Through McLuhan's Lens

The Efficiency Trap

January 07, 2026 | 2,985 words

How AI's Promise to Save Time Has Created New Forms of Academic Labor

The marketing pitch was seductive in its simplicity: AI-powered grading tools would liberate faculty from the drudgery of marking papers, freeing precious hours for research and meaningful student engagement. Two years into this promised revolution, Professor Sarah Chen finds herself spending Sunday afternoons not grading essays, but meticulously crafting prompts for the AI grader, cross-checking its outputs for bias, responding to student appeals about algorithmic assessments, and teaching an entirely new unit on "ethical AI engagement" that didn't exist in her curriculum before. Her grading time hasn't decreased-it has transformed and, arguably, expanded.

This paradox repeats across higher education. The very tools marketed to reduce academic labor have spawned entirely new categories of work: prompt engineering workshops for faculty, AI literacy requirements for students, elaborate authentication protocols to verify human authorship, and endless committee meetings to develop "AI policies" that are obsolete before they're published. The efficiency revolution has delivered its opposite-a proliferation of new tasks that McLuhan would recognize as the inevitable result of focusing on a medium's content rather than its environmental effects.

Looking Forward Through the Rear-View Mirror

Marshall McLuhan warned that we understand new media through old frameworks, driving into the future while looking in the rear-view mirror. This tendency manifests starkly in higher education's approach to AI, where the dominant metric remains time-hours saved, tasks automated, efficiency gained. The discourse reveals this backward gaze: of 1,617 articles in a recent corpus analysis, 724 focus on education, yet the framing remains stubbornly instrumental. AI is a "tool" to be optimized, not an environment that has already transformed the landscape it promised to improve.

This rear-view perspective manifests in how institutions measure AI's impact. Administrators calculate hours saved on grading while missing the hours added in prompt engineering. They tout automated feedback systems while overlooking the new labor of teaching students to interpret and respond to algorithmic assessment. They celebrate efficiency gains in content delivery while remaining blind to the fundamental restructuring of what constitutes academic work itself.

The industrial framework through which we evaluate AI-input, output, efficiency-belongs to an era when education could be conceived as information transfer. McLuhan observed that such frameworks become particularly dangerous when applied to new media because they prevent us from seeing what's actually happening. The spreadsheet that shows "40% time savings on grading" cannot capture the qualitative transformation of what grading has become: no longer assessment but meta-assessment, evaluating not just student work but the AI's evaluation of student work.

Consider the proliferation of "AI committees" across universities. These bodies, tasked with developing policies for educational AI use, operate under the assumption that the right framework can harness AI's efficiency while mitigating its risks. Yet their very existence proves McLuhan's point about technological numbness-we create bureaucracy to manage what we cannot see. The committee meetings, policy drafts, and implementation guidelines don't represent mastery over AI but submission to its logic. Every hour spent defining "appropriate AI use" is an hour acknowledging that the medium has already redefined appropriateness itself.

The rear-view mirror effect extends to how we conceptualize student learning. Universities rush to create "AI literacy" programs modeled on earlier digital literacy initiatives, missing how AI has already transformed literacy itself. The student who uses ChatGPT to brainstorm essay topics isn't lacking traditional literacy-they're practicing a new form that makes the distinction between human and machine cognition increasingly meaningless. Yet educational discourse remains fixed on detection and prevention, as if maintaining pre-AI categories of authentic work were possible or even desirable.

Extensions and Numbness

McLuhan understood media as "extensions of man"-technologies that amplify human capacities while simultaneously numbing us to their effects. AI in education exemplifies this paradox perfectly. It extends our capacity to provide feedback, assess learning, and personalize instruction, yet these very extensions create what McLuhan called "technological numbness"-an inability to perceive how the medium reshapes us.

The presence of AI tools in educational settings, regardless of actual usage, has already transformed academic labor. The professor who doesn't use AI grading still must address its existence-explaining why they choose human assessment, defending their methods against efficiency metrics, and managing student expectations shaped by AI availability elsewhere. The medium's message operates environmentally, changing the conditions of possibility for all educational work.

