KIU Interdisciplinary Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences

EPISTEMIC OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES IN ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Etuk Anthony Raphael[1] & Ujoh Emmanuel Amoji [2]

[1] (Ph.D), University of Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria, Email: etuky4real@gmail.com,
ORCID id: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7708-9061
[2] (Ph.D), Department of Philosophy, University of Calabar, Cross River State, Nigeria. Email: amojifr@yahoo.com

Citation: Etuk A. Raphael & Ujoh E. Amoji (2025). Epistemic opportunities and challenges in artificial intelligence. *KIU Interdisciplinary Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 6*(2), 10-21

ABSTRACT

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has emerged as a transformative force in our digital age, recognized for its capacity to complement human intelligence. However, despite the significant opportunities AI presents, concerns regarding the challenges posed by AI-driven applications are increasing. This contrast is particularly evident in knowledge practices; while AI reshapes how humans navigate and optimize information and knowledge, its adoption introduces epistemic challenges that tend to undermine the integrity of human knowledge. This research contextualizes AI within epistemological traditions, exploring the epistemic opportunities and challenges inherent in its integration into knowledge practices. To address these challenges, the study recommends collaborative engagement guided by human oversight to preserve epistemic autonomy, alongside institutional and technical safeguards to realign AI's framework with traditional epistemic values. The research concludes that creative, critical engagement with AI rather than resistance is essential for maximizing technological benefits while safeguarding the foundational integrity of human knowledge.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Algorithms, Epistemology, Epistemic Agency, Knowledge

INTRODUCTION

Technology is increasingly woven into the fabric of daily life, serving to enhance human capabilities and simplify routine activities (Siegel, 2019). With the advent of Artificial Intelligence (AI), society is currently experiencing an extraordinary period of technological innovation. Due to its capacity to automate complex tasks, extract insights from massive data repositories (Bag et al., 2021), manage knowledge efficiently (Wu et al., 2023), and facilitate seamless information application (Rezaei, 2024), AI has revolutionized various human endeavours. Beyond mere efficiency, AI has emerged as a "crucial bridge for connecting and expanding humanity's collective wisdom" (Colther & Gonsoulin, 2024, p. 1).

In the realm of knowledge practices, AI has fundamentally reshaped management paradigms and the ways individuals optimize knowledge resources. Through diverse digital systems, AI enables advanced methods of knowledge creation, dissemination, and utilization (Duan et al., 2019). This contributes significantly to the contemporary information society and what Floridi (2010) terms the "Fourth Revolution." Indeed, it is difficult to identify another technology whose conceptual framework has so deeply influenced social evolution in less than half a century as Artificial Intelligence (Ganascia, 2010).

However, this intervention of AI in knowledge practices is fraught with epistemic challenges that tend undermine the nature of human inquiry. AI often blurs the boundaries between human and artificial epistemology, forcing a re-evaluation of fundamental epistemological concepts such as epistemic agency (Wamba et al., 2022). These shifts pose serious threats to how knowledge is represented, validated, and utilized (Martin & Singh, 2024). This research explores these opportunities (benefits) and challenges (risks) of AI's integration in knowledge practices, proposing strategies to ensure AI supports, rather than subverts, the human pursuit of knowledge.

The Nature of Knowledge

We require knowledge to guide our actions and satisfy our curiosities about the world. However, defining knowledge and what it truly means for a human to "know" is a complex philosophical undertaking. Examining these questions is essential for understanding the ontological nature of knowledge, which serves as the necessary background for assessing the epistemic status of AI-generated outputs and the impact of AI's intervention in knowledge practices. What does it mean for a human to "know"? This question is the central concern of epistemology the theory of knowledge. Derived from the Greek episteme (knowledge) and logos (study), epistemology analyses how knowledge is acquired, processed, and validated (Hamlyn, 2004; Peters & Griffin, 2019). While the term "knowledge" is often used to describe access to correct information, satisfying its formal requirements is difficult, making a universally accepted definition elusive (Rescher, 2003). Knowledge is frequently identified with psychological states such as familiarity, awareness, or belief (Ozumba, 2015). However, these internal states are often insufficient to establish the truth of a claim, frequently due to the limitations of human perception or the indiscernibility of objects. Consequently, epistemologists distinguish mere belief from knowledge, asserting that "knowledge is not simply a matter of having a true belief, but rather, knowledge calls for having a true belief that is appropriately justified" (Rescher, 2003, p. 4).

