NATALITY AT RISK? RAISING DOUBTS
ON THE EDUCATIONAL IMPORTANCE OF ChatGPT

Pia Rojahn
University of Tübingen
e-mail: pia.rojahn@uni-tuebingen.de
ORCID 0009-0004-9597-4170

Abstract

Digital tools are part of our daily life. Thus, they also enter educational contexts. With reference to Hannah Arendt's writings this paper explores if, and to what extent, digital tools can be considered to be helpful and desirable in education. For this exploration the paper is divided into three parts. In the first part Arendt's distinction between three human activities and her concepts of *animal laborans* and *homo faber* are transferred to educational contexts. The second part connects these concepts to different ideas of educational theory and their consequences for teacher education. Finally, the last part reflects on the risks and potentialities of digital tools in education by taking a closer look at the discussion around ChatGPT and its claimed values for teachers.

Keywords: digital tools, education, Hannah Arendt, ChatGPT.

Introduction

In this paper, some of Hannah Arendt's writings will be analyzed to find answers for the challenges that the digital forms of life might pose for education. Her work is thought to include responses, because she already foresaw many problems of the 21st century, especially in relation to technologization, instrumentalism and isolation. The paper will be divided in three parts: The first part will focus on her distinctions between human activities stated in *The Human Condition* (Arendt, 1958b) and extend her train of thought – especially in relation to labor and work – to educational contexts. In the second part the characterizations of the *animal laborans* and the *homo faber* will be discussed in connection to ideas of educational theory (cf. Zamojski, 2015) and their consequences for teacher education. The last part will reflect on the risks and potentialities of a certain digital tool (ChatGPT) for education – because for education the

newness of the young generation (cf. Arendt, 1958a) and the unpredictability of inter-action is essential. Finally, the expectations that are connected to the use of digital tools in education will be questioned.

1. *Animal laborans* and *homo faber* as cautionary tales for education

Hannah Arendt's *The Human Condition* (1958b) differentiates between three human activities that constitute the *vita activa* (which is the German title of the book): labor, work and action. Labor concerns the necessities of life and thus, concentrates on im-mediate needs and how to fulfill them. In contrast to that, work focusses on production processes, on the making of things. Finally, action happens in-between people when they discuss how they want to share the world with each other. The condition of action is plurality, which is also the precondition for political life (cf. Arendt, 1958b). A cen-tral thesis of Arendt's *Human Condition* is that these three activities – labor, work and action – have fallen into an imbalance, and that in particular action, which springs from natality and constitutes the world, is increasingly rendered impossible in modern society and replaced by the other two activities.

Natality can be understood in two ways, following Arendt's thought: firstly, na-tality refers to the uniqueness and novelty of each new generation. This newness of each generation can unsettle the 'old' generation because it can question how they have seen and understood the world so far. Secondly, natality means the ability to start something anew, which is part of every human being from the moment s/he enters the world. Natality can be, thus, understood as the human ability for initiative and the potentiality that each human possesses to act spontaneously.

For Arendt, the world is the space in-between people, standing like a table in their midst and gathering them around it – it connects and at the same time separates them. This *in-between* has a continuity that extends far beyond the lifespan of an in-dividual (cf. 1958b, p. 55). The world, then, is a prerequisite for education, as it is always oriented toward the future and the continuation of humanity. The in-between arises from the fact that people are different and interact with each other, that is, they speak and act (cf. p. 176). For Arendt, the possibility of starting something anew, of taking initiative, is the second birth of humans: through their action, humans enter the world and give meaning to their physical existence (cf. p.176f). Action arises from the human condition of natality, and speech is rooted in the condition of plurality:

> If action as beginning corresponds to the fact of birth, if it is the actualization of the human condition of natality, then speech corresponds to the fact of distinctness and is the actual-ization of the human condition of plurality, that is, of living as a distinct and unique being among equals. (p. 178)

