative by nature. They resist being turned into numbers, models, or algorithms.

This fundamental divergence runs right through all three tensions. Ontologically, AI constructs the "other" based only on quantifiable behaviors, missing the learner's full, authentic state. Epistemologically, large models generate content by matching and integrating data, which tends to reinforce shallow learning and weaken the ability to construct deep knowledge structures. Axiologically, algorithmic paths are built on historical data and statistical patterns, so they cannot easily accommodate individual uniqueness or the desire for creative growth. In essence, the three tensions reflect a basic contradiction between technological logic and the nature of education. This is not a bug that can be patched. It is a philosophical friction that can only be managed through thoughtful, value-driven educational practice.

4 RESOLUTION OF THE PARADOX: IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES GUIDED BY EDUCATIONAL VALUES

The three tensions we have discussed arise from the mismatch between technology's logic and education's logic. The way out is not to reject AI and retreat to the past. It is to re-center education's fundamental purposes. We need to let educational values guide technological use, shifting from a tech-dominated model to a human-centered one. The goal is a dynamic balance between empowerment and care. In this, education's special role is to deliberately "decelerate". It is not as a rejection of technology, but as a way to preserve space for reflection, for bodily experience, and for autonomy in a world that keeps speeding up.

4.1 Renewing Educational Concepts to Achieve the Unity of Instrumental and Value Rationality

The deep resolution of these tensions depends on a fundamental shift in educational thinking. In the digital age, education must not chase technical efficiency at the cost of deeper values. But it also must not shut AI out of fear. The real task is to find a point of balance where instrumental rationality serves, rather than dominates, value rationality. Once that is settled, we can define AI's place clearly: it is a tool to help people grow, not a boss running the show.

This conceptual shift needs to show up in everyday practice. In evaluation, we should not rely solely on AI-generated data. Qualitative assessments, performance-based reviews, and peer evaluations should also count. This prevents a single data logic from narrowing our educational goals. In technology adoption, tools should not be judged by efficiency alone. A pre-evaluation panel, including teachers, students, and technical experts, should carefully weigh potential impacts on learners' subjectivity, critical thinking, and creativity. In the teacher's role, the core value of educators in the AI era lies in protecting learner autonomy, inspiring higher-order thinking, guiding values, and providing emotional support. These are the areas where technology falls short. Therefore, we should focus on spotting signs of over-reliance and encourage students to think deeply and critically about AI and about task design.

4.2 Deepening Digital Intelligence Literacy Education to Cultivate Critical Use Competence

What does it mean to be digitally literate in the age of AI? It is not just about knowing how to use the tools. It is about being able to look at what AI produces, question it, check it against other sources, and then figure out what it means for yourself. There is that epistemological tension we noted before, you know, between easy access and real understanding. And it sort of gets resolved precisely at this point. Learners need to shift from depending on AI to engaging with it critically.

The main approaches to cultivating students' digital literacy mainly include:

One piece is critical examination. Students have to learn that AI output is not gospel. It is material to be verified. A simple but effective move: teachers can show students how different AI models produce different answers to the same question. That alone can drive home the point that AI is not an oracle. It is a tool with limits.

Another piece is metacognitive monitoring. This one is more internal. Students need to develop a kind of internal alarm that goes off when they are letting AI do their thinking for them. They should be able to tell the difference between "I am using AI to help me think" and "AI is thinking for me." Regular reflection sessions—nothing fancy, just short check-ins—can help students build this habit over time.

Then there is deep integration. This is where students learn to take AI-generated content and put it through its paces: compare it with other sources, test it with logic, and check it against real-world evidence. The useful parts get absorbed

into their own knowledge base; the rest gets discarded. Teachers can design assignments that force this process—tasks that require students to synthesize AI output, academic literature, and their own independent analysis into a coherent whole.

The key point is that this kind of literacy should not be taught in isolated "digital literacy" courses. It needs to be woven into every subject, every classroom. And evaluation systems should reflect that, assessing not just the final product, but how thoughtfully students engaged with AI along the way.

4.3 Building a Human-AI Collaborative Learning Culture to Balance Efficiency and Depth

The tension between ontology and axiology concerns learner identity and educational values. At its core, this tension is a balancing act between speed and efficiency on one side and depth and autonomy on the other. These are not easy to reconcile, but the attempt has to be made. The guiding principle here is "human-in-the-loop." That means building a learning ecosystem where AI's strengths are put to good use, but where there is always enough room left for genuine, unhurried, sometimes inefficient learning [16].

The first piece of that is protecting reflective space institutionally. This sounds abstract, but it is actually quite concrete. Curriculum design should include AI-free zones, which are specific segments within a course or teaching unit. In these zones, learners must solve problems independently and without real-time algorithmic assistance. Teachers can structure a learning unit so that it alternates between "AI-assisted" phases and "independent completion" phases, with designated points in between where students are asked to stop and reflect on what they have done and what they have learned.

Now turn to the second piece: critical distance. Learners should not view artificial intelligence as an authority that provides correct answers without deliberation. Instead, they should treat it as a conversational partner to respond to, question, and debate. Teachers can design activities like "debating with AI" or "grading AI's responses" to position learners as evaluators rather than passive recipients, and this shift from receiver to evaluator is essential.

The final principle is learner autonomy, and this is non-negotiable. Learners should have the right to choose their own learning paths. They should also have the right to decline algorithmic recommendations and to make mistakes. System recommendations should be framed as options worth considering rather than the only path to follow. Exploration and trial and error, even when not optimally efficient, should be seen as indispensable components of deep learning rather than flaws to be eliminated.

