Генеративное образование и трансформация университета: вызовы академической идентичности

Ж. В. МАРФИНА, П. А. ПИЛАВОВ

АННОТАЦИЯ

Введение. Актуальность исследования определяется необходимостью философского осмысления глобальных процессов трансформации образования в условиях генеративных технологий и искусственного интеллекта. Международные инициативы ООН, ЮНЕСКО, Совета Европы и Международной ассоциации университетов фиксируют переход от индустриальной модели передачи знаний к модели соучастия, где образование рассматривается как пространство совместного смыслопорождения человека и технологии. В российском контексте этот переход отражен в стратегических документах – Национальной стратегии развития искусственного интеллекта до 2030 г., Стратегии развития образования до 2035 г. и программе «Человек в цифровом мире» (НТИ), формирующих концепцию человекоцентричного цифрового будущего.

Цель исследования – раскрыть философско-антропологические основания феномена генеративного образования и определить его роль в трансформации академической идентичности современного университета.

Материалы и методы включают феноменологический, герменевтический и сравнительно-аналитический подходы, а также метод философской реконструкции антропологических структур познания в условиях симбиоза человека и искусственного интеллекта.

Результаты. Установлено, что генеративное образование представляет собой не технологическую инновацию, а новую онтологию знания, основанную на ко- агентности человека и алгоритмических систем. Университет перестает быть институтом трансляции знаний и превращается в герменевтическую экосистему, где преподаватель и студент выступают соавторами в процессе сотворения смыслов. Концепт проектной идентичности, предложенный в исследовании, описывает новую форму субъектности – деятельную, рефлексивную и этически ответственную.

Заключение. Современная философия образования входит в фазу онтологического поворота: от эпистемологии владения к онтологии соучастия, в рамках которой формируется постантропоцентрический, но гуманистически ориентированный тип мышления. Генеративное образование становится пространством становления онтологического гуманизма соприсутствия, где человек, техника и культура объединяются в единую структуру смыслообразующего бытия.

КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА

генеративное образование, философия образования, академическая идентичность, проектная идентичность, университет, искусственный интеллект, онтология соучастия

Для цитирования: Марфина Ж. В., Пилавов П. А. Генеративное образование и трансформация университета: вызовы академической идентичности // Перспективы науки и образования. 2026. № 5. С. 44–56. https://doi.org/10.32744/pse.2026.5.3

Поступила: 23.04.2025 | Одобрена: 12.07.2026 | Опубликована: 31.10.2026

OPEN ACCESS

Лицензия «С указанием авторства — С сохранением условий». Позволяет перерабатывать, исправлять и развивать произведения при условии указания авторства и лицензирования производных работ на аналогичных условиях.

PERSPECTIVES OF SCIENCE AND EDUCATION
PSEJOURNAL.WORDPRESS.COM
SCIENTIFIC ARTICLE |

Generative Education and the Transformation of the University: Challenges to Academic Identity

ZH. V. MARFINA, P.A. PILAVOV

ABSTRACT

Introduction. The relevance of this research stems from the urgent need for philosophical reflection on the global transformation of education under the influence of generative technologies and artificial intelligence. International initiatives led by the United Nations, UNESCO, the Council of Europe, and the International Association of Universities register the transition from an industrial pattern of knowledge transmission to a complicity pattern, in which education is viewed as a domain of joint meaning generation between the human and technology. In the Russian context, this transition is reflected in such key strategic documents as the National Strategy for the Development of Artificial Intelligence until 2030, the Strategy for the Development of Education until 2035, and "the Human in the Digital World programme" (National Technology Initiative, NTI). Collectively, these initiatives formulate the vision of a human-centred digital future.

The aim of the research is to disclose the philosophical and anthropological foundations of the phenomenon of generative education and to determine its role in reshaping the academic identity of the contemporary university.

The methodological framework integrates phenomenological, hermeneutic, and comparative-analytical approaches, supplemented by the method of the philosophical reconstruction of anthropological structures of cognition within the emerging human- AI symbiosis.

Results. The study demonstrates that generative education is not merely a technological innovation but rather a new ontology of knowledge, grounded in the co-agency of human and algorithmic systems. The university thus ceases to function as an institution of knowledge transmission and becomes a hermeneutic ecosystem, where teachers and students act as co-authors in the process of meaning generation. The concept of project identity, introduced in this study, describes a new mode of subjectivity—active, reflexive, and ethically accountable—that emerges within the generative environment.

Conclusion. Contemporary philosophy of education is undergoing an ontological turn: a movement from an epistemology of possession toward an ontology of cooperation, within which a post-anthropocentric yet humanistically oriented mindset is taking shape. Generative education thereby becomes the locus of what may be termed an ontological humanism of co-presence, wherein the human, the technological, and the cultural converge into a unified structure of meaning-bearing existence.

KEYWORDS

generative education; philosophy of education; academic identity; project identity; university; artificial intelligence; ontology of participation

For Citation: Marfina, Zh. V., & Pilavov, P. A. (2026). Generative Education and the Transformation of the University: Challenges to Academic Identity. *Perspektivy nauki i obrazovania = Perspectives of Science and Education*, (5), 44–56. https://doi.org/10.32744/pse.2026.5.3

Received: 23 April 2026 | Approved: 12 July 2026 | Published: 31 October 2026

OPEN ACCESS

This is an open access article distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike International License (CC-BY-SA 4.0) that allows others to share the work with an acknowledgement of the work's authorship and initial publication in this journal

INTRODUCTION

Contemporary philosophy of education is emerging within the horizon of global civilisational transformations initiated by international and national programmes that seek to reconceptualise the aims, agents, and forms of educational process. In the early twenty-first century, educational thought increasingly gravitates towards a metaphysics of co-participation, in which the human being, culture, and technology appear not as antinomies but as mutually conditioning modes of existence.