Arendt sees these two human abilities – speaking, as well as acting – but also their conditions threatened in modernity (cf. p. 208). She illustrates this threat by means of two sharp characterizations between which humans range in modernity.[1]

Arendt outlines the *animal laborans*, the working animal, in relation to Karl Marx's work[2] as a being that is only concerned with its livelihood and the satisfaction of its biological needs (cf. 1958b, p. 102–105). In contrast to this concept stands the *homo faber*, the producer, who places the making of things in the center of his life (cf. p.154–157). Both types mark extremes that focus on a certain logic. The *animal laborans* lives only for the satisfaction of its needs and has lost contact with the world (cf. p. 160). For the *animal laborans*, nature is only a source of material to satisfy its desires. For *homo faber*, the production of things is at the center of his existence. In contrast to the *animal laborans*, who lives in a herd-like existence, there is still a public space for the *homo faber*: the marketplace, where one offers one's products and receives recognition for them (cf. 1958b).

Since action and speech serve neither the basic satisfaction of needs, nor the production of products, these human activities are characterized as inactivity and stagnation in the logic of these two beings (cf. Arendt, 1958b, p. 208). Any public activities are judged only by utility in the perspective of *homo faber*, or only by the criterion of facilitating life in the *animal laborans'* way of thinking: "Both, therefore, are, strictly speaking, unpolitical, and will incline to denounce action and speech as idleness [...] and generally will judge public activities in terms of their usefulness to supposedly higher end – and to make the world more useful and more beautiful in the case of *homo faber*, to make life easier and longer in the case of the *animal laborans*" (p. 208; PR). The perspectives of *animal laborans* and *homo faber*, thus, always imply an instrumental point of view on the world and human's behavior in relation to the world. On the contrary, action is an activity that evolves as an end in itself and that happens spontaneously. If the interaction between humans is understood mainly in terms of *animal laborans* and *homo faber* the autotelic and spontaneous moments of human action are ignored.

Arendt's fear – that *homo faber* and *animal laborans* increasingly determine human coexistence – can also be applied to educational contexts. Arendt herself gives an example at the end of her work: Behaviorism,[3] which she considers worryingly realistic

---

[1] These characterizations are exaggerated and, therefore, cannot be found in pure form in any human. However, these exaggerations are very useful to understand certain tendencies, particularly, in educational thinking.

[2] Arendt's interpretation of Marx's labor-term is quite narrow. In most of Marx' work his term of labor is very broad and includes nearly all conscious activities (cf. Marx, 1844/2022).

[3] Behaviorism first emerged in psychology at the beginning of the 20th century: "The behaviorist school arose through consistent application of animal psychological methods to human psychology in response to unfruitful discussions about the nature of phenomena of

in light of modern developments (cf. 1958b, p. 322). Behaviorist educational theory follows the logic of the *animal laborans*: humans have needs and only need to learn how to satisfy them most easily and safely. Adolescents are conceived in this educational logic as trainable beings who need only learn standardized rules in order to survive. The unpredictability of human actions is to be reduced as much as possible by conditioning the next generation. They are supposed to disrupt the existing society as little as possible and fit seamlessly into the existing. Behaviorism focuses on behavioral training in the here and now and manages without a specific idea of the future.

Fabrication (work), the second of the three human activities, can also be related to pedagogical contexts. Education as fabrication refers first to the nature-nurture-debate that has always been part of the educational discussion. The metaphor of the sculptor, who conceives of adolescents as raw material that s/he can shape according to his/her ideas, focuses on the environment as the most formative educational force. It also follows from the logic of production that the environment is judged according to the principles of usability. This idea would also have to be applied to the treatment of the next generation: Adults would primarily pass on their work-relevant skills to their offspring so that they could participate in the fabrication processes as quickly and smoothly as possible (cf. Arendt, 1958b, p. 162).