Epistemology focuses on propositional knowledge expressed as "X knows that P." This suggests a specific relationship between a subject and a proposition. For a subject to truly "know," three conditions must typically be met: the subject must believe the proposition, the proposition must be true, and the belief must be appropriately justified by adequate grounds rather than luck or guesswork (Dancy, 1991). Without these "tripartite" conditions Justified True Belief (JTB) the mind is merely holding an opinion. While Edmund Gettier (1963) famously challenged the sufficiency of these conditions by demonstrating that one could hold a justified true belief based on facts irrelevant to the truth of the belief, his critique did not dismiss the necessity of these conditions. Instead, the "Gettier Problem" shifted contemporary discourse toward finding supplementary conditions to further secure the boundaries of human knowledge.

Beyond formal definitions, knowledge involves subjective experience and interpretive elements. The two major schools of thought Rationalism and Empiricism regard "ideas" as the building blocks of knowledge but differ on their origins. Empiricists emphasize the primacy of sense experience, arguing that ideas represent objects perceived through the senses (Hume, 1739/1976; Onah, 2025). Conversely, Rationalists uphold the primacy of reason, suggesting

that reality is known through intuition, logical deduction, and innate ideas (Copleston, 1977).

Furthermore, human knowledge is deeply contextual, shaped by culture, social structures, and experiential practices (Williams, 1993). The knowing subject is never entirely detached from their environment; rather, knowledge is situated within a rich interplay of sensory data and conceptual frameworks. Chang (2023) explains that knowing is not a static representation of reality but a dynamic process of inquiry involving a rich interplay of sensory data, conceptual frameworks, and experiential practices, manipulations, and evolving aims of investigators. Similarly, Uzoigwe and Innocent (2025) note that human knowledge is both flexible and context-dependent. However, with the advent of AI, epistemology has expanded beyond these traditional concerns to examine the implications of adopting intelligent machines into knowledge practices. Assessing the impact of AI requires a clear understanding of its epistemic framework and the specific opportunities and challenges it introduces to the human pursuit of knowledge.

Artificial Intelligence System

Artificial Intelligence technology system is a branch of computer science focused on developing computational systems capable of functions such as learning, reasoning, problem-solving, perception, and decision-making (Russell & Norvig, 2021). It fundamentally seeks to design machines that behave in ways that would be considered intelligent if a human were performing the same actions (McCarthy et al., 2006) or to perform tasks that would typically require human intelligence (Minsky, 1975). As Hauser (2016, p. 1).) notes, the discipline of AI represents the "possession of intelligence, or the exercise of thought, by machines such as computers".

Although AI was formally established in the 1950s, narratives regarding intelligent machines have a long historical trajectory (Cave et al., 2018). Alan Turing's (1950) seminal work, Computing Machinery and Intelligence, which posed the foundational question, "Can machines think?" and introduced the "Imitation Game" now known as the Turing Test laid the groundwork for AI as a field concerned with designing machines capable of tasks that normally require human cognition (Eke et al., 2023b). But the modern era of AI research was formally inaugurated at the Dartmouth Summer Research Conference in 1956, where the term "artificial intelligence" was first coined (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2019).