The international initiatives of the United Nations—and above all the UNESCO programmes *Incheon Declaration. Education 2030: Towards Inclusive and Equitable Quality Education (2015)* [1], *Futures of Education: Learning to Become (2021)* [2], and *Reimagining Our Futures Together (2022)* [3]—mark a decisive transition from an industrial, knowledge-centric pattern to a paradigm of co-generation of meaning, wherein education is understood as a process of anthropological and cultural formation. These documents introduce into philosophical discourse the notions of "sustainable development of human potential," the "ecology of cognition," and "integrated reason" as foundational articulations of the future of education.

Developing the traditions of educational humanism, the Council of Europe, in its *Education Strategy 2024–2030: 'Learners First' (2023)* [4], elaborates the concept of democratic competence and "responsible civic reason," emphasizing that in the digital epoch education must cultivate not only knowledge but also the capacity for ethical distinction. Likewise, the International Association of Universities (IAU), in its declarations for 2020–2030 [5], conceives the university as a "mediating institution of ethical responsibility," being in an ongoing dialogue with society, technology and culture.

At the national scale, these tendencies are reflected in a range of Russian strategic and philosophical-educational initiatives oriented toward rethinking the place of the human being and the role of knowledge in digital civilization. Among the most significant are the Presidential Decree of the Russian Federation No. 490 of 10 October 2019, *"On the Development of Artificial Intelligence in the Russian Federation" (as amended on 15 February 2024) [6], the Strategy for the Development of Education in the Russian Federation until 2036 [7], and the interdepartmental programme "The Human Being in the Digital World"* within the National Technology Initiative (NTI) [8]. These documents introduce into educational policy the central idea of a "human-centred digital future" presupposing the preservation of subjectivity, cultural identity, and value-based personal autonomy in the emergent environment of artificial intelligence and generative technologies.

The initiatives of the Russian Academy of Education, the Russian Philosophical Society, and the Presidential Council for Digital Ethics further underscore the need for philosophical reflection on the anthropological risks of digitalization. In the strategic priorities of the Russian Academy of Education, education is conceived as an ontological practice of human self-formation within an algorithmic reality, in which the university functions not merely as a transmitter of knowledge but as a semantic counterweight to technocentrism, ensuring the recovery of the humanistic foundations of cognitive activity.

In this respect, international and Russian initiatives recognize that contemporary education is losing its traditional institutional boundaries and is becoming a field-like cultural phenomenon: a mode of existential co-presence of the human and the technological. It is against this backdrop that the phenomenon of generative education arises. Generative education does not constitute a methodological innovation but rather a new form of ontological experience, wherein knowledge is not transmitted but generated through the co-operation of human and machine intelligence.

The phenomenon of generative education represents a new ontological and cultural-epistemological reality in which teaching process and knowledge production cease to be the transmission of sustainable meaning and instead turns into the dynamic co-generation of meaning by human and non-human cognitive agents. Generative education represents not merely a technological novelty in pedagogy, but a fundamentally distinct pattern of the being of knowledge, in which cognition becomes distributed, non-linear, and interactive [9]. In contrast to classical educational models, generative education is based not in reproduction but in the generation of meanings arising through networked interaction among multiple actors—human and algorithmic, individual and collective, real and digital.

This new educational paradigm profoundly transforms the university as a cultural institution which, for centuries, has served as the custodian of rationality, truth, and methodological rigour. Under the influence of generative technologies, the university relinquishes the attributes of a closed corporation of knowledge and turns into a hybrid intellectual ecosystem in which the distinctions between the subject and the environment, the author and the instrument, the teacher and the learner become increasingly permeable. The university—historically conceived as a locus ratio, a privileged site of concentrated human reason—becomes a space of co-generation of meaning, wherein cognitive activity unfolds through the interplay of human and algorithmic agents [10]. Within this environment, a new epistemological and axiological architecture emerges, requiring a reevaluation of authorship, originality, responsibility, and educational subjectivity [11].

Consequently, the university confronts a multiplicity of challenges to academic identity at the most fundamental levels of its existence. These include ontological challenges, pertaining to the altered status of the subject of cognition; epistemological challenges, involving the redefinition of authorship, originality, and the criteria of epistemic validity; axiological challenges, entailing the reformulation of the humanistic values of education; ethical challenges, arising from the tension between human autonomy and machine productivity; and institutional challenges, requiring a restructurization of the traditional organisation of the university community. Academic identity—which formerly guaranteed the stability of cognitive and axiological frameworks—becomes multiple, hybrid, and projective, taking shape at the intersection of the human and the algorithmic, the individual and the networked, the creative and the technical [12].

The discussion of these challenges is impossible without recoursing to philosophical anthropology and the philosophy of culture, which provide the conceptual resources necessary for analyzing the evolving image of the human being and his or her participation in cognitive processes. Philosophical anthropology reveals the human being as one who maintains identity by refracting the technological within the horizon of self-understanding, thereby preserving the boundaries of the human in the age of hybrid thought [13]. The philosophy of culture elucidates the ways in which new technological forms of knowledge are incorporated into the symbolic order, transforming the value foundations of education and reshaping the cultural mechanisms of meaning transmission [14]. Only the synthesis of these perspectives allows us to discern the internal logic of generative education as an anthropocultural process in which new forms of subjectivity and new foundations for the humanitarian knowledge emerge.

Accordingly, the research problem lies in the need for a philosophica- anthropological and cultural analysis of the multiple challenges to the academic identity of the contemporary university posed by generative technologies, and in identifying the ontological and axiological mechanisms capable of sustaining the humanistic dimension of education within algorithmic regimes of knowledge production.