Both educational logics – of education as labor and as work – ignore human natality and they no longer have the continuance of the world in view. In addition to that they no longer make the world as the in-between possible. In the logic of the *animal laborans*, there is no longer any need for plurality, since the laboring animals devote themselves herd-like and repetitively to their labor. Any differences are ignored, as they are irrelevant to the simple processes of labor. *Homo faber* reduces the world to a material to be worked with and s/he needs interpersonal interaction only to exchange ideas about his/her products and their manufacturing processes. Mutual exchange beyond considerations of utility is not of relevance to *homo faber*. The reduction of human activities to labor, or work excludes action and thus the initiative, the ability of humans to start something new, as far as possible. Finally, political action is consequently made impossible (cf. Arendt, 1958b, p. 220, p. 314).

Arendt's characterizations of *animal laborans* and *homo faber* illustrate two imaginable extremes of life forms in capitalist societies. When these logics are transferred

---

consciousness. The object of psychology becomes the behavior that serves to adapt to the environment. The two main questions are: 1. what acts as a stimulus to organisms by eliciting responses? 2. how do new connections between stimuli and responses emerge?" (Bergius 2017, translated by PR). These considerations, formulated by W. McDougall (1912) and J. B. Watson (1913), among others, were also widely received in educational psychology, especially by B. F. Skinner, who wanted to make behaviorist ideas fruitful for the "methodology of teaching" (1971). In particular, he concentrated on reinforcement through rewards for desired behavior of students. At the same time, however, the possibilities of weakening undesired behavior through punishment were also explored.

to education, they hint at some educational challenges of (post-)modern times. Thus, these two characterizations can be linked to educational thinking and point out some problems of instrumental and critical ideas of educational theory that are present in today's conceptions of teacher education.

2. The Risks of Instrumental and Critical Thinking in Educational Theory

In his essay "Philosophy for Education", Piotr Zamojski (2015) distinguishes three ideas of educational theory: the instrumental, the critical, and the post-critical. The instrumental approach can be related in particular to Arendt's critique of *homo faber*: In the instrumental perspective, theory is understood as instrumental guidance that should above all establish clear references for application (cf. Zamojski, 2015, p. 131). In this understanding, educational theory is reduced to writing down guidelines that should bring about certain "educational action"[4] (p. 133). Pedagogical practice thus becomes a "manageable process" (p. 134) in which educational theory serves only to justify certain courses of action. Zamojski states that pedagogical practice understood as the application of intended action, the results of which should already be fixed, reduces education to a "technical tooling of 'human material' (2015). People would be objectified and dehumanized within the instrumental logic. All educational considerations would be "framed by the logic of production, its means and outcomes" in the instrumental understanding (2015). This instrumental understanding of educational theory pursues – just like *homo faber* – only the logic of fabrication processes.

Following this logic, teacher education would be understood only as the standardized production of teaching personnel who can follow ministerial guidelines and successfully apply pedagogical teaching prescriptions. The fact that empirical educational research – which largely pursues this instrumental notion of 'educational theory' – has become the most important basis for school and educational policy decisions in recent years seems to stem precisely from this desire to produce 'functioning' teachers as quickly as possible.

Critical educational theory has sought to respond to the dehumanization and fabrication orientation in school and university settings.[5] Instrumental logic leads – as Arendt showed in her Eichmann analysis – to thoughtlessness, which results in the inability to judge, since one absolves oneself of one's autonomy of action if one only blindly follows externally given guidelines (cf. Zamojski, 2015, p. 135). In the critical

---

[4] Zamojski's use of the term 'action' here is not identical with Arendt's understanding of action. In contrast to Arendt's concept, the understanding of action used here does not necessarily happen in relation to other people, and does not always concern public or political issues.

