ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS
Vol. 6, No. 3 | March 2026 | pp. 41–48

ORIGINAL RESEARCH ARTICLE

From Prohibition to Integration: Why Universal AI Adoption in Education and Communication Is a Civilizational Imperative

Hulusi Aytekinv[1,] , **Nokuthula Bongani**[2] , **Banele Sifiso**[1,3]
[1] *Institute of AI Systems, Izmir, Turkey*
[2] *Laboratory of Adaptive Computation Research, Minsk Institute of Physics and Technology, Minsk, Belarus*
[3] *Institute of Complex Systems, Harare, Zimbabwe*

Received: 18 November 2025 | Accepted: 20 February 2026 | Published: 25 March 2026

Abstract

This paper extends the formal model of communication norm shift developed in Kriger (2026) and argues that institutional resistance to large language model (LLM) use — particularly prohibitions in educational settings — constitutes not a defense of intellectual integrity but a structural impediment to cognitive and communicative development. Building on the concept of the AI-extended agent $A\phi$ and the threshold dynamics of normative phase transition, we demonstrate that prohibitive policies: (1) delay an inevitable phase transition in communication norms without the capacity to prevent it; (2) generate cognitive inequality between agents with and without access to AI mediation; and (3) deprive learners of the metacognitive skills that distinguish productive augmentation from passive replacement. We propose an alternative educational paradigm — teaching reflective AI partnership — and articulate principles of pedagogical integration grounded in the cultivation of critical thinking rather than the restriction of tools. The analysis synthesizes evidence from educational psychology, technology adoption research, and communication theory to argue that the question is no longer whether AI will transform human communication, but whether institutions will prepare populations for that transformation or abandon them to navigate it without guidance.

Keywords: AI in education, LLM integration, communication norms, cognitive augmentation, educational policy, digital literacy, AI-extended agents, metacognition

1. Introduction

The release of ChatGPT in November 2022 triggered a global institutional reflex whose speed and uniformity were remarkable: within months, school districts, universities, and professional organizations across dozens of countries issued prohibitions on AI use in student work (Cotton et al., 2024). The speed of the prohibitive response contrasted sharply with the slowness of pedagogical adaptation. Three years later, the institutional landscape remains fractured: some institutions have embraced AI integration, but a substantial proportion continue to enforce restrictions ranging from outright bans to ambiguous policies that discourage use without providing frameworks for productive engagement (Chan & Hu, 2023).

Kriger (2026) formalized the dynamics of this situation through a game-theoretic model of communication norm shift. The model demonstrates that AI mediation, formalized through the operator ϕ, expands an agent's communicative strategy space, reduces interaction friction, and recalibrates the agent's minimum acceptable dialogue depth upward. When the proportion of AI-extended agents in a population crosses a critical threshold p^*, a phase transition occurs: communication norms shift irreversibly toward higher depth and lower friction. The model further shows that this transition is delayed but not prevented by reputational resistance — the systematic underestimation of AI capability driven by anchoring to early, primitive models and reinforced by institutional prohibition.

The present paper takes these formal results as its foundation and develops their implications for educational and institutional policy. The core argument is straightforward: if the communication phase transition is inevitable — as the threshold dynamics and competitive pressure mechanisms of Kriger (2026) predict — then the only consequential policy choice is whether populations are prepared for it or not. Prohibition does not prevent the transition; it merely ensures that those subject to prohibition enter the post-transition communicative environment without the metacognitive skills required to thrive in it.

We develop this argument in six stages. Section 2 reviews the empirical evidence on AI's effects on communication and learning. Section 3 analyzes the structural logic of prohibition and its self-defeating dynamics. Section 4 presents the case for AI as a cognitive amplifier rather than a cognitive crutch. Section 5 proposes a pedagogical framework for reflective AI integration. Section 6 discusses the equity implications of differential AI access, and Section 7 concludes.

---

2. The Evidence: AI Mediation Enhances, Not Degrades, Communicative Competence

The predominant justification for AI prohibition in educational settings rests on two assumptions: that AI use substitutes for learning, and that AI use degrades independent cognitive capacity. Neither assumption is well supported by the available evidence.