The aim of the study is to develop the philosophical and methodological foundations for analysing generative education as a factor reshaping academic identity and to propose a conceptual model of the university’s projective identity related to the ontology of co-creativity and the principles of hybrid rationality.

The objectives of the study include:

1. To analyse the nature of generative education as a phenomenon shaping a new cultural and cognitive environment;

2. To identify the mechanisms through which the university is transformed under the impact of generative technologies;

3. To articulate the multi-layered challenges to academic identity (ontological, epistemological, axiological, ethical, and institutional);

4. To substantiate a philosophical-anthropological conception of projective identity that reveals the conditions for reconciling the human and the algorithmic within educational experience.

The object of the study is academic identity as a philosophical and cultural phenomenon constituted within the university. The subject of the study is the philosophical foundations of the transformation of academic identity within the context of generative education. The scientific

novelty of the research lies in developing a philosophical-anthropological interpretation of generative education as an ontological event that reconfigures the structure of cognition and the modes of subject existence within academic culture, as well as in introducing the concept of the university's projective identity as a new form of human participation in the co- generation of meaning.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Addressing the research problem—the philosophical-anthropological interpretation of the challenges to the academic identity of a university in the era of generative education—required the construction of a complex methodological framework that brings together hermeneutic, phenomenological, and comparative- analytical approaches, supplemented by the principles of the philosophy of culture and philosophical anthropology.

The methodological design of the study proceeded from the recognition that generative education constitutes a multi-level anthropo-cultural phenomenon that cannot be captured by empirical descriptions of technological or institutional changes alone. Accordingly, the investigation unfolds as a philosophical reconstruction of the new forms of subjectivity and cognitive agency that arise within the symbiosis of the human being and artificial intelligence—a reconstruction that aims to disclose the internal semantic structures, not merely the external effects of technological transformation [15].

Within the phenomenological component of the method, the attention was focused on analyzing the experience of cognition as it unfolds within generative practices. Through phenomenological reduction, it became possible to delineate the altered modes of intentionality and self-presentation characteristic of a subject who thinks in the co-presence of a non-human cognitive partner. This perspective enabled an interpretation of generative education as a mode of embodied thinking in which the boundaries between the internal and the external, the personal and the technical, become fluid, and in which the very act of thinking assumes the character of interaction [16].

The hermeneutic method was employed to analyze the texts, discourses, and cultural narratives that shape contemporary conceptions of knowledge, truth, and identity within the university. By juxtaposing philosophical models of cognition— from classical rationalistic to posthumanistic—the study reconstructed the transformation of academic identity and isolated those of its invariants that persist despite the digital and algorithmic medialisation of intellectual practices.

The comparative-analytical method was used to contrast historical models of the university (scholastic, research, humanist, and digital) with the emergent model of the generative university. This approach made it possible to reveal the internal logic of the evolution of university identity: a trajectory from the autonomous knower to the projective subject operating within a networked environment in which the boundaries between the production, the consumption, and the reflection of knowledge are increasingly permeable [17].

The analysis also drew upon the works of contemporary philosophers and theorists of education who examine the interaction between the human and artificial intelligence within cognitive practices (including M. Peters, B., L. Floridi, V. Lektorsky). An intertextual analysis allowed the study not only to articulate the divergences between technocentric and anthropocentric approaches but also to propose a synthetic philosophical model of generative education as a cultural form in which the human and the machinic participate in a unified process of meaning formation [18].

In addition, elements of structural-anthropological analysis were employed to conceptualise generative education as a distinctive cultural structure in which the functions of a mediator of knowledge, a custodian of tradition, and a generator of meaning are distributed among multiple agents: the individual, the collective, the machine system and the institution. This approach made it possible to identify the mechanisms through which academic identity is transformed and a new model of educational interaction takes shape [19].

Thus, the methodological strategy of the research was not aimed at constructing empirical models or establishing quantitative correlations, but rather at philosophical modelling the anthropological situation in which university education, as a socio-cultural practice, enters a phase of ontological reconfiguration. The research problem was addressed through the systematic philosophical

elucidation of the meanings, forms, and structures of academic identity that emerge in the era of generative technologies—through their reconstruction, interpretation, and conceptualisation within the framework of philosophical–anthropological discource [20].

RESULTS

The research has made it possible to conceptualise the phenomenon of generative education as an ultimate manifestation of the transformation of cognitive experience within post-digital culture, and to articulate its philosophical- anthropological foundations in conjunction with the institutional and ontological reconfiguration of the university [21]. The obtained results reveal not merely pedagogical but, above all, ontological and anthropological dimensions of the ongoing transformations, marking a shift from the classical paradigm of education understood as the transmission of knowledge to a model of education understood as an event of co-presence between the human being and neural network-based cognitive systems.

1. Generative education as a new form of ontological experience

For the first time, the research provides a philosophical definition of generative education as a mode of co-existence of the human being and the artificial intelligence within the act of cognition—an act in which knowledge relinquishes its status as a ready-made content and becomes a process of meaning generation [22]. Generative education constitutes a form of ontological experience in which the relation between the human and the machinic is not external but takes the form of *co-presence*, where meaning arises as an event of interaction.

Thus, knowledge loses its object-like character and acquires a processual mode. The transition from an epistemology of possession to an epistemology of participation entails that the subject of cognition ceases to be a bearer of knowledge in the classical sense and becomes, instead, a mediator of meaning formation, wherein human thinking and algorithmic procedure enter into dynamic correlation.