The Dartmouth conference convened pioneering minds such as John McCarthy, Marvin Minsky, Nathaniel Rochester, and Claude Shannon. They were motivated by the conjecture that every aspect of learning or intelligence could be precisely described and simulated by a machine (McCarthy et al., 2006). This vision inspired decades of research, leading to significant breakthroughs in the field (Crevier, 1993). In recent years, the perception of AI has shifted from a purely scientific examination of intelligence toward an engineering discipline focused on producing functional tools (Brey & Søraker, 2009). AI is generally categorized into Narrow (Weak) AI, which acts as a specialized problem-solving tool, and General (Strong) AI, which envisions the creation of a "real" mind possessing consciousness and self-awareness comparable to humans (Chang, 2020; Flowers, 2019).

A significant recent advancement in AI is Generative AI (Gen AI) systems based on advanced neural networks capable of producing realistic synthetic text, images, and audio (Galaz et al., 2023). The rise of Gen AI, particularly Large Language Models (LLMs) like ChatGPT, marks a new phase in knowledge

creation, enabling real-time interaction with vast repositories of information (Alavi et al., 2024; Storey, 2025). These technologies are now embedded in diverse sectors, including healthcare, finance, and education, transforming how knowledge is produced and consumed (Ade-Ibijola & Okonkwo, 2023; Kaplan & Haenlein, 2019). Estimates suggest that by 2030, AI could contribute over $15 trillion to the global economy as humans and machines increasingly collaborate (Schoeman et al., 2017).

Knowledge Creation and Sharing in AI

Knowledge creation in AI is the dynamic process of generating insights and contents through computational models (Uzoigwe & Innocent, 2025). Unlike human cognition, AI's mechanisms are primarily data-driven, relying on mathematical patterns and statistical models to represent information (Thompson & Weiss, 2020). This process typically involves several stages:

i. Data Ingestion: The collection and processing of vast datasets from diverse sources.
ii. Pattern Recognition: The analysis of data to identify underlying relationships.
iii. Machine Learning: The iterative process by which the system improves its performance over time.
iv. Knowledge Representation: The structuring of information into formats such as graphs or ontologies.
v. Reasoning and Inference: The application of logical rules and statistical models to draw conclusions and make predictions.

Epistemic Benefits of AI

Artificial Intelligence offers significant epistemic opportunities, fundamentally altering how knowledge is accessed, stored, and expanded. These benefits can be categorized into three primary areas: improved access, memory enhancement, and the acceleration of knowledge growth.

Improved Access to Knowledge

The most immediate epistemic impact of AI is its capacity to facilitate rapid access to information (Gill et al., 2022). Programmed to analyze data at a scale and speed that far exceeds human cognitive limits, AI systems establish and disseminate knowledge in real-time (Dwivedi et al., 2021). A prominent example is the deployment of chatbots and virtual assistants (Rezaei, 2024), which provide personalized, expeditious responses to queries. By automating routine information retrieval, AI "liberates time and energy for humans to engage in higher-order knowledge creation" (Luo et al., 2019). In this digital framework, the human subject is no longer required to be in a specific mental state of "focused inquiry" to claim knowledge. Simple engagement with AI interfaces overcomes traditional barriers of distance, time, and resource scarcity. As Colther and Doussoulin (2024) observe, AI creates an interconnected world that "redefines the ways society accesses, shares, creates, and consumes new knowledge" (p. 1).

Epistemic Aid to Memory

AI serves as a powerful epistemic tool that addresses the inherent limitations of human memory. In epistemology, memory is often regarded as a vital source of knowledge, as much of what is "known" is known through recollection (Pollock, 1999; Senor, 2009). However, human memory is naturally fallible; experiences fade and recollections cannot be reconstructed accurately. This unreliability of memory led David Hume (1739/1976) to argue that the images of memory are less vivid, less forceful, and less trustworthy than the immediate impressions from which they are derived.