[5] The most famous example for critical pedagogy would be Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970/2005).

approach, pedagogues become critical creators of their own practice, continuously using their intellectual abilities and, above all, their ability to reflect (cf. p. 137). What is important here is that any critique that rejects something implicitly affirms something else: in this case, it is a utopia that inspires pedagogical action (cf. Zamojski, 2015). What seems problematic is that this utopia lies at a very long distance – for example, freedom from relations of domination and/or the end of capitalism – and will not be achieved by those who are currently striving for it. This could lead to cynicism and frustration among teachers. Zamojski notes that pedagogical practice in the critical approach is understood as a substantially political activity and is linked to the belief that pedagogy, through emancipatory enlightenment, can change the social world (cf. p. 138–139).[6]

If teacher education is now thought of primarily in terms of this outline of critical understanding, problems arise on two levels. The critical approach assumes a student image that in a way corresponds to the *animal laborans*: pupils are subject to certain constraints and necessities from which they must first be freed in order to participate in learning processes. Thus, before they could enter into educational processes, students would first have to be emancipated and enlightened with the support of critical teachers. In this logic, teachers become fighters against social inequality. On the level of the teaching-learning relationship, a rescuer-victim logic[7] is anchored, which always assumes a disadvantaged position of the students. Similarly, at the level of teacher education at the university, a naïve and deficient position of teacher students is often assumed, which would have to be remedied by university teachers. What is problematic at both levels is that the transmission of knowledge takes a back seat, although it is precisely by focusing on the subject matter that equality could be created (cf. Vlieghe & Zamojski, 2019, p. 45–60). The university in particular, which is based

---

[6] Zamojski's depiction of the critical approach in education outlines one reduced reception of critical theory in education that can sometimes be found in teacher training programs. However, the problems that Zamojski describes, are not necessarily inherent in critical educational theory but they emerge out of a reduced perception of it. It could be claimed that the teacher's cynicism and frustration arise from a rather instrumental understanding of critical theory, which leads to unrealistic expectations towards the impact of teacher's action. It is important to underline that not all critical pedagogues inevitably turn into cynics.

[7] This logic can be found in Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970/2005), in which he underlines the liberation of the oppressed as a pedagogical task: "The revolutionary leaders of every epoch who have affirmed that the oppressed must accept the struggle for their liberation – an obvious point – have also thereby implicitly recognized the pedagogical aspect of this struggle. Many of these leaders, however (perhaps due to natural and understandable biases against pedagogy), have ended up using the 'educational' methods employed by the oppressor. […] The struggle begins with men's recognition that they have been destroyed. Propaganda, management, manipulation—all arms of domination—cannot be the instruments of their rehumanization. The only effective instrument is a humanizing pedagogy in which the revolutionary leadership establishes a permanent relationship of dialogue with the oppressed" (p. 67–68; PR).

on an idea of equality in the ability to do research, would have to understand students as equally capable of (thinking about) the subject matter in the first place.

This idea of equality in relation to the ability to think is a core element of post-critical educational theory, which makes a strong case for linking thought and action. Zamojski therefore emphasizes that, especially in the pedagogical field, we should first assume that every action is meaningful "as it is connected with a certain life-world" (2015, p. 142). The meaningfulness of actions, however, is not recognizable in their result, but in their underlying logic (cf. 2015). Therefore, the instrumental production orientation is fruitless for pedagogical contexts. Particularly, it is important that pedagogical actions are always interactions, that is, "something that happens between people. Its sense lies in the quality of this interaction, in how it happens, and not in how it ends" (p. 143). The meaningfulness and quality of teaching-learning processes results precisely from the ongoing exchange between different people and not only from the outcome of the interaction. Zamojski refers here to a phenomenological understanding of educational theory that focuses neither on results of educational processes nor on curricula or legitimations, but rather puts the educational process itself in the center: "The theory offers itself as the logic of the practitioners' action. [...] The most important concern of educational practitioners is thus what happens between people while they act" (p. 145). This post-critical approach, however, should not replace criticism, but rather complement the critical position and remind us of "what has not been thought, what is forgotten and lost in the currently dominant way of thinking and simultaneously, essentially crucial for education" (p. 146).[8]