This understanding discloses the properly philosophical nature of education: it is not merely a pedagogical phenomenon but a mode of anthropogenesis through which culture affirms a new form of human presence in a world filled with technical mediators [23]. Generative education, therefore, cannot be reduced to methodology; it is the ultimate expression of a cultural dynamic in which the cognitive, the technological, and the anthropological converge into a single ontological continuum. The university as a transitional structure: nodes of transformation

The transition to generative education exposed the internal structure of university transformation. The university relinquishes its former identity as the *locus ratio*, the space in which truth was concentrated, and becomes an institution whose mode of being is defined not by the accumulation of knowledge but by its perpetual reproduction within networked interactions [24].

Philosophical analysis has therefore made it possible to identify several key transformational nodes that determine the nature of this reconfiguration.

First, the university as an educational site has lost its topological determinacy. The post-pandemic shift towards hybrid forms of learning has dissolved the boundaries between space and presence. The act of learning now takes place within a dispersed cognitive environment, where the interaction of human beings, algorithms, and digital infrastructures forms a new mode of communication. The university ceases to be a place in the physical sense and becomes an *event of a dialogue*, in which the educational process becomes the mode of co-generation of meaning.

Second, the university as a mechanism of accumulation and transmission of knowledge has changed its functions. Algorithmic systems are capable of collecting, classifying, and processing information with the speed and scale unattainable by human beings; as a consequence, the university loses its epistemic monopoly. Its mission shifts from the production of the content of knowledge to a hermeneutic function: the cultivation of interpretation, critical assessment and ethical filtering of the knowledge being produced [25]. The university becomes not an archive of truth but a space of its ongoing interpretation, where human reason preserves primacy in the domain of meaning and value reflection.

Third, the university as a methodological structure has entered a phase of internal crisis. Generative technologies not simply supplement but also alter the very logic of scientific thinking. Research activity, partially delegated to artificial intelligence, gives rise to a new form of subjectivity—a distributed cognitive subject—for whom method becomes a field of cooperation [26]. Consequently, the task of the university is not merely to teach methods of cognition but to preserve the capacity for methodological self-reflection, which maintains a proportionate relation between human thinking and machine modelling.

Taken together, these transformations indicate that the university ceases to be a locus of the representation of knowledge and becomes a *processual form of culture*, in which truth is not stored but enacted.

2. Academic identity as a philosophical problem

The transformation of the university's structure exposes challenges to academic identity that cannot be adequately explained in sociological or organisational terms, for they concern the very foundations of the human way of "being in the world of knowledge" [27].

The **ontological** dimension of these challenges lies in the fact that the subject of knowledge is no longer the autonomous centre of cognition. The subject's position is determined not through the possession of knowledge but through participation in a distributed cognitive network. This change undermines the traditional category of authorship, based on the primacy of an individual mind, and requires rethinking of the structure of subjectivity itself.

The **epistemological** dimension of the crisis concerns the erosion of the notion of originality. Algorithmic co-authorship produces texts in which the boundaries between the contribution of the human and that of the machinic cannot be sharply delineated. Truth ceases to be the outcome of an individual cognitive act and becomes a process unfolding within the hermeneutic interaction of multiple cognitive agents.

The **axiological** dimension of academic identity challenge concerns the undermining of the humanistic foundation of education. A university oriented towards efficiency and outcome risks to lose the value dimension wherein education functioned as a means of cultivating the subject's inner autonomy [28]. Generative education, by contrast, reveals the need to return to value reflection: it requires the understanding of the human being perceived not as a carrier of competencies but as a being capable of self-determination within a technologically mediated world.

The **ethical** dimension emerges in the transformation of the structure of responsibility. A phenomenon of "distributed responsibility" arises, in which the boundaries between an action and its consequence, the author and the instrument, become fluid. Ethical norms must be reconceived not as external constraints but as a mode of self-reflection through which the subject recognises his or her entanglement with a multiplicity of cognitive agents.

The **institutional** dimension of the crisis is expressed in the need to redefine the mission of the university itself. The university, as a social institution, loses its monopoly on the production of knowledge and must become an institution of hermeneutic mediation, wherein knowledge is interpreted and ethically validated. Its role is not to produce truth but to maintain the *horizon of its possible understanding*.

These challenges constitute an integrated system in which academic identity ceases to be a status and becomes a process. The person within the university is no longer a "scholar," a "teacher," or a "student" in the classical sense, but a participant in a field of meaning genesis, where identity exists only as a project continually reassembled in acts of thinking and interaction.

3. Projective identity as a form of anthropological response

The results of the research allow the contemporary state of the university to be interpreted as a transition from a substantial to a projective identity of the academic subject. Projective identity is not given but constituted within the process of thinking and interaction; it does not precede the action but arises from it [29].

Projective identity presupposes that the human being preserves his or her place in the cognitive process not by excluding artificial intelligence but by integrating it into the structure of one's own

thinking. The human self becomes not an antipode to the technological but a form of its critical appropriation. This mode of subjectivity is both ethical and epistemological: it maintains the possibility of discernment and evaluation while preserving the capacity for co-operation.

Thus, projective identity does not signal the loss of humanism but its reconfiguration. Humanism in the age of generative education ceases to be anthropocentric and becomes dialogical, for the human being asserts himself or herself not through opposition to technology but through the capacity to be related to it.

4. The university as a hermeneutic and ethical structure

Taken together, the findings indicate that in the age of generative technologies the university retains cultural legitimacy only in case it understands itself not as a "factory of knowledge" but as a hermeneutic and ethical structure [30]. Its task is not to produce information but to sustain the *horizon of meaning* within which the distinction between the true and the false, the human and the technological, the valuable and the merely functional, remains intelligible.

In this sense, the university recovers its philosophical vocation: it becomes a space in which culture reflects upon its own modes of existence within the world of knowledge. The university does not simply adapt to digital conditions; it becomes a *laboratory of understanding*, in which the meaning of the "human" is continually reenacted under conditions of technological mediation.