In contrast, AI systems possess highly reliable, dense memory architectures. These systems automatically categorize and retrieve information without the degradation associated with biological memory (Wu et al., 2023). Expert systems, which mimic human expertise, store knowledge based on specific rules and heuristics that do not suffer from forgetfulness (Balogun, 2013). Furthermore, AI-powered search engines utilize advanced algorithms to understand intent and context, providing more accurate retrieval than traditional methods (Hill et al., 2024). Consequently, AI extends the scope of human knowledge, ensuring that our access to the past knowledge is more reliable and robust.

Growth and Quality of Knowledge Enhancement

AI accelerates the pace of scientific discovery by enabling researchers to process vast datasets and automate repetitive tasks (Abbadia, 2023). Tools driven by AI are revolutionizing the research lifecycle by generating hypotheses, identifying patterns in genomics or climate science that humans might overlook, and even assisting in literature reviews (Jenkins & Morrison, 2020; Robinson, 2018). Furthermore, AI is increasingly integrated into academic publishing and peer review, where automated systems assist in evaluating submissions and identifying emerging research trends (Huang & Smith, 2023). These advancements ensure that the growth of knowledge is not only faster but also more analytically rigorous.

Epistemic Challenges of AI

While AI significantly transforms how individuals navigate knowledge resources, its intervention in knowledge practices has precipitated serious epistemic challenges that threaten the integrity of human inquiry. These challenges include the diminution of epistemic agency, a burgeoning crisis regarding the nature of "knowing," the problematic "naturalization" of epistemology, and others as discussed below.

Diminished Epistemic Agency

Epistemic agency refers to "the control that human agents may exercise over their beliefs" (Schlosser, 2019, p. 2). It involves the ability of a subject to act intentionally in the pursuit of knowledge by forming and revising beliefs, which ensures both autonomy and accountability on the part of the human subject of knowledge (Coeckelbergh, 2025). However, this agency is increasingly threatened by digital environments that are very much mediated by AI digital technologies, which now heavily shape our epistemic lives, making the formation and revision of our beliefs rather difficult (Coeckelbergh, 2025). For instance, AI can be used to manipulate beliefs through algorithmic profiling and targeted propaganda, making it difficult for individuals to distinguish between truth and intentional deception.

Furthermore, AI-driven environments often trap users in "epistemic bubbles," where exposure to opposing views is systematically restricted (Coeckelbergh, 2025). This effect is intensified in "echo chambers," where individuals may develop a systematic distrust of any information originating outside their digital network (Nguyen, 2022). Peterson (2024) identifies a related harm known as the "streetlight effect," where individuals focus on easily accessible, AI-curated information rather than seeking broader, more accurate data. Such environments foster cognitive passivity, reducing the perceived need for critical reflection and leaving subjects "epistemically confused" by a surplus of unverified information (Gunn & Lynch, 2021).

The Epistemic Crisis: Can AI "Know"?

AI's data-driven structure has introduced profound confusion regarding the nature of knowledge itself (Martin & Singh, 2024). Traditionally, knowledge is a cognitive and normative affair – a relationship between a person and a fact characterized by psychological states and propositional content (Rescher, 2003). In contrast, AI redefines knowledge as mere data processing, statistical modelling, and algorithmic output. This shift raises a fundamental question: Can AI truly "know"? This research aligns with the consensus among many epistemologists that AI-generated output is not genuine knowledge but a computational simulation of understanding (Robinson & Zhao, 2021). While AI mimics cognitive behaviours and executes complex calculations, it lacks the subjective experience and intentionality essential to human consciousness. Operating solely on probabilistic reasoning, AI lacks the context-driven and intuitive depth of human cognition (Elias & Innocent, 2025). Consequently, machine output is at best probabilistic a characteristic that falls short of the indubitable, justified knowledge sought in classical epistemology.

