Through McLuhan's Lens

The Silent Student

December 31, 2025 | 2,683 words

In the sprawling landscape of educational technology discourse, a peculiar paradox emerges. Students-the very subjects around whom entire educational systems orbit-represent a mere 0.07% of voices in conversations about artificial intelligence in education. This statistical invisibility stands in stark contrast to their physical omnipresence in classrooms, lecture halls, and campus spaces. Yet this is not merely an oversight or administrative failure. Through Marshall McLuhan's penetrating framework, this silence reveals itself as a profound symptom of technological numbness-a condition where the very people most affected by technological transformation become least able to perceive or articulate its effects.

McLuhan, who warned that "we shape our tools and thereafter our tools shape us," would recognize in this 0.07% figure not just a number but a message. The medium of academic discourse about AI-with its journals, conferences, and policy papers-carries within it an inherent logic that systematically excludes those it purports to serve. This exclusion operates not through conscious design but through what McLuhan termed the "subliminal and docile acceptance of media impact." The discourse itself becomes a technology, reshaping educational relationships even as it claims to merely describe them.

The Discourse as Hot Medium

McLuhan's distinction between "hot" and "cool" media provides a crucial lens for understanding how AI discourse functions within educational spaces. A hot medium, in McLuhan's taxonomy, is one of high definition that provides complete information, requiring little participation or completion by the audience. Radio is hot; telephone is cool. Photography is hot; cartoons are cool. And the discourse surrounding AI in education, as revealed by the analysis of 1,629 articles, operates as an intensely hot medium-predetermined, complete, and requiring minimal student input.

The data reveals a striking pattern: institutional voices dominate, creating what McLuhan would recognize as a one-way flow of predetermined meanings. Academic researchers, administrators, and technology companies speak; students listen-or more accurately, students are spoken about. This hot medium extends not student voices but administrative control, creating what McLuhan presciently termed "the inevitable contraction of the world to village status," where the global educational village paradoxically becomes more hierarchical even as it claims greater connectivity.

McLuhan observed that students live "mythically and in depth," experiencing the world through immersive, participatory modes of engagement. Yet when they encounter the "classified information" of formal education-now increasingly mediated by AI systems-they face a fundamental disconnect. The hot medium of AI discourse exemplifies this

disconnect at its most extreme. While students navigate AI tools daily, swimming in the deep waters of algorithmic recommendation systems, automated feedback loops, and predictive analytics, their lived experience finds no expression in the formal discourse that shapes these very systems.

The dominance of institutional voices in the AI conversation creates what McLuhan would identify as a peculiar form of technological determinism. When 823 articles focus on "Education" as a category while only 152 address "AI Tools" directly, we see the discourse privileging abstract institutional concerns over concrete technological encounters. This hot medium approach transforms AI from a lived environment that students inhabit into a policy problem that administrators solve.

Consider how this hot medium operates through academic publishing itself. Peer-reviewed journals, with their lengthy submission processes, specialized vocabularies, and institutional gatekeeping, create an inherently exclusive space. Students, who lack the credentials, time, and institutional support to participate in these forums, become objects of study rather than subjects with voice. McLuhan would note how the medium itself-academic publishing-shapes the message, ensuring that those most affected by educational AI remain least able to influence its development.

The heat of this medium intensifies through what McLuhan called "specialism," where expertise becomes fragmented and exclusive. AI researchers speak to AI researchers; educational theorists to other theorists; policymakers to their peers. Each specialist community generates its own hot medium of discourse, further excluding students who exist at the intersection of all these specialisms but belong to none. The very structure of academic discourse about AI creates what McLuhan would recognize as a "tribal encyclopedia," where specialized knowledge replaces participatory wisdom.

The Rear-View Mirror Effect

McLuhan's most penetrating insight about technological change was his observation that "we look at the present through a rear-view mirror. We march backwards into the future." This rear-view mirror effect pervades the discourse on AI in education, revealing itself most starkly in the contradiction between stated values and actual practices. While "Centering Diverse Stakeholder Voices" appears prominently in the data, students remain at 0.07% participation-a gap between rhetoric and reality that McLuhan would identify as symptomatic of profound media blindness.

The dominant "tool frame" for understanding AI in education exemplifies this rear-view mirror thinking. By conceptualizing AI as a "tool"-a term redolent of industrial age thinking-educators and policymakers miss what McLuhan would recognize as AI's environmental effects. Tools are discrete, controllable, and separate from their users. But AI, in McLuhan's framework, operates not as a tool but as an environment, reshaping the entire sensory and cognitive landscape of education.

