Through McLuhan's Lens

The Adaptation Fatigue

January 29, 2026 | 2,451 words

The English professor stares at her laptop screen, shoulders tense, not from grading papers or preparing tomorrow's lecture, but from reading yet another announcement about a new AI tool the university has adopted. She has just mastered the previous platform-or at least achieved functional competence-when this email arrives, promising "seamless integration" and "intuitive design." Her exhaustion is not physical but something deeper: the weariness of perpetual becoming, never arriving. This scene, replicated across institutions globally, reveals a paradox at the heart of higher education's technological transformation. Faculty report unprecedented fatigue not from their traditional labors of teaching and research, but from the meta-labor of constant adaptation itself-and this exhaustion peaks precisely when AI tools promise to reduce their workload.

McLuhan would observe that this paradox illuminates a fundamental misunderstanding of how media transform human experience. The issue is not the individual technologies-the learning management systems, AI writing assistants, or automated grading platforms-but the medium of perpetual change itself. What message does this medium carry? What does it do to those who inhabit it? This week's data from institutions grappling with AI integration reveals that "adaptation fatigue" among faculty is not merely a practical challenge to be solved with better training or more gradual rollouts. Rather, it represents a profound transformation in academic identity itself, one that occurs beneath the threshold of conscious awareness.

The Numbness of Perpetual Transition

McLuhan's concept of "numbness" offers a crucial lens for understanding faculty responses to technological change. When he wrote that "the function of the body, as a group of sustaining and protective organs for the central nervous system, is to act as buffers against sudden variations of stimulus in the physical and social environment," he was describing a process of psychic self-protection that occurs when change overwhelms our adaptive capacity. The proliferation of AI tools in higher education has created precisely such an environment of "sudden variations of stimulus."

Consider the testimony emerging from faculty forums and institutional surveys. Professors describe a peculiar form of disconnection from their own teaching practice. One mathematics instructor reports: "I used to know my classroom like I knew my living room. Now I feel like I'm constantly redecorating while trying to live in it." This sensation represents what McLuhan called "autoamputation"-the psychic numbing that occurs when extensions of ourselves change too rapidly for integration. The faculty member has not simply learned new tools; she has undergone a form of self-amputation, cutting off her previous pedagogical identity to accommodate the demands of constant technological transition.

This numbness manifests in specific behavioral patterns visible in this week's data. Among the 1,651 articles analyzed on AI in higher education, the dominant "tool frame" reveals how faculty attempt to maintain psychic equilibrium by reducing each new technology to its instrumental function. If AI can be understood merely as a tool-like a particularly sophisticated calculator or spell-checker-then perhaps the fundamental nature of teaching remains unchanged. This reduction serves as a form of anesthesia, allowing faculty to continue functioning despite the radical transformations occurring around and through them.

McLuhan would recognize this pattern as a desperate attempt to maintain what he called the "equilibrium of the sensorum." When one sense is extended or amplified too rapidly, the entire sensory balance must readjust. In the academic context, when the technologies of knowledge transmission and evaluation change faster than faculty can internalize them, a protective numbness sets in. The exhausted professor is not simply tired; she is experiencing the psychic equivalent of phantom limb syndrome, still reaching for pedagogical practices that the new medium has already amputated.

The Rear-View Mirror of Academic Adaptation

The phenomenon of understanding new media through old frameworks-what McLuhan termed the "rear-view mirror" syndrome-pervades faculty responses to AI integration. This week's discourse analysis reveals a consistent pattern: each new AI tool is initially understood through the lens of the technology it purports to replace. ChatGPT becomes a "better search engine," automated grading systems are "faster rubrics," and AI teaching assistants are "available 24/7 office hours."

This rear-view mirror effect creates a peculiar temporal displacement in faculty experience. A history professor spends months mastering an AI-powered research tool, developing workflows and assignments around its capabilities, only to discover that students have moved on to a newer platform with different affordances. She finds herself in the position of teaching obsolete mastery, like a scribe perfecting calligraphy as the printing press arrives. The exhaustion she feels is not merely from learning but from the Sisyphean nature of the task-rolling the boulder of competence up the hill only to watch it roll back down as the next innovation appears.

