

ChatGPTechners: Technoethical Attunements of Teaching Practice in AI-Mediated Learning Networks

Sean Groten, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, Canada, sgroten@ualberta.ca

Cathy Adams, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, Canada, cathy.adams@ualberta.ca

Jillian Kowalchuk, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, Canada, jbkowalc@ualberta.ca

Cheryl Shinkaruk, Edmonton Catholic School Division, Canada, cheryl.shinkaruk@ecsd.net

Nicole Cunningham, Edmonton Catholic School Division, Canada, nicole.cunningham@ecsd.net

Rebecca Woodruff, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, Canada, rwoodruff@ualberta.ca

Abstract

The emergence of AI, particularly Generative AI (GenAI), has introduced powerful new actors into learning networks, creating an urgent need for research on how these technologies may be mediating connections between teachers, learners, and other digital technologies and institutional infrastructures. While GenAI extends connectivity across these networks, it also regenerates and reconfigures the conditions of teaching, learning, and professional practices. As a result, questions of professional ethics, teacher identity and agency are becoming central to understanding how teachers' work is adapting and changing in the context of AI-mediated learning environments. This paper reports on a six-month study in which 20 K-12 teachers in a Canadian urban school division were provided access to ChatGPT Teams. Teachers participated in phenomenologically oriented interviews at the beginning and end of this period. From these accounts, Lived Experience Descriptions (LEDs) were developed to capture moments of tension, hesitation, curiosity and ethical reflection. Through these teacher-ChatGPT anecdotes, we examine how GenAI provokes technoethical tensions in teachers' everyday work and learning lives, and, in the process, reshapes their planning, communication, and professional identity. Our analysis reveals that teachers encountered manifold technoethical dilemmas when interacting with ChatGPT. Their concerns extended beyond the appropriate use of the LLM to existential questions about their integrity and identity as teachers when using ChatGPT. Teachers experienced ambivalence when using ChatGPT to assist with professional communication or when imagining what it would be like to incorporate it into their pedagogy. Such anecdotes reveal the importance of professional learning that supports ethical discernment in networked learning contexts. Here, we suggest that the Technoethical Framework for Teachers (TEFT) can strengthen teachers' ethical attunement and agency as they engage with GenAI in their practice. The paper contributes to networked learning scholarship by situating teachers' encounters with GenAI within relational and ethical ecologies rather than adoption or policy frameworks. It offers implications for NL researchers, teachers reflecting on the ethical implications of their Technological-Pedagogical-Content Knowledge (TPACK) in light of GenAI, and school leaders developing professional learning and policy around the critically informed and responsible use of Large Language Models (LLMs) in schools. Prior studies have described how teachers engage with GenAI; this paper shows how those engagements are ethically charged and ontologically mediated. By framing teachers' co-constitutive relationships with ChatGPT as technoethical relations of attunement, we offer both a theoretical vocabulary and an empirical method for studying GenAI in education through lived experience and a new conceptual lens.

Keywords

ChatGPT, Ethics, Generative AI, K-12 education, Networked Learning, Postphenomenology, Teacher Professional Learning, Technoethical Framework for Teachers (TEFT), Technoethics

Introduction

School districts across Canada and around the world continue to develop and revise policies on Generative AI (GenAI), education, and teacher practice. With the increasing sophistication of Large Language Models (LLMs) and the growing number of professional learning opportunities related to integrating tools like ChatGPT into pedagogical practice, this paper explores what technoethical questions teachers face when collaborating with GenAI. Our research investigated the entanglements of ChatGPT in teachers' work, analyzing how it unsettles pedagogical norms and ethical commitments, and the implications for understanding teacher practices in networked learning ecologies/environments.

We provided access to ChatGPT Teams to 20 K-12 teachers in a large urban school division in Western Canada for six months. We interviewed them about moments of pause, reflection or ethical tension when using ChatGPT, or instances where they noticed how their practice and/or values may have shifted in their planning, assessment, or other pedagogical work as teachers. The interviews were then culled for Lived Experience Descriptions (LEDs) that explore “what is it like to teach with ChatGPT?” We analyzed these LEDs through the Technoethical Framework for Teachers (Adams & Groten, 2024), to explore how teacher concerns extend beyond the appropriate use of ChatGPT as a tool, into considerations of how ChatGPT changes the ways they – and their students – act, think, and understand themselves and the role of education in the world. Finally, we explore the implications of contingent conditions of arrival for ChatGPT within the context of networked learning and teacher practice. Our findings show that, as they integrate ChatGPT into their professional practices and experience ethical tensions, teachers reflect on their values, teacher-student relationships, and the purpose of education, as they question whether they ought to use ChatGPT in a specific scenario. Our research demonstrates the importance of AI policy and literacy that facilitates this teacher directed, contextual circumspection, as they exert their moral and pedagogical agency amidst the arrival of GenAI agents.