Generative education, therefore, is not a pedagogical trend but a metaphysical indicator of an epoch in which a human being is compelled to redefine his or her place within the structure of being. The university, insofar as it remains a centre of culture, must become the space of this self-definition—a locus of philosophical hermeneutics in which cognition is inseparable from understanding, and knowledge is closely connected with responsibility.

DISCUSSION

A comparison of the findings with contemporary philosophical and educational research suggests that the phenomenon of generative education does not merely forms a new pedagogical model but establishes a meta-theoretical framework of humanistic synthesis within which the very foundations of human cognition are rethought. In contrast to instrumental and pragmatic models of digital learning, generative education may be understood as a philosophical ontology of interaction, in which the cognitive act is conceived not as a transfer of information but as a process of co-being and co-creation of meaning. Within this context, several interrelated and well-grounded theses emerge from the present research.

First, the cognitive dimension of generative education is expressed in the transformation of the very nature of knowledge. Contemporary philosophers of education [31] state that knowledge is ceasing to be an object of accumulation and is increasingly revealed as a process of joint meaning construction. We agree with authors such as Peters, Jandrić, and Barnett, who consider knowledge as a process of collaborative sense-making. The present research confirms and specifies this thesis by showing that generative education actualises a shift from an epistemology of possession to an epistemology of participation. Knowledge is no longer produced by an isolated subject but arises within a network of interactions between the human, the algorithmic, and the cultural environment. Within this configuration, cognitive activity acquires the character of a dialogue rather than a hierarchy: meaning is born in the process of *co-operation* rather than in the act of solitary cognition.

Secondly, the ethical dimension of generative education is connected with the need to develop new forms of responsibility in terms of cognitive and technological interdependence. As Luciano Floridi showed in his conception of the "infosphere" [31], the human being becomes an informational agent (an inforg[a]), existing within a field of data in which every action has ontological consequences. Our findings are consonant with this view of the human as an informational agent. The study extends this idea by stating that generative education gives rise to the ethics of co-participation: the cognising

[a] The term "**inforg**" (from *informational organism*) was introduced by L. Floridi to denote informationally embodied organisms—entities that exist within the infosphere and are constituted by information. Inforgs may be either natural or artificial agents, including hybrid forms of interaction between human beings and digital devices.

subject is responsible not only for the veracity of knowledge but also for the modes of interaction with non-human agents, algorithms, networks, systems of artificial intelligence. The ethical component of generative education thus becomes a structural element of cognitive activity itself: the act of learning is at once the act of co-being and the act of moral choice.

Thirdly, the cultural dimension manifests itself in the fact that generative education establishes a new form of cultural mediation between the human and the technology. In contrast to technocentric approaches that treat culture as a superstructure over technology, the present research interprets culture as a mediating environment that enables symbolic communication between the human and the algorithmic. This idea resonates with the hermeneutic philosophy of language [32], according to which meaning resides neither in the text nor in the subject but in the event of their encounter—a view that accords with both Bibikhin and Ricoeur [33]. Generative education reproduces this hermeneutic structure: technology becomes a language through which the human being enters into a dialogue with the world, and culture becomes the space in which this dialogue acquires meaning.

Fourthly, the existential dimension of generative education lies in its capacity to restore to the human being an experience of being present in the world that has been eroded by the digitalisation of thinking. As Eastern and continental philosophical traditions have shown—Nishida [34], Nishitani [35], and Khoruzhiy [36] among them—being cannot be reduced to function; it discloses itself in co-being, in encounter with the other. Generative education, as interpreted in this research, embodies precisely this type of presence: the human being does not lose himself or herself in technological space, but discovers a new way of being within it—through the collaborative creation of meanings in which AI appears not as a threat to autonomy but as a mirror of human self-understanding.

Taken together, these arguments indicate that generative education represents a new philosophy of the relation between human beings and technology, in which cognition is understood as a form of ontological *co-existence*. The human being, the algorithm, and the cultural environment form an integral system in which cognitive, ethical, cultural, and existential dimensions are interwoven in a single process of meaning-formation. Such a position makes it possible to move beyond both technological reductionism and humanistic isolationism by proposing a model of an ontology of participation, in which the human being maintains selfhood not against technology, but through meaningful participation in its world.

In this light, the phenomenon of generative education may be defined as an anthropological strategy for preserving humanity under conditions of technological transformation of civilization. It shows that education is not a mechanism of adaptation to the digital environment, but a space for the formation of a new form of consciousness capable of holding together reason, values, and meaning.

The philosophy of generative education, as it emerges in Western, Eastern, and Russian traditions, is not reducible to three cultural interpretations of a single phenomenon; on the contrary, it reveals three qualitatively distinct modes of thinking, three ways of human presence in the world, and three models of relating the subject to knowledge and technology. Their encounter displaces the problem of education from the plane of method and governance into the realm of metaphysics. The discussion turns not only on the limits of cognition but on the limits of the human as such, for it is precisely here that a new contour of the anthropology of the university and of its cultural mission begins to take shape.