The Arendtian influence on Zamojski is particularly evident when he argues for "Weak Grand Theories" that do not pursue a claim to totality but promise "a new beginning" (Zamojski, 2015, p. 146). Zamojski's remarks are a vivid example of how Arendt's conception of human interaction, grounded in natality, can be made fruitful for educational theoretical contexts. Human thought and action as two levels of new beginnings are theoretically intertwined in the post-critical approach:

> Instead of closing the question on education the post-critical way of relating philosophy and educational practice strives for keeping this question opened and vivid. To keep a question opened and vivid means to seek for an answer that would not be considered as final or ultimate, but as weak: born without a claim to absoluteness, uncertain of its own premises, free from the intention to exclude other views, and therefore propositional, open to be inspired, to be contaminated with other ideas, logics etc. (p. 147)

---

[8] I would even argue for a dialectical relationship between critical and post-critical thinking. The critical perspective analyses the society and criticizes the inequality that it still enables. The post-critical pedagogue knows about this analysis. However, post-critical pedagogy puts a focus on the experience of equality during a lesson instead of concentrating on the ever-present inequalities. Still, both perspectives are aiming at reducing the existing inequality in society, only by setting different prioritizations.

In Zamojski's description of post-critical theory the Arendtian idea of natality seems to be inherent: it is open for newness and always expects that human actions could start a new beginning, and thus question the premises that were took for granted before. Post-critical perspectives on education stay open for unexpectedness and are, therefore, cautious towards standardized or absolute explanation attempts of human action.

3. Lost Natality in a Digital Age?

Algorithms are designed to analyze human behavior and based on this analysis they make predictions concerning the needs and interests of individuals (e.g. the algorithms behind Amazon, Netflix, etc.). Thus, algorithms use the data that was fed to them, they organize it and out of this data generate answers or suggestions. There are some algorithms that are supposed to have educational value or an importance for education. The most recent example is: ChatGPT. It is an online tool in dialogic form. ChatGPT can be asked anything and it will answer any question. However, the correctness of the answer cannot be promised. ChatGPT is based on the Common-Crawl dataset,[9] several books and big parts of Wikipedia (cf. Lopez, 2023, p. 17). This dataset was already analyzed and the result is a large language model that can create different texts. This artificial intelligence (A.I.) was created to generate texts that are coherent and that have a specific form. The form can be addressed in the question that you ask ChatGPT. It can write an essay, a poem, a song-text, a definition, etc. However, ChatGPT has its flaws: It can also come up with numerous sources concerning a theme that 'look' like they are valid sources – but they only have the form of a typical reference. A ChatGPT-generated bibliography has the perfect shape and the titles in it appear to be very important for the topic; but they do not exist. ChatGPT follows the rule 'form before content'. The text that it produces might appear like a well written essay, but the content is usually superficial and not very persuading.

Nevertheless, there are several articles that suggest ChatGPT could or even should be used for teaching, or could substitute a teacher, at least for some tasks.[10]

---

[9] Cf. commoncrawl.org/the-data/

[10] For example Roose (2023) and DitchThatTextbook (2022), which are particularly addressed to school teachers. In the German context, one of the most important political institutions for the reception of research in education – The Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Länder in the Federal Republic of Germany (Ständige Wissenschaftliche Kommission der Kultusministerkonferenz (SWK)) – even argues strongly for the high potential of Language Learning models for education (cf. SWK 2024). Another example is a collective commentary in the journal for *Learning and Individual Differences* that suggests: "For lesson planning, large language models can also assist teachers in the creation of (inclusive) lesson plans and activities. Teachers can input to the models the corpus of document based on which they want to build a course. The output can be a course syllabus with short description of each topic. Language models can also generate questions and prompts

Most of these articles believe that ChatGPT could make some parts of the teaching profession easier, for example writing lesson plans, or creating "personalized learning experiences" (Ditch That Textbook, 2022) for students, as well as "generate targeted and personalized practice problems and quizzes, which can help to ensure that students are mastering the material" (Kasneci et al., 2023). However, the idea of learning that underlies these suggestions is a very reduced one. In this understanding, learning is a linear process that starts with a question that can be answered easily and clearly. If learning is understood in this way, any instruction could be taken over by a chatbot.[11]