Teachers’ emerging relationships with GenAI: A brief background

Zhai (2024) conducted a survey of 4,028 teachers across China, examining how they perceive and engage with Generative AI in their work. Using regression and cluster analyses of the survey data, the study identified distinct patterns of teacher-GenAI engagement that informed Zhai’s development of a four-stage framework describing teachers’ evolving roles in relation to GenAI: Observer, Adopter, Collaborator, and Innovator. The findings show that teachers’ relationships with GenAI extend beyond simple adoption, developing toward forms of collaboration and increasing professional agency as educators integrate AI more meaningfully into their practice. Drawing on a postdigital perspective, Moylan, Code, and O’Brien (2025) interviewed nine Canadian social studies teachers to explore how they made sense of their work, identities, and professional agency in relation to AI technologies. The authors observe that, “teachers’ accounts ... reflected the existence of shared agency between teachers and the dispersed technological networks made of hardware, software, infrastructure, corporations, and human workers” (p. 7). Their analysis suggests that teachers do not experience AI as a neutral tool but as a co-constitutive agent that defies easy categorization. Another study by Selwyn, Ljungqvist, and Sonesson (2025) examines how teachers must work around the “frailties” and breakdowns of GenAI tools, and suggests that it is the “hidden labour of humans [that] co-produces the illusion of automation” (p. 311). Their interviews of 57 teachers in Australia and Sweden revealed that teachers devote considerable time to “amending, rewriting, reworking and sometimes completely replacing generative AI outputs in order to make these outputs usable and useful for the classroom” (p. 317). They conclude that rather than relieving teachers of work, the integration of GenAI technology in education depends on teachers’ professional judgment, tacit knowledge, and ethical discernment.

Taken together, these studies demonstrate that teachers' engagement with GenAI is situated, interpretive, and value-laden. They are marked by negotiation, breakdown and repair, and ethical discernment rather than passive adoption. While this growing body of postdigital research captures aspects of teachers’ sensemaking and ethical agency, it leaves open the question of how to theoretically conceptualize these relational and ethical dimensions. The Technoethical Framework for Teachers (TEFT) offers one such lens, providing a way to articulate how technologies mediate, amplify, and constrain teachers’ pedagogical practices within complex teaching and learning ecologies.

Theoretical Framework

The Technoethical Framework for Teachers (TEFT) (Adams & Groten, 2024) is an analytical framework that enables teachers to approach educational technologies in ethically sound and pedagogically sensitive ways in their classroom. The ethics of technology in education has long been preoccupied with the instrumentality of educational tools: how to use a particular tool well and, in particular, how to avoid harm in its use. This focus has led to district policies concerning the appropriate use of technology, adherence to school authority, and provincial/state and federal legislation regarding the safety, health, and rights of individuals. While this is certainly important as schools must work to protect the personal, emotional, and social well-being of students and teachers in the use of technologies, including data rights and privacy, TEFT also attends to the ways in which technologies invite particular structures of action, habituating and privileging certain ways of thinking, and come to mediate our understanding of ourselves as humans and our place in the world. We turn to it as an analytical framework for participants' stories to illustrate how it can help teachers recognize and navigate the onto-epistemological influences of GenAI.

Instrumental technoethics considers technology as a neutral tool with which human ethical decisions are enacted. It can be summarized by the cheeky aphorism, “PowerPoint doesn’t kill meetings... People kill meetings. But using PowerPoint is like having a loaded AK-47 on the table: you can do very bad things with it” (Norvig, 2000). Here, technology is viewed as a non-agential object, and the ethical or “good” use of PowerPoint resides solely within the conscious moral agency of the human. A person can utilize technology, such as PowerPoint or ChatGPT, in either positive or negative ways. A teacher acting from an instrumental technoethical perspective ensures that the educational technologies they incorporate into their classrooms are aligned with school, district, provincial/state and national policies regarding the protection of data rights and privacy. They further consider how technologies can be used appropriately and inappropriately, and how to avoid infringing on students’ educational and personal rights beyond compliance with legislation. Questions of plagiarism and academic integrity when using Generative AI generally fall cleanly within the category of instrumental technoethics, as the teacher is concerned with the use – or misuse – of the technological tool on behalf of the students or their colleagues. A teacher acting within the instrumental technoethical lens may create class rules governing when and how GenAI technologies may be employed (i.e., proper citation policies, and limiting or placing conditions on their use of ChatGPT for certain summative assessments, such as at the brainstorming stage).

Whereas instrumental technoethics regards technology as “just a tool” and is concerned with the moral agency of the tool-*users*, sociomaterial technoethics understands technology as a political co-actor that affords particular actions. Sociomaterial technoethics suggests that a technology “cannot be neutral, because ... it has an inherent bias based on the properties of its materials and methods” (Strate, 2012, p. 6). To reconsider the PowerPoint aphorism through a sociomaterial technoethical lens, and adapting the words of sociomaterialist Bruno Latour (1999, 178-179, emphasis in original), “Who or what is responsible for [a presentation]? Which of them – the [PowerPoint software] or the [Teacher] – is the actor in this situation? *Someone else*. (A [PowerPoint-Teacher, a Teacher-PowerPoint]).” Technologies here, as political artifacts, are created within a particular worldview and re-articulate the values underpinning that worldview in the form of scripts. Technologies configure situations of choice; they also invite or suggest what choices should be made (Verbeek, 2011). A chair “invites” a body to sit on it, and a speed bump “urges” the driver of a car slow down. When we take up a technology’s invitation(s), we become entangled in its scripts. We are co-agential with our intent, and the politics of intent behind a particular technology encourages us to use it in a specific way, for a specific end. A teacher evaluating an educational technology through a sociomaterial lens asks questions like: what actions does the technology invite, and inversely, what actions does it discourage for themselves, as teachers, and for their students? Whose power is augmented and whose power is diminished when this technology is employed or deployed? What or whose values are embedded or prescribed in the inclinations and affordances of this technology?