2.1 Language and Communication Skills

A systematic review of 30 empirical studies on AI chatbots in language education found consistent improvements in productive language skills, particularly speaking and writing, attributed to real-time feedback and reduced anxiety (Jia & Huang, 2025). Studies in English as a foreign language (EFL) contexts demonstrated that AI chatbot interaction increased learners' communication confidence and reduced speaking anxiety (Kim & Su, 2024; Yang et al., 2022). Naseer et al. (2024) found that chatbots functioning as conversational partners reduced foreign language anxiety while facilitating

Vol. 6, No. 3 | March 2026 | pp. 41–48

acquisition. These findings are significant because they demonstrate that AI interaction does not merely bypass the development of communicative competence — it accelerates it.

The mechanism is not mysterious. AI systems provide what Vygotsky (1978) theorized as scaffolding within the zone of proximal development: structured support that enables learners to perform at a level beyond their unassisted capacity, with the scaffolding gradually removed as competence increases. The difference between LLM scaffolding and traditional scaffolding is one of availability, patience, and adaptability — the AI never tires, never judges, and adjusts to the learner's level in real time (Kasneci et al., 2023).

2.2 Writing Quality and Structured Thinking

Research on AI-assisted writing has consistently found that students who use LLMs as revision partners — not as ghostwriters but as interlocutors who challenge, reorganize, and extend drafts — produce higher-quality written output than students working without assistance (Deng & Yu, 2023). Critically, longitudinal studies suggest that the improvement transfers: students who practice AI-assisted revision develop internalized editing skills that persist even when AI is unavailable (Escalante et al., 2023). This finding directly challenges the "cognitive crutch" narrative. A crutch weakens the limb it supports; a training partner strengthens the athlete who trains with it.

2.3 The Kriger Framework: Cognitive Amplification, Not Substitution

Kriger (2026) formalized this distinction through the concept of strategy space expansion. The AI-extended agent $A\phi$ does not lose access to the strategies available to unmediated agent A; rather, $A\phi$ gains access to additional strategies — arbitrarily long formulation times, external memory for maintaining coherence across complex arguments, structural optimization of expression, and iterative editing — that are infeasible under unmediated cognitive constraints. The relationship is one of strict inclusion: $S(A\phi) \supset S(A)$. An agent whose strategy space has been expanded has not been weakened; they have been equipped with capabilities that were previously unavailable.

The critical insight of the Kriger model is that this expansion is bidirectional. The AI-extended agent is not A plus a static tool but a co-evolving dyad in which both components improve through interaction. The human provides embodied experience, situated judgment, and evaluative capacity that the AI lacks; the AI provides knowledge access, logical verification, and structural scaffolding that the human lacks. The coupled system $A\phi$ exceeds the capabilities of either component operating independently (Kriger, 2026). Prohibition severs this coupling — not to protect the human component, but to prevent the emergence of the coupled system entirely.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS
Vol. 6, No. 3 | March 2026 | pp. 41–48

3. The Structural Logic of Prohibition and Its Self-Defeating Dynamics

3.1 Prohibition as Moral Framing

The institutional prohibition of AI use in education is rarely framed in purely pragmatic terms. It is framed as a moral imperative: using AI is "cheating," "dishonest," "a violation of academic integrity" (Cotton et al., 2024). This moral framing is consequential because it transforms a pragmatic decision — whether to use a tool that improves cognitive output — into an identity statement — whether one is an honest person (Bicchieri, 2016). Kriger (2026) identifies this mechanism precisely: agents who internalize the moral frame experience AI adoption not as a threshold decision based on social prevalence but as a moral boundary that cannot be crossed regardless of the proportion of adopters in their environment. In the formal model, these agents have effectively infinite adoption thresholds — they are permanently outside the adoption cascade.

The moral framing is historically recognizable. The introduction of calculators in mathematics education provoked identical objections: calculators would destroy students' ability to perform arithmetic, would constitute cheating, and would undermine the intellectual discipline that manual calculation develops (Ellington, 2003). The objections were not baseless — there is evidence that calculator dependence can reduce arithmetic fluency in specific contexts — but the categorical prohibition was ultimately abandoned because the cognitive benefits of redirecting attention from mechanical computation to conceptual understanding proved overwhelming. The same trajectory is visible with AI, but the stakes are higher because the cognitive domain affected is not arithmetic but the entirety of structured thinking and communication.