Within this horizon, the confrontation of the ontological stances of Luciano Floridi, Kitarō Nishida, and Vladimir Lektorsky becomes exemplary [37]. Floridi proceeds from the thesis of the infosphere as the dominant mode of contemporary being, in which the gap between the ontological and the epistemic is smoothed out and the human is conceived as an *inforg*, an informational agent embedded in flows of data and meaning [31]. Consequently, the ethical and educational task is to learn to be a responsible node in the network, neither separating oneself from the informational field nor dissolving in it. Nishida, by contrast, does not think in terms of networks but in terms of place (*basho*), understood as a topology of being in which subject and object are originally interpenetrating [34]. Where Floridi sees data communication, Nishida discerns co-being as the condition of possibility of any relation whatsoever. His objection to posthumanist optimism can be condensed into a clarifying question: if the human being is a node, then a node of *what* and *whose* relation—in other words, what is the metaphysical ground of the communicative linkage that makes the network possible at all? Responding to this challenge, Lektorsky shifts the debate from a purely metaphysical level to that of activity [37]: the human being neither disappears into data flows nor dissolves into emptiness, but exists as an agent capable of reflecting upon his or her own involvement in the

world. Meaning, therefore, is given neither in information as such nor in emptiness as ontological transparency; it arises and is sustained in the act in which the infosphere and basho intersect and in which significance becomes the outcome of meaningful action.

In this way, a first axis of metaphilosophical dialogue is delineated: informational co-being (Floridi), topological interpenetration (Nishida), and agentive mediacy (Lektorsky) converge in an ontology of participation, in which the human being ceases to be thought as a centre and becomes a mediator between being and its technological articulations.

From the ontological level, the dialogue naturally passes to the anthropological, where the emphases of Francesca Ferrando, Keiji Nishitani, and Sergei Khoruzhiy come into view. For Ferrando, the human being is an open system of relations whose identity does not vanish but is dispersed, assuming the mode of multiplicity [38]. In this sense, generative education appears as a practice of "metahuman participation," in which the act of learning coincides with the co-creation of knowledge, and freedom is understood as the capacity to inhabit heterogeneous ontological modalities simultaneously. Nishitani, by contrast, describes emptiness (*śūnyatā*) as tragic openness and thus as a demand for the inner overcoming of all forms, including technological ones [35]. The symbiotic bond between the human and the machine may result in spiritual apathy if the existential centre—the capacity to suffer, to doubt, to choose—disappears.

Freedom, therefore, is not the expansion of the set of forms but the overcoming of attachment to form as such. Khoruzhiy, without rejecting either multiplicity or the demand for overcoming, introduces the notion of synergy as the joint action of the human being and another principle, an action in which there is no fusion but a mutual transfiguration [36]. The human being does not disappear or dissolve, but is transformed, becoming a site of encounter and an event at the frontier between being and technology. Thus an anthropological triptych emerges: multiplicity (Ferrando) is viewed as the freedom of participation; emptiness (Nishitani)—as the trial of inner freedom; and synergy (Khoruzhiy)—as a form of transcended dualism. Here the human being first appears not as an object of analysis but as a process of philosophising itself—a living boundary at which East, West, and Russia meet in a single act of self-understanding.

Aligning the ontological and anthropological lines, the philosophical conversation inevitably ascends to the institutional level—that is, to the question of the fate of the university as a space of the experience of thinking. From a Western perspective, the university is described as a mediating platform for the generation of knowledge, where distributed agencies—human and machinic—constitute a post- digital ecosystem of research and learning [9]; from an Eastern perspective, as a place of self-overcoming and inner contemplation, in which the educational process coincides with the practice of dwelling in an "empty" dimension [35]; and from a Russian perspective, as a space of "thought-activity" and semantic labour, where knowledge is not transmitted but constructed within communicative structures and procedures [39]. Considered together, these emphases converge upon an understanding of the university not as an institution in the narrow sense, but as an ontological field in which action, emptiness, and information are synthesised: what Floridi describes as an "informational ecosystem of responsibility" [31], Nishida as a "place of mutual disclosure" [34], and Lektorsky as "active reason" [37], corresponds to what Ferrando thinks as "metaparticipation" [38], Nishitani as "the path of selfovercoming" [35], and Khoruzhiy as "synergic labour" [36].

For this reason, the final metaphilosophical conclusion demands a refusal of both simplistic synthesis and mere eclecticism. The Western line points towards a new ontology of knowledge; the Eastern towards a path of dissolving distinctions in a mode of co-being; the Russian towards a practice of self-conscious action. Their genuine encounter does not produce a sum of theses but gives rise to a philosophy of participation in which the human being exists neither outside technology nor simply within it, but *through* it—as mediator, event, and meaning, holding together in a single act the informational, the empty, and the active dimensions. At this intersection, the content of generative education as a cultural form becomes manifest: it cannot be reduced to an instrumental updating of teaching practices, but inaugurates a new figure of humanism—a humanism of co-presence, in which world, emptiness, and action appear as interpenetrating modalities of one and the same being, a being that demands both responsibility of thought and openness to experience.

Thus, setting the present results alongside contemporary philosophical and educational research allows us to argue that the phenomenon of generative education constitutes not merely a new pedagogical paradigm but a comprehensive theoretical framework of humanistic synthesis, within

which the cognitive, ethical, and cultural dimensions of human experience are integrated. Generative education brings to light the deep connections between the act of knowing, the act of being, and the act of responsibility, thereby restoring a fundamental intuition of the humanistic tradition: the idea of the human being as co-creator rather than consumer of knowledge. In this sense, generative education appears less as an instrument of digital modernization than as a philosophy of co-participation, in which each act of thinking entails an element of ethical choice and cultural self-understanding.

The analysis shows that, unlike instrumental interpretations of artificial intelligence characteristic of many technological approaches, generative education construes the interaction between human and machine as an ontological process of participation. Cognition ceases to be a mere function of cognitive efficiency and becomes a form of meaningful human presence in a world where the boundaries between the natural and the artificial, the individual and the collective, the empirical and the symbolic are increasingly blurred. This perspective aligns the study with the tradition of philosophical anthropology [13], in which the human being is defined by the capacity to preserve a reflexive distance while participating in processes that transcend individual consciousness. Generative education, in this light, may be regarded as an anthropological mediator between human beings and technology, safeguarding the spiritual dimension of human experience under conditions of the automation of thinking.