Finally, existential technoethics extends the understanding of technologies as co-agential (i.e., in how they affect our behaviours and choices) to exploring the mediatory capacity of technologies to amplify, diminish, or otherwise affect our thinking, being and doing in the world (Adams & Groten, 2024). Put otherwise, technologies are not simply tools, nor are they only political artifacts that prescribe our behaviours: we are in a co-constitutive relationship with them. They shape our understanding of ourselves, our perceptions of the world, and our relationships with others. Indeed, PowerPoint can be used to deliver a presentation that is either incredibly boring or incredibly engaging. It is also a co-actor, uttering a myriad of invitational scripts that dictate the behaviours of teachers (*point out the knowledge that matters; centre your presentation on this particular point of focus in the room*) and students (*look to the screen, take note of bullet points*), enhancing the power of the speaker over the viewer. Existentially, as PowerPoint becomes more deeply embedded in the technological ecology of the classroom, it impacts the expectations, the atmosphere, and the onto-epistemological matterings of the classroom more and more thoroughly. It comes to mediate who we are as teachers and students, how we apprehend knowledge, and how we understand our place in the world. Learning becomes synonymous with PowerPoint: Teachers present information, students receive it and are subsequently assessed on their receipt of it. It dictates comportment in the classroom and the ethical engagement with knowledge, foregrounding what counts as knowledge and backgrounding other ways of knowing, bearing implications for who we are and how we learn that reach far beyond the classroom walls.

As we embark on a TEFT analysis of teachers’ Lived Experience Descriptions of turning to ChatGPT – of using it, having their actions scripted by it, and attending to the mediatory position it occupies between them and their students, their pedagogical practice, and the world – it is crucial to understand that TEFT does not place one lens above any other in terms of importance. While instrumental technoethics articulates a more familiar, common-sense understanding of technology and ethics in education, sociomaterial and existential technoethics each offer a different perspective that, when employed in concert with instrumental technoethics, provides the teacher with

a more nuanced and circumspect insight into the ways in which their technological ecologies influence their work and themselves.

Methodology

We recruited 20 teachers from a large urban school district in Western Canada to participate in a 6-month study examining value alignment, ethics, and the use of ChatGPT in education. We provided the participants with a ChatGPT Teams subscription (to ensure they had access to state-of-the-art tools and that any interactions with ChatGPT would not be used to train the LLM) and asked them to document and share their use of ChatGPT. We asked them to notice any moments of ethical discomfort or disagreement between their values and the experience of interacting with ChatGPT. Through two hour-long interviews – one at the outset of the study and the other near the end of the 6-month period – we asked participants to share their stories, detailing the moments they decided to reach for ChatGPT, their perceptions and values as teachers and individuals. We culled the interview transcripts for specific events recollected by each teacher. We then reconstructed these lived experience descriptions (LEDs) as anecdotes to reflect what it is like for a teacher to interact with ChatGPT in their everyday teaching practice. For this paper, we selected two teacher anecdotes to analyze in depth using TEFT, which, in their ordinariness, were particularly revealing of the teachers’ ethical considerations when describing their “feelings of coming up against” ChatGPT (Ahmed, 2017, p.136). Our analyses employ phenomenology, postphenomenology, Actor-Network Theory, and curriculum and pedagogical theory to uncover some of the onto-epistemological shifts that occur as teachers become increasingly entangled with ChatGPT, or resist such entanglement, as assertions of their values and pedagogical ethics.

Analysis

The Siren of ChatGPT

I scan the text of one of my students’ essays and sigh, “This is going to take a while.” The idea of using ChatGPT to generate feedback crosses my mind—a few of my colleagues have said they’ve tried it. I hesitate. What if the AI doesn’t understand the Alberta curriculum? Would it provide meaningful suggestions, or just generic writing advice? I go back to reading the essay, providing feedback as I go. In the back of my mind, I continue to wonder if I’m overlooking a tool that could save me time. (Mr. R)

A teacher sits down to mark a pile of student essays. Mr. R opens the first essay and sighs at the long stretch of demanding work before him: the hours of reading, pausing, considering, and responding. Such pedagogical work requires a steady focus on each essay, weighing the writing against curricular outcomes and grade-level expectations, then crafting thoughtful, detailed comments for each student in turn. As he begins, Mr. R knows that “this is going to take a while.” Yet today, another thought occurs: the possibility of turning to ChatGPT.