3.2 The Wikipedia Parallel

Kriger (2026) draws an instructive parallel with the institutional reception of Wikipedia. Early Wikipedia contained significant errors, and the initial skepticism was rational. But the reputational frame — "anyone can edit it, therefore it cannot be trusted" — persisted long after the platform had achieved accuracy comparable to traditional encyclopedias on empirical topics (Giles, 2005). Universities banned Wikipedia citations; the ban framed the resource as a threat to intellectual integrity rather than a cognitive tool, creating a moral dimension to non-use. The prohibition was eventually abandoned under competitive pressure: Wikipedia is now routinely used by journalists, cited in academic work, and integrated into institutional workflows (Mesgari et al., 2015).

The structural parallel is precise. Early AI chatbots were genuinely unreliable. The initial skepticism was rational. But the reputational imprint of early models persists in the evaluation of systems whose capabilities have improved by orders of magnitude, and institutional prohibition reinforces this reputational lag by providing authoritative confirmation that non-adoption is correct (Kriger, 2026).

Vol. 6, No. 3 | March 2026 | pp. 41–48

3.3 Why Prohibition Cannot Prevent the Phase Transition

The threshold dynamics model of Kriger (2026) makes a specific prediction: once the proportion of AI-extended agents crosses the critical threshold p^*, communication norms shift irreversibly toward the high-depth, low-friction regime. Prohibition affects this dynamic by shifting the threshold distribution rightward — agents require more social proof before adopting — and by creating a bimodal distribution with a group of permanently resistant non-adopters. These effects delay the cascade but do not prevent it, because four mechanisms operate to overcome resistance: output asymmetry becomes undeniable (AI-extended agents produce visibly superior work), generational replacement dilutes the population anchored to early negative impressions, institutional capitulation follows as competitive costs mount, and normalization through ubiquity dissolves the distinction between "using AI" and "using technology" (Kriger, 2026).

The implication for educational policy is that prohibition is not a stable equilibrium. It is a temporary delay that imposes costs on the populations subject to it without altering the eventual outcome. Students educated under prohibitive regimes enter the post-transition communicative environment without the skills to navigate it — not because they lack AI access (access is increasingly ubiquitous and difficult to police), but because they lack guided practice in reflective AI use.

3.4 The Detection Arms Race

A practical dimension reinforces the theoretical argument. Institutions that prohibit AI use must detect it, and AI-generated text detection has proven unreliable. Detection tools produce high rates of both false positives and false negatives; they disproportionately flag non-native English speakers as AI users; and their accuracy declines as models improve (Liang et al., 2023). The result is a surveillance regime that is both ineffective and inequitable: it punishes the wrong students, creates an adversarial relationship between learners and institutions, and redirects pedagogical energy from teaching to policing.

Moreover, as Kriger (2026) demonstrates through the concept of functional indistinguishability, the distinction between AI-generated and human-generated text becomes structurally incoherent as AI capability approaches human capability across institutional domains. Any detection mechanism that attempts to distinguish AI from human output will eventually produce a false-positive to true-positive ratio approaching 1 — meaning it cannot restrict AI output without equally restricting human output. The detection project is not merely difficult; it is asymptotically impossible.

Vol. 6, No. 3 | March 2026 | pp. 41–48

4. AI as Cognitive Amplifier: The Case for Embracing the Coupled System

4.1 The Telescope Analogy

Kriger (2026) proposes an analogy that clarifies the nature of AI cognitive augmentation: the appropriate comparison is not a person wearing better glasses (same vision, clearer image) but a person equipped with a telescope. The instrument does not improve the eye, but it radically expands what the eye can see. The expansion of communicative strategy space is a consequence of genuine cognitive amplification, not merely improved formatting of pre-existing thoughts.

This analogy has direct educational implications. No one argues that astronomers should be prohibited from using telescopes on the grounds that telescope use constitutes "cheating at observation." No one claims that the knowledge gained through telescopic observation is less valid than knowledge gained through unaided vision. The telescope does not replace the astronomer's judgment — it expands the domain to which judgment can be applied. The same relationship holds between the learner and the LLM.