Through McLuhan's lens, the tool metaphor reveals itself as a comforting anachronism, allowing educators to imagine they can simply "use" AI while remaining fundamentally unchanged. Yet McLuhan understood that "environments are invisible. Their groundrules, pervasive structure, and overall patterns elude easy perception." The 0.07% student voice represents not just an exclusion but a symptom of this environmental invisibility. Students, swimming in the AI environment, cannot articulate its effects precisely because they are too immersed in it.

The rear-view mirror effect manifests particularly clearly in how educational institutions approach AI governance. Traditional frameworks of curriculum committees, technology policies, and usage guidelines attempt to contain AI within familiar administrative structures. McLuhan would observe how this represents "studying program content" while ignoring the medium itself. The content-what AI teaches or how it teaches-receives scrutiny, while the medium-how AI restructures the entire educational environment-remains largely unexamined.

This backwards orientation appears throughout the discourse's treatment of AI as something to be "integrated" into existing educational structures. Integration assumes a stable educational environment into which AI can be inserted, like adding a new textbook to a familiar curriculum. But McLuhan would recognize AI as what he called an "anti-environment"-a new medium that makes the old environment visible by contrast while simultaneously obsolescing it.

The data's revelation that "AI Tools" represents the smallest category (152 articles) while "Education" dominates (823 articles) illustrates this rear-view mirror perfectly. The discourse focuses on preserving educational structures while minimizing engagement with the transformative technology itself. It's as if educators are discussing how to arrange deck chairs while the entire ship of education undergoes fundamental reconstruction.

McLuhan's framework reveals how the discourse's "nearly ABSENT" partner frame for AI represents more than semantic choice-it embodies a deep misunderstanding of AI's nature. Partners collaborate within existing structures; environments transform those structures entirely. By seeing AI as an absent partner rather than a present environment, the discourse reveals its own inability to perceive the transformation already underway.

Extensions and Amputations

McLuhan's theory of media as extensions of human faculties-and the corresponding amputations these extensions create-provides crucial insight into the student silence phenomenon. Every technology, McLuhan argued, extends certain human capacities while numbing others. The wheel extends the foot but atrophies walking; the book extends the eye but diminishes memory. In the discourse of educational AI, we witness a peculiar extension: institutional voice is amplified while student voice is amputated.

The debate between "Institutional/Deficit Models vs. Community/Autonomy Models" revealed in the data takes on new meaning through McLuhan's extension/amputation

framework. Institutional models extend administrative control, creating what McLuhan would recognize as "huge collective surgery carried out on the social body with complete disregard for antiseptics." The surgery here is the removal of student agency, performed through the very discourse meant to enhance their educational experience.

What human capacity does student silence extend? McLuhan would identify it as the extension of institutional processing power-the ability to manage, categorize, and optimize educational "outcomes" at scale. Students become data points in learning management systems, patterns in predictive analytics, nodes in engagement networks. Their silence in the discourse extends the institution's capacity to process them as educational objects rather than engage them as learning subjects.

This amputation of student voice creates what McLuhan termed "numbness" or "narcosis"-a state where the affected population loses awareness of what has been lost. Students, immersed in AI-mediated educational environments from early childhood, may not recognize their exclusion from AI discourse as unusual. The numbness is complete when the amputation feels natural, when 0.07% participation seems not like silencing but simply like the normal order of things.

The extension of institutional voice through AI discourse creates peculiar effects that McLuhan's framework illuminates. When AI systems are designed based on discourse that excludes student input, they embed institutional assumptions about learning, assessment, and success. These systems then extend institutional reach into previously private spaces of student learning-tracking reading patterns, analyzing writing processes, monitoring engagement levels. The extension is profound: institutional oversight achieves omnipresence through AI's mediation.

Yet McLuhan would remind us that "the effects of technology do not occur at the level of opinions or concepts, but alter sense ratios or patterns of perception steadily and without resistance." The amputation of student voice from AI discourse doesn't just silence opinions; it restructures the entire sensory and cognitive environment of education. Students learn to experience themselves as objects of algorithmic analysis rather than subjects of their own learning journey.

The community/autonomy models that appear in opposition to institutional approaches offer what McLuhan might call a "counter-environment"-an attempt to make visible what the dominant discourse renders invisible. Yet even these models, when articulated without student voices, risk creating new forms of amputation. Community without student participation becomes another form of institutional control, merely distributed rather than centralized.

The Revelation: Discourse as Transformation

The profound revelation that emerges through McLuhan's lens is that the discourse itself performs the very transformation it claims to study. This is not merely academic conversation about educational change-it is the medium through which that change occurs. The 0.07% student participation rate doesn't just describe an exclusion; it enacts a fundamental reshaping of educational relationships.