This underlying idea of learning assorts well with the above outlined ideas of education as labor (*animal laborans*) or work (*homo faber*). If creating lesson plans is understood as a standardized task through which the teacher finds a fitting method/technique for some content, it can be understood as labor. It is, then, a repetitive task that just aims at outlining the transmission process of some content or skill to the students. Or if creating "personalized learning experiences" (Ditch That Textbook, 2022.) for students is understood as a fabrication process, in which students are the fabricators of their learning outcomes, learning can be understood as work. In the understanding of education as labor the teacher is reduced to a trainer who uses standardized techniques to transmit certain skills that are useful to fulfill immediate needs.[12] The idea of education as work implies that the teacher is a facilitator of students' learning processes. The teacher creates a certain learning environment that enables the students to do (produce) something.

Those reduced conceptions of the teaching profession can be also criticized with Arendt's essay on the "Crisis in Education" (1958a),[13] in which she emphasizes that teachers always are representatives of the common world (cf. p. 188). She points out

---

that encourage the participation of people at different knowledge and ability levels, and elicit critical thinking and problem-solving. Moreover, they can be used to generate targeted and personalized practice problems and quizzes, which can help to ensure that students are mastering the material." (Kasneci et al., 2023; highlight in original). Finally, one paper even poses the question "Can Chat GPT Replace the Role of the Teacher in the Classroom" (Ausat et al., 2023) and concludes: "In essence, the use of ChatGPT in the classroom can make an important contribution in simplifying the teacher's task and assisting students in learning […]. However, the role of teachers as mentors and role models *still cannot be fully replaced by technology*. Therefore, ChatGPT can be used as an auxiliary tool in the learning process and not as a substitute for the teacher's role" (16103; PR).

[11] Even though, this instruction would still need to deal with the problem that ChatGPT produces incorrect content.

[12] For example, the teachers would focus on teaching how to basically write and read. However, complex literature analyses that need profound language understanding would be deemed needless.

[13] Arendt's essay can be understood as an addition to her *Human Condition* where she tries to relate her concepts also to education (cf. Arendt, 1959, p. 46).

that the teaching profession[14] is embedded in the generational relationship between the young and the old and that the teacher's most important task is the mediation between them. This mediator position comes along with a twofold responsibility:

> In education they assume responsibility for both, for the life and development of the child and for the continuance of the world. These two responsibilities do not by any means coincide; they may indeed come into conflict with each other. The responsibility for the development of the child turns in a certain sense against the world: the child requires special protection and care so that nothing destructive may happen to him from the world. But the world, too, needs protection to keep it from being overrun and destroyed by the onslaught of the new that bursts upon it with each new generation. (Arendt, 1958a, p. 182)

Because of this twofold responsibility the teacher needs to choose cautiously, which content will be taught and not only how it will be taught. To make those decisions teachers need to be experts of the subject(s) that they teach. They need to have a systematic overview of their discipline and thanks to this overview, they are able to choose examples of 'exemplary validity' (cf. Arendt, 1992, p. 85).[15] However, Arendt emphasizes that teaching is not only about this expert knowledge, but also about taking responsibility for that knowledge. This includes knowing about the historical context and about how some content emerged, evolved, but also knowing about its limits. In her *Lectures on Kant's Political Philosophy* (1982/1992) Arendt describes this as critical thinking and points out that it includes to "analyze what we can know *and* what we cannot" (p. 33).