In contrast to existing approaches that focus primarily on institutional transformations in the university environment or on normative-ethical issues of digital pedagogy, the present study uncovers the anthropological foundations of generative education as a process of preserving human presence within a technological milieu. The human being, in this context, is understood not as an object of algorithmic processing but as a subject of semantic resistance, capable of transforming technological processes into a space of culture. Such an understanding restores to the philosophy of education its genuine vocation—the protection and development of the humanistic principle under the conditions of digital civilization.

Consequently, generative education is not merely the next stage of digitalization, but a metaphysical form of humanistic self-preservation, in which the possibility of genuine thinking, dialogue, and responsibility is maintained. It unites the cognitive (as a form of knowledge), the ethical (as a form of choice), and the cultural (as a form of self-identification) dimensions of human existence, thereby laying the foundations for a new anthropology of education. This anthropology asserts that even within distributed networks and amidst autonomous algorithms, the human being retains the status of a source of meaning and a bearer of value discernment, while education remains the space in which technology does not supplant the human, but becomes part of his or her meaningful and cultural experience.

CONCLUSIONS

The study has made it possible to identify and conceptualize the deep philosophical foundations of the phenomenon of generative education, understood not as a mere technological innovation but as a new mode of knowledge’s being within a post-classical ontological horizon. The analysis has shown that contemporary education is entering a transitional phase from a model of transmission to a model of meaning-generation, in which the act of cognition is realised as a form of co-being between the human and the technology. This shift is not only methodological but also ontological: the subject of knowledge relinquishes the exclusive status of an autonomous rational centre and becomes a mediator within a network of cognitive, cultural, and digital interactions.

It has been established that what is termed generative education embodies a transition from an epistemology of possession to an epistemology of participation, and from a fixed identity to a processual, projective one. Human cognition, under conditions of artificial intelligence and distributed thinking, appears as a dynamic structure capable of generating meaning through interaction with non-human agents, without thereby forfeiting its anthropological core. In this sense, education becomes not merely an instrument of socialization but a mode of the ontological presence of the human being in a technological world, in which the boundaries between knowledge, action, and being are rendered mutually permeable.

The analysis has further demonstrated that the crisis of academic identity, manifested in the loss of subjective unity within the university community, is not a degradation but a transformation of the

humanistic principle of education. The university, as a cultural-historical form, ceases to function as a space of monological reason and is reconfigured as an environment of generative co-participation, in which teacher and learner appear as co-authors, and technology becomes an element within the hermeneutic circle. This model entails a redefinition of academic subjectivity as an active, reflexive, and responsible form of human presence within the world of data.

As a philosophical conclusion, the study introduces the notion of projective identity, which registers the transition from a stable subject of knowledge to a subject that exists as an event of projection and self-transcendence. Generative education thus becomes a space for the formation of a new type of anthropological experience, in which cognition and creativity coincide with the very process of human becoming.

Taken together, the findings attest to the emergence of an ontology of participation that opens new horizons for the philosophy of education. Within this ontology, the human being is not conceived as a subject opposed to technology, but as a co-participant in being, whose spiritual, practical, and hermeneutic activity preserves the possibility of distinguishing truth from simulation in a world of algorithms. The philosophy of generative education, accordingly, does not reveal the end of humanism but its transformation—a passage from an anthropocentric humanism to an ontological humanism of co-presence, in which the human being, technology, and culture form a single, proportionate structure of a meaning- generating world.

REFERENCES

1. UNESCO. Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action for the Implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 4, 2015. Available at: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000245656 (accessed 14 November 2025). UNESCO. Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education. Paris: UNESCO Publishing, 2021. Available at: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000379707 (accessed 14 November 2025).
2. UNESCO International Commission on the Futures of Education. Futures of Education: Learning to Become, 2021. Available at: https://en.unesco.org/ futuresofeducation/ (accessed 14 November 2025).
3. Council of Europe. Education Strategy 2024–2030: "Learners First", 2023. Available at: https://rm.coe.int/education-strategy-2024-2030-26th-session council-of-europe-standing-c/1680abee81 (accessed 14 November 2025).
4. International Association of Universities (IAU). IAU Strategic Plan 2020–2030, 2020. Available at: https://www.iauaiu.net/IMG/pdf/iau_ strategy_ 2030. pdf (accessed 14 November 2025).
5. President of the Russian Federation. Decree of the President of the Russian Federation No. 490 of 10 October 2019 "On the Development of Artificial Intelligence in the Russian Federation" (as amended on 15 February 2024), 2019. Available at: https://www.kremlin.ru/acts/bank/44731 (accessed 14 November 2025). (in Russ.)
6. Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation. Strategy for the Development of Education in the Russian Federation until 2036, 2022. Available at: https://образование.объясняем.рф/ (accessed 14 November 2025). (in Russ.)
7. National Technology Initiative. HelthNet Roadmap, 2020s. Available at: https://roscongress.org/materials/plan-meropriyatiy-dorozhnaya-karta-khelsnet natsio nalnoy-tekhnologicheskoy-initsiativy/ (accessed 14 November 2025). (in Russ.)
8. Federation Council of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation. Resolution No. 49-SF of 14 March 2025 "On Strategic Directions for the Development of Education in the Russian Federation under Contemporary Challenges", 2025. Available at: https://sh6-minusinsk-r04.gosweb.gosuslugi.ru/netcat_files/32/50/Postanovlenie_SF_FS_RF_ot_14.0 3.2025_N_49_SF_O_strategichesk.pdf (accessed 14 November 2025). (in Russ.)
9. Peters M. A., Jandrić P. The Digital University: A Dialogue and Manifesto Rebooted. Peter Lang, 2024.
10. Barnett R. The University in the Ecological Age: A Feasible Utopia. London: SRHE, 2023. 190 p.
11. Clark A., Chalmers D. The Extended Mind. *Analysis*, 1998, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 7–19.
12. Floridi L. The Fourth Revolution: How the Infosphere Is Reshaping Human Reality. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. 248 p.
13. Plessner H. The Levels of the Organic and Man: An Introduction to Philosophical Anthropology / trans. from German by A. V. Garadzhi, A. V. Filippova. Moscow: Ves' Mir, 2019. (in Russ.)
14. Cassirer E. The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms. Vol. 1: Language / trans. from German by S. A. Romashko. Moscow: Akademicheskii Proekt Publ., 2013. (in Russ.)
15. Coeckelbergh M. The Political Philosophy of AI. Polity Press, 2024.
16. Ihde D. Postphenomenology and Technoscience: The Peking University Lectures. SUNY Press, 2023.