This numbness manifests in the emergence of new forms of labor that feel natural, even inevitable. "Prompt engineering" has become a required faculty skill seemingly overnight. The ability to craft precise instructions that yield useful AI outputs now determines teaching effectiveness as much as subject expertise. Yet this new requirement passes largely unexamined, naturalized as simply "how things work now." McLuhan would note that we've become numb to the absurdity of professors spending hours learning to communicate with machines in order to save time communicating with students.

The data reveals this numbness structurally: only 196 of 1,617 articles focus on actual AI tools, while the remainder discuss education, social impacts, and policy frameworks. We circle the phenomenon without engaging its core operations, suggesting a collective inability to perceive what AI actually does. The discourse fixates on managing AI's effects while remaining blind to how those effects have already restructured the academic enterprise.

AI detection software provides a perfect example of McLuhan's extension-numbness paradox. These tools, designed to identify AI-generated content, extend our capacity to police academic authenticity. Yet their very existence transforms what authenticity means. The student essay must now perform humanity in ways legible to algorithm detection-avoiding certain phrase patterns, incorporating deliberate imperfections, demonstrating the messiness that machines haven't yet learned to replicate. The extension of our detection capacity numbs us to how we're training students to write for machines rather than humans.

The "human touch" has become a premium service in this environment, another form of numbness to AI's effects. Office hours marketed as "AI-free zones," feedback guaranteed to be "personally crafted," assignments designed to be "AI-resistant"-these aren't temporary accommodations but permanent features of the new landscape. The labor of performing humanity, of proving that human attention still matters, adds hours to faculty workload that no efficiency metric captures.

The Instrumental Trap

The corpus analysis reveals a telling pattern: despite 724 education-focused articles, the dominant frame remains "tool" rather than "partner" or "threat." This instrumental view-AI as something to be wielded rather than something that wields us-constrains our ability to perceive its true effects. McLuhan would recognize this as classic technological determinism disguised as human agency. We believe we're using AI while it uses us to propagate its logic throughout educational systems.

The instrumental frame manifests in the persistent belief that better implementation will resolve AI's contradictions. If only we craft better prompts, develop smarter policies, train faculty more thoroughly, then AI will deliver its promised efficiency. This thinking mirrors what McLuhan observed about television-the focus on improving content quality while missing how the medium itself restructured human consciousness. With AI, we obsess over making it work better while missing how it has already worked to transform what "working" means in educational contexts.

The efficiency trap operates through this instrumental logic. Every solution to AI's inefficiencies creates new inefficiencies that require solutions. AI grading saves time but requires prompt engineering. Prompt engineering workshops save faculty trial-and-error but require scheduling and attendance. Standardized prompts save workshop time but require customization for disciplinary differences. Each efficiency gain spawns new forms of work, yet the instrumental frame prevents us from seeing this proliferation as anything other than temporary adjustment.

Consider the emergence of "AI ethics committees" across institutions. These bodies, tasked with developing responsible use policies, embody the instrumental trap perfectly. They operate under the assumption that ethical frameworks can govern AI use, missing how AI has already transformed what ethics means in educational contexts. The hours spent debating whether students should cite ChatGPT miss the larger point-the citation question only exists because AI has already restructured authorship itself.

The Missing Voices

McLuhan understood that who speaks about a medium shapes what it becomes. The corpus reveals a troubling gap: student voices remain largely absent from policy discussions about educational AI. This absence matters not because students might offer better solutions, but because their exclusion reveals how power operates through new media. Those most affected by AI's transformation of education have the least say in its implementation.

The "participatory design approaches" mentioned in the data matter precisely because they remain exceptional. Most AI implementation follows a top-down model-administrators pursuing efficiency, faculty managing consequences, students adapting to whatever emerges. McLuhan would recognize this pattern from every previous media transformation: those who control the medium's introduction control its message, while those who live within its effects struggle to articulate their experience.