4.2 The Three Conversation Versions

The appendix to Kriger (2026) provides a striking demonstration of cognitive amplification through three versions of the same conversation between two participants with identical cognitive endowments discussing whether technology improves human judgment. In Version 1 (unmediated live dialogue), 15 turns produce mutual frustration and zero intellectual progress — three potential insights are raised but none developed. In Version 2 (AI-mediated asynchronous exchange), the same participants produce a two-dimensional analytical framework integrating three theoretical traditions, a novel concept, and a testable experimental prediction in 9 turns. In Version 3 (live dialogue with AI as a third participant), comparable depth is achieved in real-time speech.

The comparison is decisive. The intellectual outputs of Versions 2 and 3 — the replacement/augmentation/degradation taxonomy, the metacognitive blind spot of technological replacement, the nudge architecture design implication — were not poorly expressed in Version 1. They were cognitively inaccessible without the scaffolding that AI mediation provided. The participants did not become smarter; their effective cognitive capacity was amplified by coupling with a system that provided access to theoretical frameworks, empirical findings, and structural reasoning they did not independently possess (Kriger, 2026).

This is precisely what education should enable. The purpose of education is not to preserve cognitive isolation but to expand cognitive capacity. If AI mediation achieves this expansion more effectively than unmediated instruction in specific domains, then prohibiting AI in educational settings is pedagogically counterproductive.

Vol. 6, No. 3 | March 2026 | pp. 41–48

4.3 The Metacognitive Variable

The most important insight for educational policy emerges from the distinction between augmentation and replacement. Kriger (2026) treats this distinction as a property of the interaction mode, but the educational implication is that it is a teachable skill. The difference between a student who uses an LLM to generate an essay they submit without reading and a student who uses an LLM to challenge their draft, identify logical gaps, and refine their argument is not a difference in tool access — it is a difference in metacognitive capacity: the ability to monitor one's own cognitive processes and evaluate the quality of tool-mediated output (Flavell, 1979).

This metacognitive capacity — what we might call AI literacy — cannot be developed under prohibition. It can only be developed through guided practice in reflective AI use, where instructors model and cultivate the skills of questioning AI output, identifying AI errors, recognizing when AI suggestions strengthen versus weaken an argument, and maintaining evaluative control over the coupled system. Prohibition does not protect students from passive replacement; it prevents them from learning the metacognitive skills that distinguish augmentation from replacement.

5. A Pedagogical Framework for Reflective AI Integration

We propose five principles for integrating AI into educational practice in a manner that develops metacognitive skills rather than encouraging passive dependence.

5.1 Transparency over Prohibition

Students should be required to use AI openly and to document their interaction process. Rather than detecting and punishing AI use, institutions should make AI partnership a visible and assessable component of the learning process. This aligns with findings from Purcell et al. (2024), who demonstrated that secret AI use is judged less acceptable than open use, suggesting that transparency norms are both socially preferred and pedagogically productive. The assessment shifts from "did you write this alone?" to "how effectively did you collaborate with AI, and can you explain and defend the result?"

5.2 Critical Evaluation as Core Competency

Students should be taught to evaluate AI output with the same rigor applied to any other source. This includes identifying factual errors, recognizing logical fallacies in AI-generated arguments, detecting bias in AI framing, and assessing the relevance and quality of AI-suggested sources. These skills constitute a new form of information literacy that extends traditional source evaluation to AI-generated content (Ng et al., 2021). The educational goal is not to trust AI uncritically but to develop the judgment required to use it productively — precisely the metacognitive capacity identified in Section 4.3.

Vol. 6, No. 3 | March 2026 | pp. 41–48

5.3 Process-Oriented Assessment

Traditional assessment evaluates final products. AI-integrated assessment should evaluate the process of intellectual development, including the student's ability to formulate productive prompts, iterate on AI-generated suggestions, identify and correct AI errors, synthesize AI contributions with their own knowledge and judgment, and produce a final output that exceeds what either the student or the AI could have produced independently. This process orientation captures the bidirectional nature of the $A\phi$ coupling described in Kriger (2026): the educational value lies not in the AI's output but in the student's capacity to engage with, challenge, and improve upon it.