McLuhan understood that "the medium is the message," and the medium of academic AI discourse carries a clear message: students are objects of educational technology, not subjects shaping it. This message operates below the threshold of conscious awareness, embedded in the very structure of how AI in education is discussed, researched, and implemented. The discourse creates a new form of student-not the active learner of progressive pedagogy, but what we might call the "data subject" whose education happens to them rather than with them.

The transformation occurs through what McLuhan identified as "participation mystique"-but inverted. Traditional educational environments, even at their most hierarchical, required some form of student participation. The lecture hall, for all its limitations, still demanded physical presence and at least performative attention. But AI-mediated education, shaped by discourse that excludes student voice, creates environments where students participate without participating-generating data through their every interaction while having no say in how that data shapes their educational experience.

This new form of student-as-data-subject represents what McLuhan would recognize as a fundamental shift in human type. Just as "typographic man" emerged from print culture with new forms of consciousness and social organization, we now witness the emergence of "algorithmic students" whose educational identity is constructed through their data traces rather than their voiced experiences. The 0.07% figure marks not just a statistical absence but an ontological transformation.

Implications for Faculty: Creating Cool Spaces

For educators navigating this transformed landscape, McLuhan's framework offers both diagnosis and direction. The challenge is not simply to include student voices in existing discourse structures-that would be mere content adjustment. Rather, faculty must recognize how they participate in a medium that fundamentally reshapes the student-teacher relationship. The question becomes: How can educators create what McLuhan would call "cool" spaces for genuine student participation in shaping their technological future?

Cool media, in McLuhan's terms, require active participation to complete their meaning. A seminar is cooler than a lecture; a conversation cooler than a presentation. In the context of AI discourse, cool spaces would be those that require student input not as token representation but as essential completion of the educational environment itself. This might mean reimagining research methodologies that center student experience, creating publishing venues accessible to student voices, or developing AI systems that require active student configuration rather than passive student consumption.

Faculty must also recognize their own role in what McLuhan called "the global village"-a space that paradoxically becomes more tribal as it becomes more connected. The academic tribes that dominate AI discourse (researchers, administrators, technologists) must consciously create openings for student participation, understanding that such openings require not

just invitation but fundamental restructuring of discursive spaces.

The path forward requires what McLuhan termed "pattern recognition"-the ability to perceive the hidden environments that shape our experience. Faculty who recognize the pattern of student exclusion in AI discourse can begin to create counter-environments, spaces where students don't just use AI tools but participate in imagining and shaping them. This is not about adding student representatives to existing committees but about recognizing that the medium of educational AI itself must become cooler, more participatory, more incomplete without student input.

Becoming What We Behold

McLuhan's central insight echoes through this entire analysis: we become what we behold. In beholding AI without student voices, education risks creating students who see themselves as objects of technological systems rather than subjects with agency. The 0.07% participation rate is not just a number-it's a mirror reflecting back a transformed educational environment where students are data to be processed rather than voices to be heard.

Through McLuhan's lens, the absence of student voice in AI discourse reveals itself not as oversight but as symptom-a profound indicator of how technological environments reshape human relationships below the threshold of conscious perception. The discourse that excludes students doesn't just talk about educational transformation; it performs that transformation through the very act of exclusion.

The challenge for educators, policymakers, and technologists is to recognize that every discussion of AI in education that occurs without meaningful student participation further entrenches a model of education where students are objects rather than subjects. McLuhan would urge us to understand that the medium of our discourse about AI is already creating the educational future-a future where 0.07% might not be an aberration but a new normal.

Yet McLuhan also offers hope through understanding. By recognizing how media environments shape perception and possibility, we can begin to consciously craft alternatives. The creation of cool spaces, counter-environments, and participatory frameworks represents not just pedagogical choice but species necessity. As AI reshapes the educational environment, the inclusion of student voices becomes essential not just for democratic principles but for human flourishing.

The silence of students in AI discourse is deafening precisely because it speaks so loudly about the transformation already underway. Through McLuhan's lens, we see that this silence is not empty but full-full of institutional assumptions, technological determinisms, and environmental blindness. Breaking this silence requires more than token inclusion; it demands recognition that students must help create the very medium through which their education will be transformed. Only then can education avoid what McLuhan warned against: the numbness that comes from unconscious adaptation to new environments, the amputation that occurs when extension proceeds without awareness.

In the end, the 0.07% student voice in AI discourse stands as both symptom and warning. It reveals an educational environment already transformed by its own blindness, where those most affected by technological change are least able to shape it. But recognition, as McLuhan knew, is the first step toward agency. By seeing how the medium of AI discourse creates its own message of exclusion, educators can begin the crucial work of creating genuinely participatory environments-spaces where students don't just experience AI-mediated education but actively shape what that education becomes. The future of education depends not on the tools we create but on who participates in their creation. McLuhan would remind us: the medium is the message, and a medium without student voices sends a message we cannot afford to ignore.