ChatGPT has arrived at a moment when teachers in Alberta, like many school jurisdictions across Canada, are working in increasingly complex and demanding classrooms. The local teachers’ union, the Alberta Teachers’ Association (ATA), noted in a 2022 survey of 1,300 teachers and administrators that 92% of respondents reported exhaustion, 88% reported high stress, and 37% said they were not likely to continue teaching the following year (Johnson, 2022). Teachers report that class sizes, the complexity of student needs, and a lack of support in implementing curriculum changes and inclusion policies are the main pressures influencing their decision to continue in the profession. Class sizes, in particular, have grown substantially in recent years, to the point that in negotiations with the provincial government for a new collective agreement concerning teacher pay and work conditions, class size and complexity features as prominently as salary increases to adjust for inflation from the last 15 years (Farrell, 2025). Conversely, teachers who choose to remain in the profession report that structural support, mentorship, feedback, and a sense of collaboration are key factors in their resilience. GenAI has emerged at the nexus of these professional pressures and desires for support.

Mr. R. finds himself in an ethical quandary that has emerged alongside ChatGPT. He is caught in a moment of pause by the potential usefulness of the technology in a largely untenable pedagogical context. Under more manageable circumstances, perhaps he would not have even thought of using ChatGPT, or wrestled with the implications of turning to it. Mr. R. has not used ChatGPT to provide feedback themselves, but he has learned of its possibilities through colleagues, professional learning opportunities, and media sources. He is primed to hear the solicitations of ChatGPT: *‘Let me read this for you,’ ‘let me generate comments for your students,’ ‘let me save*

you time.' ChatGPT has become a siren call, beckoning teachers to steer their practice closer to it. Marshall McLuhan referred to this moment of stepping into the sphere of a technology's influence as being immersed in its "acoustic space", a "sphere... whose boundaries are nowhere" that shifts perception and culture (McLuhan, 1972). We can liken this experience to the tale of Odysseus and his men as they approach the Sirens' island (Homer, 2017). Where other sailors had heard the cautionary tale of the Sirens who lured men to their doom, Odysseus wanted to hear the nature of the song itself. Following Circe's advice, he instructed his crew to plug their ears with beeswax while he was tied to the mast. In this way, he could hear the Sirens' call, remaining securely bound and protected from losing himself to their intoxicating but deadly allure.

The etymological root of the word Siren is the Greek *seirá* (σειρά), which means "rope, cord, or fetter" (Liddell, Scott, Jones, & McKenzie, 1940, s.vv. *σειρά*, *Σειρήν*). The call of the Siren thus alludes to the binding, coextensive relationship humans develop with their technologies. We humans find ourselves fatefully attached to them, entangled with them in our actions, our perceptions, our ways of knowing and being in the world. Mr. R, in a moment of exhaustion, is drawn in by ChatGPT's potent promises. He must decide whether to follow the siren call without resistance or, like Odysseus, anchor himself to something steady (like his professional ethic) amid such powerful calls. McLuhan identifies this moment of entry into the acoustical sphere of influence of technology as an ephemeral, yet profound, immersion into the medium-as-environment (McLuhan, 2001). By passing through the unfixed boundaries of technological influence, our perception shifts, immersing us in a new, evolving ecology that begins to change our ways of thinking, being, and acting.

ChatGPT calls the teacher to come and prompt it, to enter into a collaborative pact of call-and-response that promises to ease Mr. R's labour. But the teacher hesitates, wondering about the epistemological limits of ChatGPT as a suitable pedagogical reader and mentor in his stead. Like Odysseus before him, Mr. R moors himself in professional judgment and his pedagogical commitment to his students. He questions whether ChatGPT has the pedagogical training and tact necessary for the task: whether it understands the requirement to reference specific learning outcomes from the Alberta Program of Studies, and whether its feedback would be perfunctory or of a significant depth. Too, Mr. R worries about the shift in power and agency that could occur if he were to turn to ChatGPT for this critical aspect of his professional work. He is not concerned with the students having less power. Rather, exhausted and overwhelmed, he is tempted to relinquish a degree of power and agency to ChatGPT, to temporarily offload the pedagogical responsibility of providing meaningful feedback to an actor that, according to a few colleagues, can apparently stand in for him.

Instead of testing whether ChatGPT is capable, Mr. R's hesitation gives way to refusal. Today, he chooses not to heed the scripts of the co-actor in this instance. He acknowledges a certain degree of instrumental concern that he cannot fully understand the implications of using ChatGPT as a tool. However, his curiosity is eclipsed by the uncertainty of whether unintended harms will come to the students, such as the lost pedagogical moment that results from receiving unhelpful feedback. Mr. R demonstrates a limited understanding of AI, asking *what if it doesn't understand*, and *would it work*. This unknowing, combined with a reticence to experiment, limits his capacity to imagine the ethical use of ChatGPT as a tool. Simply put, he lacks AI literacy, which then prevents him from turning to AI. This discomfort extends into the existential technoethical lens as he wonders whether he is ignoring a powerful tool or protecting the integrity of the learning process. Here, Mr. R suggests that there is an ephemeral reverence in the learning process and that the manner in which pedagogical acts, such as assessment, operate within the relationship between students and teachers is important. Stressed for time and overwhelmed by the labour before them, Mr. R chooses not to act with ChatGPT, and not to invite ChatGPT as a mediating presence between themselves and their students' work. However, was this choice due to a sense of anxiety over what ChatGPT might cheapen in the learning process? Perhaps, his discomfort arose from the hypothetical wondering of how he would understand himself as a teacher if he invited ChatGPT into the technology ecology of his pedagogical practice? Yet, even as he continues to read and provide feedback, he is pulled by the scripts uttered by ChatGPT – could he come to use this tool, to engage it as a pedagogical co-actor, and to allow it to mediate his craft of teaching and his relationship with his students?