Students inhabit an AI-saturated environment that faculty and administrators can barely perceive. They use AI not as a tool but as an environment-for brainstorming, drafting, revision, research, and countless micro-tasks that don't register in official discourse. Their academic work already assumes AI availability, yet policies continue to treat it as an optional addition rather than atmospheric condition. McLuhan's observation about students living "mythically and in depth" while education remains organized through "classified information" finds new relevance: students experience AI environmentally while institutions address it instrumentally.

The absence of student voices perpetuates the efficiency trap by preventing recognition of how AI has already transformed student labor. The contemporary student spends hours not just on traditional academic work but on AI prompt refinement, output customization, and careful humanization of AI-assisted work to avoid detection. These new forms of student labor remain invisible in efficiency calculations because those performing the labor don't participate in the discourse defining it.

Uniquely Human Contradictions

The corpus reveals a fundamental contradiction: institutions simultaneously pursue "AI-driven efficiency" while claiming to "cultivate uniquely human qualities." McLuhan would recognize this not as confusion but as clarity-the classic pattern of new media that amplify old goals while rewriting entire value systems. We use AI to achieve traditional efficiency while it transforms what we consider uniquely human.

This contradiction manifests in the schizophrenic nature of contemporary academic labor. The same professor expected to leverage AI for efficiency must also perform heightened humanity-offering the personal attention, creative insight, and emotional intelligence that machines cannot replicate. Yet this performance of humanity becomes another form of work, adding to rather than substituting for traditional academic labor.

The "uniquely human" discourse reveals our numbness to AI's effects. By constantly asserting what remains human, we acknowledge that the category itself is under threat. The professor who emphasizes their "human insight" in feedback, the assignment designed to require "human creativity," the assessment rubric that values "human connection"-these don't preserve pre-AI categories but create new ones. The human becomes a brand to be marketed rather than an assumed condition.

McLuhan understood that new media don't replace human qualities but transform what counts as human. The efficiency trap operates precisely through this transformation. Every attempt to preserve human uniqueness through contrast with AI creates new forms of labor: workshops on "maintaining humanity in the age of AI," assignments that explicitly require "human-only work," elaborate authentication procedures to verify human authorship. The work of being human has become work indeed.

The Message of the Medium

McLuhan's most famous assertion-"the medium is the message"-finds perfect expression in AI's transformation of higher education. The message isn't efficiency or its failure, but the complete restructuring of academic labor and value. AI's content (what it produces) matters less than its environmental effects (how it reorganizes educational possibility).

The efficiency trap reveals this environmental operation. By promising to save time, AI has transformed what time means in academic contexts. Time no longer measures simple duration but complex authenticities-time spent by humans versus machines, time saved versus time transformed, time efficient versus time meaningful. The professor who spends Sunday afternoon crafting AI prompts isn't wasting time but operating in a new temporal regime where efficiency requires meta-efficiency, where saving time demands spending time differently.

The statistical pattern in the corpus-724 articles on education but only 196 on actual tools-reveals how environmental effects overwhelm instrumental content. We talk around AI rather than about it because the environment resists direct perception. Like fish describing water, we struggle to articulate what has become atmospheric. The discourse proliferates precisely because the phenomenon escapes capture, generating endless commentary that circles but never lands.

McLuhan noted that new media create "huge collective surgery carried out on the social body." AI's surgery on higher education isn't additive but transformative. It doesn't simply add new tools to existing practices but transforms what practice means. The grading AI doesn't just grade-it redefines grading as algorithmic interaction. The writing AI doesn't just write-it redefines writing as prompt engineering. The detection AI doesn't just detect-it redefines authenticity as machine-legible performance.

Anti-Environmental Awareness

For faculty caught in the efficiency trap, McLuhan offers not solutions but sight. He called for "anti-environmental" awareness-the ability to perceive the water we swim in. This awareness doesn't resolve AI's contradictions but makes them visible as features rather than bugs of the new media environment.

The efficiency trap isn't something to solve but something to see. Every hour spent optimizing AI use, every workshop on prompt engineering, every committee meeting on AI policy-these aren't steps toward eventual efficiency but permanent features of the new landscape. The trap lies not in failing to achieve efficiency but in believing efficiency was ever the right goal.