Epistemic Outsourcing and Cognitive Shift

The integration of AI has encouraged "epistemic outsourcing," where human agents become passive recipients of information rather than active constructors of knowledge. This reliance on AI search engines weakens cognitive autonomy of the human knowing subject and fosters "epistemic laziness," eroding the mind's capacity to criticize, synthesize, and analyze reality. Lynch (2016) characterizes this phenomenon as "Google-knowing," an unfortunate shortcut that bypasses the critical thinking required for genuine understanding. This cognitive offloading/shift raises concerns regarding the "dehumanization" of education and the potential loss of foundational intellectual skills (Morales, 2023). It raises the question about who is the real knower. When the capacity for rational insight is hindered, the human subject is demoted from an active agent to a mere component in an automated information loop.

The Fostering of Naturalized Epistemology

Furthermore, the integration of AI in knowledge practices risks accelerating the "naturalization" of epistemology. As famously proposed by Quine (1969), naturalized epistemology seeks to reduce the study of knowledge to a branch of empirical psychology or natural science. In this framework, epistemology becomes purely descriptive studying the genesis and causal relations of beliefs rather than normative in philosophy. This shift moves epistemology away from the rational justification of knowledge to a simple description or study of the genesis and causal relations of our knowledge (Balogun, 2013). By treating knowledge as a purely empirical output of machine systems, we risk losing the philosophical structures necessary to evaluate the validity and truth of our beliefs, ultimately undermining the critical purpose of the discipline of epistemology.

Artificial Intelligence systems significantly bolster the project of naturalized epistemology by shifting the focus of inquiry from abstract analysis to empirical investigation. First, by simulating human reasoning, learning, and decision-making, AI provides a computational framework for an empirical description of how knowledge is formed. This transition moves the study of epistemology away from purely a priori philosophical speculation toward a cognitive and computational analysis of how information is actually processed. Furthermore, AI functions as an external cognitive agent that assists

human cognition, thereby demonstrating how knowledge is produced through human-machine interaction. This supports the Quinean thesis that epistemology should be "naturalized" by studying real cognitive systems within their natural environments. Moreover, in AI's data-driven paradigms, the criteria for knowledge shift toward performance, reliability, and predictive success rather than traditional logical justification.

However, the naturalization of epistemology through AI introduces significant epistemic challenges. If epistemology is fully assimilated into the empirical sciences, the gap between theory and evidence the problem of underdetermination remains an unresolved issue for human knowledge. Even scientific methodology requires a normative framework of justification that resides outside its own findings. Traditional epistemology provides this external ground by addressing fundamental questions: What is knowledge? and What justifies a belief? As Omoregbe (1998) contends, if epistemology is reduced to a branch of science, "then all hope or possibility of external justification is ruled out," leading to a circularity where science is used to validate the very cognitive processes upon which it depends.

Epistemic Paternalism and the "Black Box" Problem

Again, AI-driven knowledge systems are fraught with the challenge of epistemic paternalism, a phenomenon where complex algorithms undermine the role of belief justification by obscuring the rationale behind their outputs. Current machine learning models often function as "black boxes," characterized by opaque algorithmic structures that elude human interpretation (Rezaei, 2025). This lack of transparency compels users to accept outputs without an understanding of the underlying evidentiary basis. Consequently, the "unboxing" of these algorithms remains a significant engineering and philosophical hurdle, essential for establishing trust and accountability. Without the ability to fulfil the demands of justification, AI-generated content fails to meet the traditional criteria for robust knowledge (Kosovskaya, 2018), leading some to argue that this opacity is not merely a technical limitation but a deliberate, surreptitious practice (Hollanek, 2020).

Algorithmic Bias and Distorted Cognition

Moreover, AI systems are frequently compromised by epistemic bias, particularly when trained on datasets that reflect historical prejudices or false assumptions. Such biases result in discriminatory decision-making processes (DeCamp & Lindvall, 2020; Martin et al., 2022) and the generation of skewed insights that are particularly hazardous in sensitive domains like criminal justice, healthcare, and academic peer review (Mehrabi et al., 2021; Huang & Smith, 2023). When users encounter inconsistent or biased data, the integrity and objectivity of the resulting "knowledge" are fundamentally diminished (Janssen et al., 2020), leading to a systematically distorted understanding of reality.