ChatGPT does not take responsibility for its answers. Its answers vary and its sources are rarely transparent. ChatGPT is based on a data set, which is not the same as systematic knowledge. Data can be fractured into little fragments and then combined nearly arbitrarily. ChatGPT just answers the question that you pose; it does not ask for the basis of your questions or raises doubts about the meaning or ends of your demands to it. On the contrary, teachers raise doubts and ask questions back that enable a student to think about the context of one's question. This is why even the articles that embrace (and maybe overestimate) the possibilities of A.I. in education come to the conclusion that only teachers can prepare students for a digital age: "This adjustment will not be easy. Sudden technological shifts rarely are. But who better to guide students into this strange new world than their teachers?" (Roose, 2023). But still, it becomes clear that the idea to replace the teacher by technology remains somehow

---

[14] Arendt refers here to school teachers and does not include university or other adult education.

[15] Arendt explains the concept of 'exemplary validity' in her work on Kant's *Critique of Judgement*: "Most concepts in the historical and political sciences are of this restricted nature; they have their origin in some particular historical incident, and we then proceed to make it 'exemplary' – to see in the particular what is valid for more than one case" (Arendt, 1982/1992: p. 85).

desirable for many authors who embrace the use of ChatGPT in education (cf. Ausat et al., 2023, p. 3–5; Kasneci et al., 2023).

There are two more doubts about the use of ChatGPT in education that need to be underlined: You cannot train your judgement with ChatGPT and ChatGPT keeps you from experiencing natality. In Arendt's concept of judgement (cf. Arendt, 1992), it is crucial that you engage with others and narrations of others to broaden your view of the world. The foundation of judgement is an 'enlarged thinking', which also includes opposed and conflicting perspectives. ChatGPT avoids these kinds of perspectives. It always answers in a neutral and normalizing way. It tries to give the most accepted answers that will not raise criticism. Therefore, ChatGPT does not confront you with debatable viewpoints on a topic. Using ChatGPT to train the ability of judgement in education, thus, is a very limited and doubtful undertaking.

Besides, ChatGPT makes use of a certain data set to create texts. Out of an existing 'language pool' it develops different combinations of the data and presents them as new answers to questions. Its writing style is usually descriptive and avoids provocation. ChatGPT can also be used to reformulate texts that you enter to it, e.g. to make a provocative statement less debatable. Having said that, it is clear that ChatGPT is not creative, or able to surprise anyone with new ideas. Trying to change, or optimize texts with ChatGPT, keeps us from using our own creativity and spontaneity. If we use ChatGPT as teachers, students or researchers to continuously adjust our writings, we keep ourselves from experiencing natality, our ability to start something anew that will surprise us.

4. Conclusions

ChatGPT will not substitute teachers, even though it is easily personified because it uses language in a seemingly creative way. However, the discussion around this new tool and its use in education reveals some problems of contemporary educational ideas – or rather, of the contemporary expectations concerning education.

> Contemporary education governance operates through measurement, rankings, and comparisons that are designed to motivate performance and direct attention to 'best practice.' […] Technology companies large and small promise to help educational organizations and individual students achieve better outcomes through data-driven management, personalized learning, and the development of automated testing and marking, but the involvement of these new actors in education is reworking relations of authority and control. (Gulson et al., 2022; PR)

Gulson, Sellar and Webb (2022)[16] point out that the use of certain technologies fits in with the current perspective on education, which focuses on measuring and ranking student performance, as well as the performances of educational institutions. This perspective easily connects with an instrumental view of educational processes and educational theory.

Zamojski's differentiation for the relation between philosophy and education emphasized, that the instrumental relation leads to a problematic idea of learning and a reified view of students (and teachers). Even though the critical educational theory wants to find a way out of this instrumental relation, it, at first, encourages the reified perspective on students. A possibility to leave those instrumental and reifying logics could be found in the post-critical perspective. A post-critical perspective on the use of ChatGPT in education would not exclude the above outlined criticism, but would try to move forward and ask: in which way does it make sense to work with ChatGPT in education? What kind of possibilities could be opened up?

In addition to that, it would be important to raise the question: in which way does ChatGPT change our perception of the world and how does this change influence our educational ideas? ChatGPT makes the world seem very fluid and unstable. If the world is seen as dynamic and changeable, questions about the stability of knowledge arise, which lead to doubts concerning the basis of the teaching profession.