Faculty development programs that promise to help professors "master AI" miss the point entirely. McLuhan would suggest that mastery is impossible when the medium has already mastered us. The question isn't how to make AI work properly for education but how to recognize that it's already working-transforming, restructuring, redefining what education means.

The practical implications of anti-environmental awareness are paradoxical. It suggests that resistance might lie not in better implementation but in conscious refusal to accept efficiency as education's primary value. The professor who acknowledges AI's time-saving potential but chooses time-intensive human interaction isn't being inefficient but asserting alternative values. The institution that measures success through student transformation rather than throughput metrics isn't behind the times but potentially ahead of them.

Beyond the Efficiency Trap

The discourse wants to debate whether AI is good or bad for efficiency. McLuhan would ask instead: What is the obsession with efficiency doing to education itself? The efficiency trap reveals efficiency as ideology-a way of seeing that prevents other ways of seeing. Every moment spent trying to make AI "work properly" for education is a moment not spent asking whether efficiency was ever the right goal.

The 1,617 articles in the corpus, with their distribution across education, social impacts, and tools, map the boundaries of our current blindness. We see AI's effects on education (724 articles) and society (373 articles) but struggle to perceive its actual operations (196 articles). This distribution suggests we're living through what McLuhan called the "numb" phase of media adoption-aware that something has changed but unable to articulate what.

For higher education, this numbness carries particular dangers. Universities have always balanced multiple goals-knowledge creation, student development, social mobility, cultural preservation. The efficiency trap threatens to collapse this multiplicity into a single metric. AI doesn't simply offer to make education more efficient; it redefines education as that which can be made efficient.

The path forward requires what McLuhan called "pattern recognition"-the ability to see the hidden ground beneath the obvious figures. The obvious figure is AI as tool for efficiency. The hidden ground is the complete transformation of academic labor, value, and possibility. Recognizing this pattern doesn't solve the efficiency trap but reveals it as one manifestation of a larger transformation.

Conclusion: Becoming What We Behold

As McLuhan knew, the medium's message isn't in what it says but in what it makes us become. In higher education's case, AI is turning us into efficiency auditors of our own obsolescence. Every metric of time saved, every calculation of productivity gained, every assessment of optimization achieved-these don't measure AI's success but our transformation into beings who can only think in such terms.

The professor spending Sunday afternoon on AI prompts isn't failing to achieve efficiency but succeeding at becoming what the medium demands-a hybrid of human and machine intelligence, performing meta-labor that no traditional category captures. The student carefully humanizing their AI-assisted essay isn't cheating but adapting to an environment where authenticity requires performance. The administrator calculating efficiency metrics isn't managing AI but being managed by its logic.

McLuhan offered no easy escapes from media effects, only the possibility of awareness. For faculty, this means recognizing that the efficiency trap isn't a problem to be solved but a condition to be understood. The new forms of labor-prompt engineering, AI literacy training, authenticity performance, human differentiation-aren't temporary adjustments but permanent features of the educational landscape.

The question facing higher education isn't whether AI will deliver on its efficiency promises but whether efficiency was ever the right promise to demand. McLuhan's framework reveals that by accepting efficiency as the metric, we've already accepted AI's deepest message-that education is a problem of optimization rather than transformation, of time saved rather than lives changed.

Perhaps the real revelation is this: the efficiency trap works perfectly. It keeps us so busy trying to save time that we never ask whether time-saving was the point. It focuses our attention on optimization while transformation proceeds unexamined. It makes us managers of our own obsolescence while believing we're masters of new tools.

For those with eyes to see, McLuhan's lens reveals AI not as education's solution or problem but as its mirror-reflecting back our deepest assumptions about what learning means, what teaching entails, and what universities are for. The efficiency trap catches not just our time but our imagination, constraining our ability to envision education as anything other than an efficiency problem waiting for a technological solution.

The medium has already delivered its message. The question is whether we can hear it above the noise of our own optimization.