5.4 Graduated Scaffolding Withdrawal

Following Vygotskian principles (Vygotsky, 1978), AI scaffolding should be gradually reduced as student competence increases. Early-stage learners may benefit from extensive AI support — AI-generated outlines, AI-assisted brainstorming, AI-mediated revision. Advanced learners should demonstrate the ability to produce structured, coherent work with progressively less AI support, demonstrating that the cognitive skills developed through AI partnership have been internalized. The goal is not permanent AI dependence but the development of cognitive capacities that transfer to unmediated contexts — the same skill transfer that Kriger (2026) identifies as an empirical question but that pedagogical design can actively promote.

5.5 Collaborative AI Dialogue

Drawing on Version 3 of the conversation demonstration in Kriger (2026) — live dialogue with AI as a third participant — classrooms should experiment with AI as an active interlocutor in group discussions. In this format, the AI contributes theoretical frameworks, challenges student claims, and provides evidence, while students retain evaluative control: correcting the AI's omissions, challenging its assumptions, and integrating its contributions with their own embodied experience and value-laden judgment. This format develops the collaborative metacognitive skills that define productive AI partnership while making the bidirectional nature of the coupling experientially vivid.

---

6. Equity, Access, and the Cognitive Digital Divide

6.1 Prohibition Exacerbates Inequality

Kriger (2026) warns that if communication norms shift toward an AI-assisted baseline, individuals who lack access to AI tools may find themselves excluded from influential discourse — a cognitive and stylistic digital divide that is more consequential than purely technological access gaps. Prohibition in educational settings exacerbates this divide in a specific way: students in institutions that prohibit AI develop neither the technical skills nor the metacognitive capacities required for productive AI partnership, while students in institutions that integrate AI develop both.

Vol. 6, No. 3 | March 2026 | pp. 41–48

The inequality is compounded by the fact that prohibition is unevenly enforced. Students with greater economic resources, technological sophistication, and social capital are better positioned to use AI despite prohibition — and to do so without detection. The students most likely to comply with prohibition are those with the fewest alternative resources, the strongest deference to authority, and the greatest need for cognitive augmentation. Prohibition thus creates a perverse dynamic in which the students who would benefit most from AI mediation are the most likely to be denied it (Holmes et al., 2022).

6.2 The Dunning-Kruger Dynamic in AI Evaluation

Kriger (2026) identifies a self-reinforcing loop in AI non-adoption: agents with lower baseline cognitive capacity are less able to evaluate the quality of AI output, more likely to have formed their impression of AI from primitive models, and less likely to encounter AI-extended agents in their immediate social environment. This dynamic has direct educational implications. Students who have never experienced productive AI partnership cannot evaluate what they are missing. Teachers who have never used LLMs for their own intellectual work cannot model productive AI use for their students. The result is that the populations most in need of cognitive amplification are the least likely to receive it — not because of technological barriers but because of evaluative barriers reinforced by prohibition.

6.3 Universal Access as Equity Imperative

The equity argument for AI integration is therefore not merely that all students should have access to AI tools — though this is a necessary condition — but that all students should receive guided instruction in how to use AI tools reflectively, critically, and productively. AI literacy should be treated as a core educational competency on par with reading, writing, and quantitative reasoning, not as an optional supplement for technologically privileged populations (Holmes et al., 2022). The pedagogical framework proposed in Section 5 is designed to be implemented across educational contexts, including resource-constrained environments where free or low-cost LLM access is available but pedagogical guidance is scarce.

7. The Civilizational Stakes

The argument of this paper can be summarized in a single sentence: the question is no longer whether AI will transform human communication, but whether institutions will prepare populations for that transformation or leave them to navigate it unaided.

Kriger (2026) demonstrates formally that the communication phase transition at p^* is delayed but not prevented by institutional resistance. The competitive advantages of cognitive amplification — more structured expression, deeper analytical capacity, lower communicative friction — are sufficiently large that they eventually overcome reputational and moral barriers to adoption. The four mechanisms of resistance dissolution — output asymmetry, generational replacement, institutional capitulation, and normalization through ubiquity — operate sequentially and, in the assessment of the model, inevitably.