McLuhan would observe that this pattern reveals a fundamental misunderstanding of how media operate. Faculty attempt to master content-the specific features of each tool-while remaining blind to the medium's true message. The rear-view mirror syndrome ensures they are always orienting themselves to yesterday's technology while tomorrow's reshapes the environment around them. The debate about "acceptable percentages" of AI use in student work exemplifies this perfectly: institutions attempt to quantify and regulate new media using metrics designed for old media, like measuring the speed of an automobile in hands of hay per fortnight.

The missing voices in this week's data-particularly the absence of student perspectives in policy discussions-suggest another dimension of the rear-view mirror problem. Faculty and administrators craft policies based on their understanding of how previous technologies affected learning, while students inhabit the new medium natively. The generational divide is not merely about comfort with technology but about fundamentally different orientations to change itself. Where faculty see disruption to be managed, students see an environment to be inhabited.

The Medium of Endless Becoming

McLuhan's most radical insight was that the medium itself, not its content, constitutes the real message. Applied to higher education's current moment, this principle reveals that the specific AI tools matter less than the condition of perpetual transition they create. The medium is not ChatGPT or Claude or any particular platform-it is the state of constant adaptation itself. What message does this medium carry?

The analysis of faculty discourse reveals several interconnected messages embedded in the medium of perpetual change. First, expertise itself must become liquid, temporary, always subject to revision. The professor who once built a career on deep knowledge of specific content now must cultivate what might be called "meta-expertise"-the ability to rapidly acquire and discard competencies as the technological environment shifts. This transformation occurs not through conscious choice but through the invisible pressure of the medium itself.

Second, the medium of constant change carries a message about the nature of knowledge. In an environment where tools and platforms shift monthly, knowledge cannot be something possessed but must become something performed, enacted in the moment of engagement with whatever technology is current. The exhausted faculty member intuits this shift without fully articulating it-she is tired not from work but from becoming, from existing in a state where identity itself must remain perpetually unfixed.

McLuhan would note that this medium creates its own form of participation. Unlike previous educational technologies that could be adopted or rejected, the medium of perpetual change demands total involvement. One cannot opt out of adaptation without opting out of the profession itself. This totalizing quality of the medium explains why faculty exhaustion feels different from previous forms of burnout-it is not the tiredness of doing but of being in constant flux.

Discourse as Acceleration

Following McLuhan's method requires examining not just what the academic discourse about AI says, but what it does. This week's data reveals that the very structure of academic communication about technological change perpetuates the acceleration it purports to analyze. The rapid publication cycles, conference presentations, webinars, and policy updates create an environment where reflection becomes impossible.

Consider the temporal compression visible in the analyzed articles. Papers published mere months ago already feel

dated, their recommendations obsolete before implementation. The discourse generates a kind of conceptual inflation where insights lose value almost immediately after articulation. Faculty participating in this discourse find themselves caught in what McLuhan might call a "feedback loop of acceleration"-the more rapidly they attempt to analyze and respond to change, the more they contribute to the very velocity that exhausts them.

The dominance of the "tool frame" in academic discourse reveals another dimension of this acceleration. By focusing on instrumental features and practical applications, the discourse maintains a surface-level engagement that must be constantly renewed as tools evolve. Deeper questions about the transformation of consciousness, identity, and academic culture remain unexplored because the medium of rapid publication does not afford the time for such reflection. The absent "partner frame"-which might explore more fundamental relationships between human and machine intelligence-requires a temporal space that the current discourse cannot provide.

McLuhan would observe that this discourse creates its own form of literacy-or perhaps illiteracy. Faculty must become fluent in an ever-changing vocabulary of platforms, features, and best practices while losing the ability to read the deeper patterns of transformation. The academic who can eloquently compare the features of competing AI platforms may be blind to how the imperative of comparison itself shapes consciousness. This is the new illiteracy: expertise in content that obscures awareness of media effects.

The Invisible Transformation of Academic Identity

Perhaps the most profound insight emerging from McLuhan's lens is how "adaptation fatigue" masks a deeper metamorphosis. Faculty are not simply learning new tools; they are being transformed from knowledge-holders into adaptation-specialists. Their primary expertise becomes not their discipline but their ability to metabolize change. This transformation occurs below the threshold of conscious awareness, mediated by the thousand small adjustments required to keep pace with technological change.