Every technology arrives on the scene by sounding its unique invitational melody, the intoxicating opening bars of its promise (McLuhan, 1964). These initial notes, the "siren call," draw the unwary user into immersion. We are all, like Odysseus and his men, subject to a given technology's allure. However, the discerning user understands that to grasp a technology's reverberating influences, we must learn to hear its unique timbre — that is, the ways it will reshape perception, practice, and culture. McLuhan's Laws of Media serve as one method of sketching this unique character of a particular technology. In Mr. R's context, ChatGPT enhances immediate student feedback. It obsolesces the slow, dialogical, pedagogical craft sensitive to the learner. When used to automate comments while still aiming to retain relevance for the students' individual skill development, ChatGPT

retrieves the Sophist tradition of private tutelage in Ancient Greece, where the focus was not on the correctness or truthfulness of what is being communicated, but on the rhetoric and systematic manner of communication. Finally, when pushed to an extreme where teachers only use ChatGPT to provide personal feedback on student writing, ChatGPT reverses into generic feedback rooted in the complex scripts and probability biases of LLMs, rather than the unique needs and writings of the students. This tetrad is speculative as Mr. R did not enter into the ecological influence of ChatGPT. However, on closer reflection, we can see how the influence of reversal was already bearing upon him as he weighed his decision to turn to ChatGPT amidst a myriad of other responsibilities, technologies and values.

Where Mr. R. decided against turning to ChatGPT, however, many teachers do enter into complex pedagogical relationships with GenAI. A recent ATA survey of 2,567 teachers found that 78% had used GenAI in the six months preceding the study. Of those users, 87.1% used ChatGPT. The most common use of AI by teachers was for support in their writing, lesson planning, customization, and administrative tasks. Notably, 28% reported using AI for student assessment and feedback (ATA, 2025). In another report, completed by Actua, a STEM outreach organization, 48% of teachers reported feeling skilled in the use of AI, and 78% expressed interest or a strong need to learn more about AI through professional development (Actua, 2025). These statistics demonstrate that a significant number of teachers are incorporating AI into their pedagogical practice, and an enduring knowledge gap remains around how to use AI appropriately and ethically, especially when AI enters the personal dialectic of feedback between teachers and students.

Even a seemingly innocuous moment of teaching is threaded through with a teacher's technological ecology and how a lack of AI literacy spurs technoethical considerations connoted by unknowing. Mr. R's limitations in understanding not just how this new educational technology works, but how it can be put to work, led him to question his responsibilities in teaching and learning, and whether he could, in good conscience, give a degree of professional agency over to ChatGPT even as he is feeling overwhelmed. Mr. R did not have the language of TEFT to help guide him through the particularities of his ethical concern. Nevertheless, he expressed a sense of ethics beyond instrumentality, and whether a tool is used for good or bad, towards circumspect questioning of how it aligns with his beliefs and values surrounding education. Unlike Odysseus, who tied himself to the mast so that he could hear the siren's call, this teacher navigated clear of the realm of using ChatGPT in their pedagogy. Mr. R adopted a stance of unknowing, like other seafarers who had heard tales of the Sirens but regarded the myth as a cautionary tale, keeping their distance and letting curiosity remain unsated. Perhaps, had Mr. R been afforded a mast point on which to tether himself – professional development in AI literacy and a framework, such as TEFT, providing him the language to navigate feelings of unease when standing in the sphere of a technology – he would have felt moored-at-sea. He might have felt secure in his values and teaching, allowing him to steer closer to the call of ChatGPT and come to understand the onto-epistemological implications of using ChatGPT for feedback, rather than dwelling in uncertainty. Perhaps Mr. R would have felt more willing to explore *what it is like to hear* the urging of ChatGPT, to stand within its influence, yet still apart so as to discern its “medial lines of force” (McLuhan, 1964, p.15 as cited in Adams & Turville, 2017, p.48). However, in this instance, the thought of losing his practice and being subsumed as a teacher by ChatGPT posed too great an existential risk.

This must be what normal people sound like: the absurdity of ChatGPT helping me sound more human

It's after school, and I'm sitting at my desk to write an email to the family of a child who has been misbehaving in class. I dread this. I've been told I can come off as “aggressive” in emails. I sometimes spend hours agonizing over the wording, writing and rewriting an email, then anxiously imagine how they will be read on the other side. I sit, unable to begin, reticent to put my hands on my keyboard, worrying that no matter what I write, I will come across wrong. Then, I recall a video I saw online where a person with Autism said that ChatGPT has helped them greatly with communication, to sound more sociable, agreeable... even more ‘human’. I open ChatGPT, type “Make this sound professional,” and provide ChatGPT with the details I need to include in the email. I chuckle to myself at the absurdity of the situation, that I am asking ChatGPT to help me ‘sound more human’, and ‘less like an AI’. It immediately drafts an email. I read it and think, “This must be what normal people sound like”. I read it over a few times, copy it into an email and send it to the family. (Ms. A)