Syntactic Manipulation vs. Semantic Understanding

Another critical epistemic challenge of AI use in knowledge practices is that AI frameworks do not facilitate genuine understanding. As Ijiomah (2013) notes, knowledge is intrinsically linked to understanding; however, AI remains "epistemically shallow," manipulating datasets syntactically without a grasp of semantic content. The limits of machine "knowledge" are strictly defined by statistical correlations and programmed rules (Elias, 2025; Turner & Schmidt, 2024). While humans engage in an active intellectual pursuit of coherence

and explanatory relationships (Briesen, 2014), AI lacks the consciousness and intentionality required for such depth. This echoes Searle's Chinese Room argument: the mere following of rules (syntax) is insufficient for the realization of meaning (semantics).

Epistemic Risks of Disinformation

Also, the proliferation of AI-generated disinformation poses a severe "epistemic risk" to the health of the social fabric. While the spread of misinformation has accelerated since the dawn of social media (Ha et al., 2021), generative AI has exponentially boosted the creation of deceptive content (Galaz et al., 2023). Since our conceptualization of reality dictates our social relations (Asouzu, 2011), a society saturated with falsehood is starved of the truth component necessary for social harmony. Social bots and deepfakes specifically exploit these techniques to emulate human behaviour and amplify low-credibility contents (Ferrara et al., 2016; Shao et al., 2018). By altering thought patterns and predisposing individuals toward negative behaviours, these technologies threaten the very foundations of shared epistemic trust.

Resolving Epistemic Challenges

While it is essential to embrace the revolutionary opportunities AI offers for the growth of knowledge, rigorous measures must be taken to mitigate its associated epistemic challenges. The objective is not resistance to AI, but a commitment to ensuring that these technologies are developed and utilized responsibly supporting human reasoning rather than replacing it. To preserve epistemic agency in the AI era, individuals must be empowered to maintain control over the pursuit of knowledge, and there must be institutional safeguards on AI models as well as adherence to AI ethical frameworks. The following approaches are therefore recommended to address the above-identified epistemic challenges:

Protecting epistemic agency requires extensive "AI literacy," which should be integrated into educational curricula as a form of epistemic literacy rather than mere technical skill. This training must emphasize the recognition of AI output statistical predictions, not authoritative truths. Users must be encouraged to exercise intellectual virtue by questioning evidence, identifying embedded assumptions, and recognizing potential biases before accepting AI-generated content. Such safeguards promote human evaluative judgment and align with the principles of virtue epistemology, ensuring that humans remain the ultimate arbiters of truth, particularly in high-stakes domains.

The "black box" nature of many AI models often engenders a lack of trust (Johnson & Patel, 2024). Consequently, Explainable AI (XAI) is vital for transparency, allowing users to comprehend the decision-making processes and the sources influencing a specific claim. As Chun and Yujie (2024) note, enhanced interpretability allows users to detect potential falsehoods and understand how specific predictions are derived (pp. 10–11). Thus, there is the need for institutional safeguards and ensuring that AI system developers develop models that provide reasons for their outputs and use interpretable architectures and post-hoc explanations.

To combat epistemic passivity, researchers and learners must balance AI efficiency with the preservation of human-centric values (Elias & Innocent, 2025). This involves regular "epistemic exercises," such as independent research and cross-referencing multiple sources before consulting algorithmic aids. Furthermore, the problem of AI-

driven disinformation must be addressed through technical safeguards, including the use of expert-curated datasets, fact-checking tools, and feedback mechanisms that allow users to report and correct errors.