5 CONCLUSION

Weakening of learning subject boundaries, the compression of reflective space, and the narrowing of autonomous exploratory fields triggered by AI are not defects of the technology itself, but rather the endogenous costs derived from its logic of pursuing efficient operation.

Throughout the history of technological development, any intelligent tool carries both positive empowering value and implicit constraints. Of course, AI is no exception. The proper orientation of education is not to deliberately reject or eliminate the negative effects of technology, but rather to cultivate learners' core competence in autonomously adjusting and rationally balancing technological convenience and independent thinking. Compared with merely mastering the operational skills of AI, the cultivation of this capacity for self-regulation and value choice is more critical and holds greater long-term educational value. This requires learners to maintain a clear sense of self-awareness in an intelligent learning environment, reasonably defining the boundaries of leveraging technology, so as to be able to effectively use intelligent tools to facilitate learning progress, while also actively upholding the cognitive bottom line of independent thinking and autonomous construction. In the end, education must uphold the value orientation of "human beings," guiding learners and intelligent technologies toward a mutually beneficial symbiosis. This is the fundamental proposition that educational research and practice in the digital intelligence era must both address.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

FUNDING

This study was supported by the interim results of the teacher development research project of Xi'an Music College for the year 2025, "Research on the Development of General Knowledge Courses for Music Art Students Using Artificial Intelligence" (xyjf2509);

This study was supported by the general topic of "Research on the Cognitive and Emotional Interaction Mechanism and Intervention in College Students' Digital Learning Supported by Digital Intelligence and Evidence-Based Methods" (SGH25Y3650) of the "14th Five-Year Plan" for Education Science in Shaanxi Province for the year 2025;

This study was supported by the Philosophy and Social Sciences Research Project of Weinan City in 2026 under the Shaanxi Provincial Philosophy and Social Sciences Research Special Project (2026HZ0905).

REFERENCES

- [1] Huang Ronghuai. Artificial intelligence is accelerating educational transformation: Realistic challenges and countermeasures. *Chinese Journal of Education*, 2023(06): 26-33.
- [2] Peng Ziming, Li Yongmei. Machine-based knowledge production and knowledge learning: Analysis centered on the "World". *Open Education Research*, 2026, 32(01): 79-86.
- [3] Jiang Chencheng, Wei Yu'ang, Wu Limeng. Empowering Personalized Learning with Generative AI: Mechanisms, Transformations, and Trends. *Jiangsu Higher Education*, 2025(12): 61-68.
- [4] Xu Yueting, Gu Yue. Foreign Language Teaching and the Professional Development of Foreign Language Teachers in the Era of AI: Challenges, Identity Tensions and Solutions. *Contemporary Foreign Language Studies*, 2025(01): 60-72.
- [5] Guo Leilei. The mechanisms, risks and responses of generative artificial intelligence driving educational transformation: Taking DeepSeek as an example. *Chongqing Higher Education Research*, 2025, 13(03): 38-47.
- [6] Wang Huaijun, Huang Feifei. Paradigm change of Human-AI interaction in the "Singularity Approaching" Scenario from subject-object dichotomy to intersubjectivity. *Journal of Dalian University of Technology (Social Sciences Edition)*, 2025(2): 8-15.
- [7] Vygotsky L S, Cole M. *Mind in society: development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, USA: Harvard University Press, 1978: 2-19.
- [8] Lu Boxing, Huo Zhiyong. From cognitive outsourcing to cognitive mastery: The theoretical construction and teaching practice of symbiotic learning in the era of GAI. *Chinese Journal of Medical Education Technology*, 2026, 40(2): 187-193.
- [9] Lv Qianxi, Jiang Zhaokun. The impact of GenAI-Instructor collaborative feedback on learner engagement and revision quality: An empirical study based on literary translation. *Contemporary Foreign Language Studies*, 2025(05): 156-169.
- [10] Liu Yan, Li Lin. An Empirical Study on Human-AI Collaborative Solving of Complex Engineering Problems Supported by AI Pedagogical Agents——Exploring Through a Multi-Loop Problem Chain Framework. *Higher Engineering Education Research*, 2025(05): 31-38.
- [11] Ye Haosheng. Embodied Mind and Embodied Education. *Educational Research*, 2023, 44(03): 32-41.
- [12] Wen Chan. The Reconstruction of Memory in the Digital Age——The Connotations of Stiegler's "Third Persistence" Theory and Its Contemporary Interpretation. *Southeast Communication*, 2024(02): 131-133.
- [13] Ma Zhiqiang, Zhang Bing'er, Jing Ning. How Can the Design of AI-Driven Intelligent Adaptive Learning System be Effective?——Based on a Meta-Analysis of the Latest International Research Achievements over the Past Fifteen Years. *Modern Educational Technology*, 2025, 35(10): 99-107.
- [14] Li Jingjing, Wang Tianjian. Four-Dimensional Orientations and Their Transcendence in Education's Response to Generative Artificial Intelligence. *Journal of Hebei University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)*, 2026, 51(03): 108-119.
- [15] Li Zhengtao. Nurturing new intelligent individuals: The education revolution in the era of artificial intelligence. *China Distance Education*, 2025, 45(03): 3-13.
- [16] Chu Leyang, Pan Xianglin, Chen Xiangdong. Ethic Risks and Responses in the Application of Large Language Models in Education. *Journal of Soochow University (Education Science Edition)*, 2024, 12(01): 87-96.