17. Barnett R., Peters M. A. (eds.). The Idea of the University: Contemporary Perspectives. Peter Lang, 2023.
18. Peters M. A., Besley T., Jandrić P. Knowledge Socialism. *The Rise of Collective Intelligence and the Future of Education*. Springer, 2023.
19. Knyazeva H. Anthropological Structures of the Educational Space in the Digital Era. *Philosophy of Education*, 2024, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 45–60.
20. Smirnov S. A. Philosophical Anthropology of Education: Man in the Era of Technogenic Transformations. Moscow: Moscow University Press, 2023. (in Russ.)
21. Fawns T. Postdigital Education: Design and Practice. Springer, 2024.
22. Coeckelbergh M. The Political Philosophy of AI. Polity Press, 2024.
23. Stiegler B. The Pedagogy of the Inhabitant: On the Anthropocene and the Digital. Open Humanities Press, 2023.
24. Barnett R. The University in the Ecological Age: A Feasible Utopia. SRHE, 2023.
25. Klein J. T. Beyond Interdisciplinarity: Boundary Work, Communication, and Collaboration. Oxford University Press, 2024.
26. Barnett R., Bengtsen S. Knowledge and the University: Reclaiming Life and Purpose. Routledge, 2023.
27. Nussbaum M. C. Justice for All? The Capabilities Approach in the AI Era. Harvard University Press, 2023.
28. Barnett R., Guzmán-Valenzuela C. The Projectified University: Horizons and Hope. *SRHE*, 2023.
29. Gallagher S. The University as Hermeneutic Community: A Dialogue. In: Peters M. A. (ed.). Heidegger, Education, and the University. Springer, 2024.
30. Peters M. A., Besley T., Jandrić P. Knowledge Socialism. The Rise of Collective Intelligence and the Future of Education. Singapore: Springer, 2023. 210 p.
31. Floridi L. AI as Agency Without Intelligence: On ChatGPT, Large Language Models, and Other Generative Models. *Philosophy & Technology*, 2022, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 45–52.
32. Bibikhin V. V. Word and Event. Moscow: Editorial URSS, 2001. 280 p. (in Russ.)
33. Ricoeur P. Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences: Essays on Language, Action and Interpretation (New Edition). Polity, 2023. 250 p.
34. Nishida K. Place and Dialectic: Two Essays by Nishida Kitaro / transl. J. W., pp. 89–112.
35. Nishitani K. Religion and Nothingness. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983, p. 134–145.
36. Khoruzhiy S. S. Analysis of Consciousness from the Perspective of Synergic Anthropology. *Voprosy Filosofii,* 2023, no. 5, pp. 201–215. (in Russ.)
37. Lektorsky V. A. The Human Being in the Digitalization Era: Boundaries of Subjectivity. *Filosofskie Nauki,* 2024, vol. 67, no. 2, pp. 45–63. (in Russ.)
38. Ferrando F. Philosophy of Posthumanism: From Transhuman to Metahuman. London: Routledge, 2023. 267 p.
39. Shchedrovitsky G. P. Methodology and Philosophy of Organizational and Managerial Activity: Basic Concepts and Principles. Moscow: Put', 2005. 320 p. (in Russ.)

Авторы

Марфина Жанна Викторовна
(Россия, г. Луганск)
Доцент, доктор педагогических наук, ректор
ФГБОУ ВО «Луганский государственный педагогический университет»
E-mail: kaf_filosof@lgpu.org
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5838-4954

Пилавов Павел Аристиевич
(Россия, г. Луганск)
Доцент, кандидат педагогических наук, доцент кафедры олимпийского и профессионального спорта
ФГБОУ ВО «Луганский государственный педагогический университет»
E-mail: rassgd@yandex.ru@mail.ru
ORCID ID: 0009-0003-8852-8669

Authors

Zhanna V. Marfina
(Russia, Lugansk)
Associate Professor, Dr. Sci. (Educ.), Rector
Lugansk State Pedagogical University
E-mail: kaf_filosof@lgpu.org
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5838-4954

Pavel A. Pilavov
(Russia, Lugansk)
Associate Professor, Cand. Sci. (Educ.),
Associate Professor of the Department of Olympic and Professional Sports
Lugansk State Pedagogical University
E-mail: rassgd@yandex.ru@mail.ru
ORCID ID: 0009-0003-8852-8669

Вклад авторов

Марфина Ж. В.: верификация данных, проведение исследования, создание черновика рукописи, руководство исследованием
Пилавов П. А.: концептуализация, методология, создание рукописи и её редактирование

Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов

Authors contribution

Zhanna V. Marfina: Validation, Investigation, Writing - Original Draft, Supervision
Pavel A. Pilavov: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing - Review & Editing

The authors declared no conflicts of interest