ChatGPT is an interlocutor that, under different circumstances, would not be welcome in a conversation between a teacher and a parent. If the conversation were to take place in person, after school, Ms. A would not be able to confer with ChatGPT on the choice of words. ChatGPT comes to mediate the relationship between Ms. A and the

parents precisely because the exigent technological ecology allowed the spatial and temporal frame for it to act upon Ms. A and the crafting of the message. Like a lawyer representing a client in court, ChatGPT employs a protocol of tone in articulating the meaning of the teacher. It speaks on behalf of Ms. A, removing any trace of emotionality or aggressiveness, conveying the message in a manner befitting the social relationship between teacher and class parent. Ms. A illuminates the pressure she feels from this dialectic between teacher and parent in her framing of the neurotypical figure of the Teacher. She refers to the scaffolding ChatGPT provides people with autism to *sound more social, agreeable... even more human*. She pleads with ChatGPT in a glib tone that belies the urgency of the request, asking the large language model to assist *her in sounding more human*.

Ms. A's experience of using ChatGPT emerges in a moment that blends pedagogical space with spaces outside the classroom, blurring the temporality of the classroom present with that of a temporality outside school hours. ChatGPT is inserted into a technological ecology already in motion. The teacher-email, or the email-teacher assemblage, communicates with the world in a vastly different way than a telephone-teacher (Turville, 2018). Whereas the telephone is an embodied technology that enhances the range of our speech and hearing in such a way that it preserves the affective tonality of speech, not requiring us to yell, email is a hermeneutic technology that divorces the semantic meaning of the message from the voice that would articulate it (Ihde, 1990). Simply put, tone of voice is not experienced as listened-to in email, but is subject to a speculative interpretation. By using email to discuss classroom management strategies with a student's parents, Ms. A is afforded more time and consideration when choosing words to communicate an issue to a parent. The cost of this time is a diminished sense of the context and feltness with which those words are received. Email is a technologized conversation that occurs across place and time, accentuating the bifurcation of the classroom environment from the world. What then are the implications of invoking ChatGPT in this network already in motion? Ms. A invokes a sense of the past in the moment she reaches for ChatGPT. She refers to prior experiences where she has been told she can come across as aggressive, and so the temporal engagement of the past affects the particular conditions of this moment, prompting her to turn to ChatGPT. In another situation, where she had not received this feedback, stoking an anxiety about how her communication is received, perhaps she may not have turned to ChatGPT. Perhaps her interpretation of the student's behaviour and the task of communicating it to their parents would have been different. However, Ms. A invites ChatGPT into the relationship she already has with email, as well as with the student and the student's family, thereby further mediating the modes of engagement with an unseen layer of hermeneutic technology.

It is clear that Ms. A values clarity, which contributes to constructive relationships and helps her avoid conflict in her communication. However, we must ask: what ways of knowing, being, and acting are mediated by this engagement with ChatGPT? What is it like to think and write with ChatGPT in this instance? What kind of human and teacher is Ms. A becoming as she leans on ChatGPT in this way? ChatGPT does not simply script Ms. A to put it to use; it is inviting her to allow it to speak *for her* and *as her*. Here, we can return to McLuhan's laws of media to consider the speculative question of reversal – *when this technology is pushed to its limits, what will it inevitably reverse into?* Though speculative, this thought experiment is important for revealing the existential technoethical concern at play, as the vectorial implication of such a reversal already bearing material consequences for what sort of teacher Ms. A. is becoming in this instance, and in every instance that she turns to ChatGPT to mediate her communication with parents. Ms. A utilizes ChatGPT to enhance her professionalism, clarity, and congeniality – to be perceived as (and sound like) a caring, clear, authoritative, and unoffensive professional. While ChatGPT appears to have greatly helped her in this experience, it comes at a cost. Namely, that by using ChatGPT and further stretching the temporal and spatial divide that is exigent when teachers communicate with parents through email, Ms. A further loses access to the feltness of how the Other comes to know and hear her words. Indeed, these are not her words. They are an algorithmic manifestation of probable patterns of communication, bereft of the epistemological and affective dimensions that give communication a sense of resonance between the speaker and listener. Ms. A sacrifices her emotional response to the student's class behaviour, the labour of crafting a message through her own experience, and the epistemological doubt that comes from writing a message and being unsure of how it is received. In a sort of stunned relief, she says *this must be what normal people sound like*, subscribing to a social exaltation of rationality without feeling. She also notes the internalized norm that teachers ought to *sound like normal people*, that they must embody and exemplify this neurotypical, rational position. As such, where Ms. A interprets ChatGPT's aid as helping her *sound like a normal human being*, she is implicated in a reversal already in process – one where *she* does not 'sound' at all. In an effort to rectify a perceived issue in her tone of voice, she obscures her voice, outsourcing the vocal authority to the safety of an algorithmically determined message.