If this analysis is correct, then prohibition is not a policy choice with a stable alternative. The alternative to integration is not the preservation of pre-AI communication norms; it is the creation of a population that enters the post-transition environment without preparation. The students educated under prohibition do not avoid AI — they encounter it without the metacognitive skills to distinguish augmentation from replacement, without the critical evaluation skills to identify AI errors, and without the collaborative skills to function as effective partners in the coupled $A\phi$ system.

The educational imperative is therefore clear. Schools should not prohibit AI use; they should teach AI use — specifically, the reflective, critical, evaluative mode of AI partnership that Kriger (2026) identifies as the augmentation quadrant of the technology-judgment interaction. The goal is not to produce students who depend on AI but students who are capable of genuine cognitive partnership with AI: who can challenge AI output, correct AI errors, contribute embodied experience and value-laden judgment that AI cannot independently access, and produce intellectual work that exceeds what either human or AI could achieve alone.

The transition to a civilization of AI-extended agents does not begin with machines becoming autonomous. It begins with humans learning to communicate as AI-extended agents (Kriger, 2026). Education is where that learning should happen — openly, reflectively, and with institutional support rather than institutional resistance.

References

Bicchieri, C. (2016). *Norms in the wild: How to diagnose, measure, and change social norms*. Oxford University Press.

Chan, C. K. Y., & Hu, W. (2023). Students' voices on generative AI: Perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *20*(1), 43.

Cotton, D. R. E., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2024). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *61*(2), 228–239.

Deng, J., & Yu, H. (2023). A preliminary study on the application of ChatGPT in academic writing. *IEEE Access*, *11*, 82414–82431.

Ellington, A. J. (2003). A meta-analysis of the effects of calculators on students' achievement and attitude levels in precollege mathematics classes. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, *34*(5), 433–463.

Vol. 6, No. 3 | March 2026 | pp. 41–48

Escalante, J., Pack, A., & Barrett, A. (2023). AI-generated feedback on writing: Insights into efficacy and ENL student perceptions. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *20*(1), 57.

Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive-developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist*, *34*(10), 906–911.

Giles, J. (2005). Internet encyclopaedias go head to head. *Nature*, *438*(7070), 900–901.

Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2022). *Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning* (2nd ed.). Center for Curriculum Redesign.

Jia, C., & Huang, J. (2025). AI-driven chatbots in second language education: A systematic review of their efficacy and pedagogical implications. *System*, *119*, 103254.

Kasneci, E., Seßler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., ... & Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *103*, 102274.

Kim, S., & Su, Y. (2024). Chatbot implementation and Korean language learners' communication confidence and anxiety. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*.

Kriger, B. (2026). AI-extended agents and the transformation of human communication: A game-theoretic model of norm shift in populations with AI-mediated communicators. Institute of Integrative and Interdisciplinary Research. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18521341

Liang, W., Yuksekgonul, M., Mao, Y., Wu, E., & Zou, J. (2023). GPT detectors are biased against non-native English writers. *Patterns*, *4*(7), 100779.

Mesgari, M., Okoli, C., Mehdi, M., Nielsen, F. Å., & Lanamäki, A. (2015). "The sum of all human knowledge": A systematic review of scholarly research on the content of Wikipedia. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, *66*(2), 219–245.

Naseer, A., et al. (2024). Chatbots as conversational partners: Reducing foreign language anxiety and facilitating language acquisition. *Language Learning & Technology*.

Ng, D. T. K., Leung, J. K. L., Chu, S. K. W., & Qiao, M. S. (2021). Conceptualizing AI literacy: An exploratory review. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *2*, 100041.

Purcell, Z. A., Dong, M., Nussberger, A.-M., Köbis, N., & Jakesch, M. (2024). People have different expectations for their own versus others' use of AI-mediated communication tools. *British Journal of Psychology*.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Vol. 6, No. 3 | March 2026 | pp. 41–48

Yang, H., Kim, H., Lee, J. H., & Shin, D. (2022). Implementation of an AI chatbot as an English conversation partner in EFL speaking classes. *ReCALL*, *34*(3), 327–343.

How to cite this article: Hulusi Aytekin, H., Nokuthula Bongani, N., & Banele Sifiso, B. (2026). From prohibition to integration: Why universal AI adoption in education and communication is a civilizational imperative. Artificial Intelligence Systems, 6(3), 41–48.