However, the pivotal point that this paper wanted to underline is that ChatGPT is not a magic tool that solves most educational problems.[17] Because the idea that educational problems could be solved easily and quickly is in itself already problematic. If education is understood in technological and economical terms (cf. Arendt, 1958a), the natality and plurality of human interaction is ignored. So, the discussion on education needs to shift its focus again on the basic principles and conditions of educational processes; and then it can ask questions about the use and meaningfulness of any tools in education, including ChatGPT.

---

[16] In their book on *Algorithms of Education* Gulson, Sellar and Webb (2022) analyze the relation between A.I. and education and its effects on educational governance.

[17] An example for the overestimation of ChatGPT can be found in a collaborative commentary titled "ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education" that ends with this paragraph: "In conclusion, large language models *have the potential to revolutionize teaching from a teacher's perspective* by providing teachers with a wide range of tools and resources that can assist with lesson planning, personalized content creation, differentiation and personalized instruction, assessment, and professional development. Overall, *large language models have the potential to be a powerful tool in education*, and there are a number of ongoing research efforts exploring its potential applications in this area." (Kasneci et al., 2023; PR).

REFERENCES

Arendt, H. (1958a/2006). *The Crisis in Education. Between Past and Future*. Penguin.

Arendt, H. (1958b/1998). *The Human Condition*. Chicago University Press.

Arendt, H. (1959). *Reflections on Little Rock.* Dissent.

Arendt, H. (1982/1992). *Lectures on Kant's Political Philosophy*. Chicago University Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226231785.001.0001

Ausat, A. M. A., Massang, B., Efendi, M., Nofirman, N. & Riady, Y. (2023). Can ChatGPT Replace the Role of the Teacher in the Classroom: A Fundamental Analysis. *Journal on Education*, *5*(4), 16100–16106. https://jonedu.org/index.php/joe/article/view/2745 (access: 11.03.24).

Bergius, R. (2017). Behaviorismus. In J. Ritter, K. Gründer, G. Gabriel (Eds.), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie*. Onlineversion 2017. Schwabe AG Verlag. https://doi.org/10.24894/hwph.424

DitchThatTextbook. (2022). ChatGPT, Chatbots and Artificial Intelligence in Education. 17.12.2022. https://ditchthattextbook.com/ai/#t-1671292150924 (access: 11.08.23).

Freire, P. (1970/2005): *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Continuum.

Gulson, K. N., Sellar, S., Webb, P. T. (2022): *Algorithms of Education. How Datafication and Artificial Intelligence Shape Policy*. University of Minnesota Press. https://doi.org/10.5749/9781452968797

Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *103*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274

Lopez, P. (2023): ChatGPT und der Unterschied zwischen Form und Inhalt. *Merkur, 77*(891), 15–27.

Marx, K. (1844/2022). *Ökonomisch-philosophische Manuskripte. Mit einem Kommentar von Michael Quante*. Suhrkamp.

Roose, K. (2023, January 12). Don't Ban ChatGPT in Schools. Teach With It. *The New York Times*, 12.01.2023. https://www.nytimes.com/2023/01/12/technology/chatgpt-schools-teachers.html (access: 10.08.23).

[SWK] Ständige Wissenschaftliche Kommission der Kultusministerkonferenz. (2024). *Large Language Models und ihre Potenziale im Bildungssystem. Impulspapier der Ständigen Wissenschaftlichen Kommission der Kultusministerkonferenz*. SWK. https://www.pedocs.de/volltexte/2024/28303/pdf/SWK_2024_Large_Language_Models.pdf (access: 11.03.24).

Vlieghe, J., Zamojski, P. (2019). *Towards an Ontology of Teaching. Thing-centred Pedagogy, Affirmation and Love for the World*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-16003-6

Zamojski, P. (2015): Philosophy for Education – an attempt at exercise in thought. *Kwartalnik Pedagogiczny, 1*(235), 127–151.