The word 'sound' evokes a sense of identification – or disidentification – with the technology. ChatGPT outputs text at the request of the teacher, and it *sounds like* them, or like the teacher they wish they were, or that they feel

they ought to be. Here, *sound* carries multiple meanings. In the case of Ms. A, she positions herself alongside the child's parents, as a reader of the message, interpreting tone and word choice for what they sound like. Sound refers to the impression conveyed by the message – the periperformative meaning below the semantic surface (Sedgwick, 2002). However, *sound* can also convey a sense of depth, health, and alignment, particularly in regard to the logic used to reason through a course of action. To say *it sounds like me* is in part to understand the impression of one's person, values and agency within the world, and to recognize in the message an affinity between the self and the utterance they hear. This recognition exceeds parroted semantic meaning; It is also a recognition in resonance – that the ChatGPT output aligns with the ever-emerging positionality of the teacher-in-the-world and the *sound rationale* for their voice in the world. Vibrationally, the identification or disidentification of the teacher with ChatGPT as Ghost Writer is a matter of affective resonance – how the conveyance intimated from the ChatGPT output resonates with the teacher's co-constitutive, onto-epistemological emergence in the world.

To *sound like* suggests a poetics that precedes the arrival of the Teacher-ChatGPT. As the teacher is necessarily in flux, constituted in place and the particularities of the present – the here and now – and as ChatGPT is similarly in flux, engaged in myriad processes of machine learning and its own becoming – *sound alignment* is not simply a matter of choosing the correct prompts to make ChatGPT *sound like me*. It is instead how these two voices, singing “a contrapuntal melody of perception and movement” (Adams & Turville, 2017, p. 48), are “each other's ongoing ... possibility for being what they are” (Introna, 2017). They are co-constituting sounding bodies that, in an effort to *sound alike*, engage in a complex ecological choreography of value alignment and intimated meaning. They sing one another into being, and in doing so, they are a process of acoustic worlding; They sing each other's “unfolding of bodies into worlds” (Ahmed, 2010, p. 30), co-creating the conditions of arrival into the space, and the possibility of being in *this* particular context, in *this* particular ecology of relations. When a teacher says ChatGPT *sounds like me*, or *sounds like the teacher I ought to be*, we gain insight again into the moment they pass into the acoustic space of ChatGPT. It is a moment of realization that ChatGPT's sphere of influence demands a politics of being, thinking, and doing from them. Therefore, the difference between *sounds that are familiar to me* and *those that are not* is an ethical statement of alignment with space – the difference between a sense of home and a sense of unmooring in acoustic space – and the degree of affective resistance or deference the teacher expresses as ChatGPT impresses itself upon them, so as to mould the teacher into consonance with its functional tonality (von Uexküll, 2010). Upon hearing ChatGPT's song, the teacher must find a way to choose how they wish to sing along: as part of the choir, or “out of tune, out loud, on purpose” (Machado de Olivera, 2021, p.xvi).

Conclusion: ChatGPT, Attunement, and Networked Learning

The implications of this TEFT analysis of teachers' experiences using ChatGPT for Networked Learning suggest that exploring the intricate web of relationships in education, and the technologies that mediate those relationships, can yield powerful insights from the affective resonance of agents within their shifting technological ecologies. In *The Theory of Education: Towards a Dialogic Foundation for Design*, Rupert Wegerif and Louis Major propose a dialogic theory of educational technology (2023). They write: “Technology does not just do what it is told and help us to realize our independently arrived at ends. Technology shapes us from the inside; it is always already there influencing how we understand ourselves and how we make decisions” (p. 2). We have explored, through TEFT, how ChatGPT exerts its acoustical sphere of influence through actions and ways of thinking and being that it impresses ecologically upon the teacher. We have further explored how the ethical moment of entry into ChatGPT's sphere is connoted by the affective experience of resonance between the Teacher and ChatGPT – *it sounds like me; it sounds nothing like me*. These teacher experiences intimate the complexity and feel of engaging in a dialogue with ChatGPT, where ethical decision-making is rationalized – or determined to be sound – based on both policy and affinity or disidentification with technology. These are the stories of just two teachers. Nonetheless, they provide us a glimpse into some of the conditions of arrival for ChatGPT – the political environment, the labour of teaching, and the classroom within the world – and the ethical decisions made by these teachers as they enter the acoustic sphere of ChatGPT. One teacher, like the nameless sailors alluded to in *The Odyssey*, who avoided the Sirens, resisted the entry into the sphere. The other, enticed by the song of neurotypicality and the image of the teacher they feel they ought to be, embraced the call, entangling themselves in the urgings of ChatGPT. Designing a policy surrounding the use of AI in schools must be grounded in an intimate, ecological framework that attends to the agential capacities of the Teacher, the student, and the AI, as well as the complex interrelationships that may emerge in their co-constitutive, networked environmentality – how these entities co-create one another and the place within which they interrelate. As we consider what education *ought to be*, we must consider the conditions of arrival and entry into the influence of AI, and recognize the values expressed behind the ethical choices made by teachers: to steer clear, to follow the song, or to tie

themselves to the mast – thereby entangling themselves in another set of technological relations – in an effort to resist being subsumed in thoughts, actions, and being by the mythic potency of ChatGPT.