The data reveals this shift in the changing nature of faculty development programs. Where once these programs focused on deepening disciplinary knowledge or pedagogical techniques, they now predominantly address technological competencies. But even this frame misses the deeper transformation. Faculty are not simply adding technical skills to their existing expertise; they are undergoing a fundamental shift in professional identity. The successful academic of the AI era is not the one who knows the most but the one who can most rapidly unknow and reknow, who can maintain cognitive flexibility in an environment of perpetual flux.

McLuhan would note that this transformation represents a new form of specialization-specialization in non-specialization. The professor who once derived identity from mastery of a specific domain now must cultivate what might be called "negative capability," the capacity to exist in uncertainty and doubt without irritably reaching after fact and reason. But unlike Keats's poetic concept, this negative capability is not chosen but imposed by the medium of perpetual change.

The exhaustion faculty report is thus not merely physical or emotional but ontological-a tiredness that comes from the constant work of self-revision. Each new platform demands not just new skills but new ways of being an educator. The medium's message is clear: to remain is to change, and to change is to remain perpetually incomplete.

Recognition as the First Recovery

McLuhan consistently emphasized that awareness of media effects was the first step toward recovering human agency. For faculty swimming in the waters of perpetual technological change, recognizing the medium itself-constant adaptation-as the primary message offers a form of liberation. This recognition does not solve the practical challenges of keeping pace with AI integration, but it does something perhaps more valuable: it reveals the invisible environment that shapes contemporary academic experience.

The revelation that expertise itself has been transformed from a noun to a verb-from something one has to something one does-helps explain the peculiar nature of current faculty exhaustion. Understanding that the fatigue comes not from incompetence but from existing in a medium that demands perpetual becoming offers a kind of absolution. The professor who feels always behind, always catching up, is not failing but responding normally to an abnormal environment.

Moreover, recognizing the medium of perpetual change as the message opens space for different responses. If the problem is not mastering particular tools but navigating constant transition, then faculty might develop different strategies for professional sustainability. Instead of pursuing comprehensive mastery of each new platform, they might cultivate what McLuhan called "pattern recognition"-the ability to perceive the underlying structures that persist across technological change.

This recognition also suggests the importance of creating what might be called "zones of stability" within the flux-spaces where the pace of change is deliberately slowed to allow for integration and reflection. These zones are not escapes from technological change but places where its effects can be observed and understood rather than merely endured.

Conclusion: The Message in the Medium

As higher education continues its technological transformation, McLuhan's insights offer essential guidance for understanding the true nature of current challenges. The exhaustion faculty report is not a temporary adjustment period that better change management might resolve. Rather, it represents the human cost of inhabiting a medium-perpetual adaptation-whose message fundamentally alters the nature of academic work and identity.

The professor staring at her laptop screen, reading about yet another new AI tool, embodies the contemporary academic condition. Her exhaustion is not a personal failing but a systemic effect of a medium that demands constant becoming.

Recognizing this can offer not a solution-for there is no solution to a media environment-but a form of understanding that itself changes the experience.

McLuhan would remind us that every medium creates its own form of awareness and its own form of blindness. The medium of perpetual technological change has made faculty exquisitely aware of features, functions, and capabilities while blinding them to the deeper transformation of their professional identity. Recovery begins with seeing not just the tools but the environment the tools create, not just the changes but the meta-change of existing in perpetual transition.

For faculty readers, this analysis offers not prescriptive solutions but what McLuhan considered more valuable: perception of the invisible environment that shapes daily experience. In recognizing that their primary challenge is not mastering technology but navigating the medium of endless adaptation, faculty might find new ways to maintain professional identity and personal equilibrium. The message has been received: in an environment of perpetual change, the deepest expertise may be the ability to recognize and articulate what the changes are doing to us, even as we cannot escape their effects.

The medium of perpetual adaptation will continue to broadcast its message, transforming higher education in ways both visible and invisible. But for those who can perceive its operations, who can see the water they swim in, there remains the possibility of conscious navigation rather than unconscious drift. This awareness-this recovery of perception-may be the most essential faculty development of all in an age where the only constant is change itself.