References

- Adams, C., & Groten, S. (2024). A TechnoEthical Framework for Teachers. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 49(4), 701-718. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2023.2280058>
- Actua. "AI Skills Gap: Youth confident, Educators need support, Actua report reveals." *Cision Canada*, CNW Group, 23 June 2025
- Ahmed, S. (2017). *Living a feminist life*. Duke University Press.
- Ahmed, S. (2010). Happy Objects. In M. Gregg & G. Seigworth (Eds), *The Affect Theory Reader*. (pp.29-51). Duke University Press.
- Alberta Teachers' Association. (2025). *Pulse survey on artificial intelligence in education: Alberta teachers' experiences and attitudes*. Alberta Teachers' Association.
- "Artificial Intelligence in Education (AIEd)." *Alberta Teachers Association*, 15 Apr. 2025, teachers.ab.ca/sites/default/files/2025-05/COOR-101-44_ReportingOnLiteracy_2025-04-15.pdf.
- Bennett, J. (2017). *Influx and efflux: writing up with Walt Whitman*. Duke University Press.
- Farrell, J. (2025, September 19). *Bargaining between province and teachers' union resumes as Oct. 6 strike deadline looms* | *CBC News*. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/edmonton/teachers-union-government-resume-talks-1.7638720>
- Hansen, J. J., & Rosenlund, L. T. (2018). Teaching in a networked world—skills, knowledge and beliefs. In N. B. Dohn (Ed.), *Designing for Learning in a Networked World* (pp. 81-101). Routledge.
- Harper, D. (n.d.). Etymology of siren. Online Etymology Dictionary. Retrieved September 24, 2025, from <https://www.etymonline.com/word/siren>
- Ihde, D. (1990). *Technology and the lifeworld: from garden to earth*. Indiana University Press.
- Introna, L. (2017, June 29). *Phenomenological approaches to ethics and information technology*. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2022/entries/ethics-it-phenomenology/>
- Homer. (2017). *The Odyssey* (S. Butler, Trans.; 1st ed.). Open Road Integrated Media.
- Johnson, L. (2022, January 26). *More Alberta K-12 educators say they won't be teaching in the province next year: ATA survey* | *Edmonton Journal*. <https://edmontonjournal.com/news/politics/more-alberta-k-12-educators-say-they-wont-be-teaching-in-the-province-next-year-ata-survey>
- Latour, B. (1999). *Pandora's hope: essays on the reality of science studies*. Harvard University Press.
- Liddell, H. G., Scott, R., Jones, H. S., & McKenzie, R. (1940). *A Greek-English lexicon* (9th ed., with rev. supplement). Oxford University Press.
- Machado de Olivera, V. (2021). *Hospicing modernity: facing humanity's wrongs and the implications for social activism*. North Atlantic Books.
- McLuhan, M. (1967). *The Gutenberg galaxy: the making of typographic man*. University of Toronto Press.
- McLuhan, M. (1972). *The end of the work ethic*. [speech transcript]. The Empire Club of Canada addresses. <https://speeches.empireclub.org/61809/data?n=9>
- McLuhan, M. (2001). *Understanding media: the extensions of man* (2nd Ed.). Routledge.
- Moylan, R., Code, J., & O'Brien, H. (2025). Teaching and AI in the postdigital age: Learning from teachers' perspectives. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 153, 104851. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2024.104851>
- Norvig, P. (2000). *The Gettysburg Powerpoint presentation*. (accessed September 24, 2025). <http://norvig.com/Gettysburg>
- Sedgwick, E. K. (2002). *Touching feeling: Affect, pedagogy, performativity*. Duke University Press.
- Selwyn, N., Ljungqvist, M., & Sonesson, A. (2025). When the prompting stops: Exploring teachers' work around the educational frailties of generative AI tools. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 50(3), 310–323. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2025.2537959>
- Strate, L. (2012). If it's neutral, it's not technology. *Educational Technology*, 52(1), 6–9.
- Strate, L. (2016). Media Ecology. In K. B. Jensen & R. T. Craig (Eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Communication Theory and Philosophy* (pp. 1–8). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Turville, J. A. M. (2018). *Email and its involvements in the lives of K-12 teachers: Phenomenological, postphenomenological, and posthumanistic explorations* [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta]. University of Alberta Education & Research Archive. <https://ualberta.scholaris.ca/items/438091f3-97f5-48f1-9d10-38f1a23af6d4>
- Verbeek, P.-P. (2011). *Moralizing technology: Understanding and designing the morality of things*. University of Chicago Press.
- von Uexküll, J. (1934/2010). *A Foray into the Worlds of Animals and Humans: With a Theory of Meaning* (J. D. O'Neil, Trans.; intro. D. Sagan). University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1934)

Wegerif, R., & Major, L. (2023). *The theory of educational technology: towards a dialogic foundation for design*. (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003198499>

Zhai, X.. (2024). Transforming teachers' roles and agencies in the era of generative AI: Perceptions, acceptance, knowledge, and practices. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-024-10174-0>

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by funding from the Alberta Education Research Partnerships Program (Grant No. 2024-0076) and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) (Grant No. 435-2025-0487). Additional support was provided by the University of Alberta's Office of the Vice-President Research. We also thank the Edmonton Catholic School Division for their research partnership and support. The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the funding agencies.