Furthermore, at the heart of responsible AI is the development of systems that are not only legally compliant but also ethically and culturally sensitive. To overcome epistemic bias and injustice, AI design must represent diverse contextual understandings of reality (Eke et al., 2023a). While there is a global convergence around five ethical principles transparency, justice, non-maleficence, responsibility, and privacy their practical application by major technology corporations remains inconsistent (Jobin et al., 2019). A greater commitment to these principles is required from policymakers and developers. In the African context, for instance, AI integration must be sensitive to indigenous knowledge systems and cultural values to ensure epistemic fairness.

Conclusion

Artificial Intelligence has fundamentally redefined the landscape of knowledge creation and dissemination. However, its integration into knowledge practices has also introduced significant epistemic risks and challenges, specifically the diminution of epistemic agency and the erosion of critical thinking. This research does not advocate for the rejection of AI, but for a model of collaborative cognition. By prioritizing human oversight, enhancing AI's model transparency, and implementing robust institutional safeguards, society can effectively harvest AI's immense potential while safeguarding the foundational integrity of human inquiry. In this evolving partnership, humans must remain active, critical epistemic agents, ensuring that the AI technology serves as a tool that truly enhances, rather than diminish human knowledge.

References

1) Ade-Ibijola, A., & Okonkwo, C. (2023). Artificial intelligence in Africa: Emerging challenges. In D. O. Eke, K. Wakunuma, & S. Akintoye (Eds.), Social and cultural studies of robots and AI (pp. 35–60). Palgrave Macmillan.
2) Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. MIS Quarterly, 25(1), 107–136.
3) Alavi, M., Leidner, D., & Mousavi, R. (2024). Knowledge management perspective of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI). Journal of Association for Information Systems, 25(1),1-12.
4) Asouzu, I. (2011). Ibuanyidanda and the philosophy of essence (50th Inaugural Lecture of University of Calabar). Seesprint Press.
5) Bag, S., Gupta, S., Kumar, A., & Sivarajah, U. (2021). An integrated artificial intelligence framework for knowledge creation and B2B marketing rational decision making for improving firm performance. Industrial Marketing Management, 92, 178–189.
6) Balogun, O. (2013). Artificial intelligence and the quest for knowledge. In K. Ojong & E. John (Eds.), Living issues in epistemology (pp. 64–73). El-johns Publishers.
7) Borenstein, J., & Howard, A. (2021). Emerging challenges in AI and the need for AI ethics education. AI and Ethics, 1, 61–65.
8) Brey, P., & Søraker, J. (2009). Philosophy of computing and information technology. In A. Meijers (Ed.), Philosophy of technology and engineering sciences (pp. 1341–1407). Elsevier.
9) Briesen, J. (2014). Pictorial art and epistemic aims. In H. Klinke (Ed.), Art theory as visual epistemology (pp. 11–24). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

10) Byskov, M. (2021). What makes epistemic injustice an "injustice"? Journal of Social Philosophy, 52(1), 114–131.
11) Cave, S., Craig, C., Dihal, K., Dillon, S., Montgomery, J., Singler, B., & Taylor, L. (2018). Portrayals and perceptions of AI and why they matter. Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction, 53(2), 1–21.
12) Chang, A. (2020). Intelligence-based medicine: Artificial intelligence and human cognition in clinical medicine and healthcare. Annals of Translational Medicine, 8(7), 1–3.
13) Chang, H. (2023). Realism for realistic people: A new pragmatist philosophy of science. Cambridge University Press.
14) Coeckelbergh, M. (2025). AI and epistemic agency: How AI influences belief revision and its normative implications. Social Epistemology, 40(1), 59–71.
15) Colther, C., & Doussoulin, J. P. (2024). Artificial intelligence: Driving force in the evolution of human knowledge. Journal of Innovation & Knowledge, 9(4), Article 100625.
16) Copleston, F. (1977). A history of philosophy: Vol. 7. Modern philosophy: The British philosophers. Hobbes to Russell. Image Books.
17) Crevier, D. (1993). AI: The tumultuous search for artificial intelligence. Basic Books.
18) Dancy, J. (1991). Introduction to contemporary epistemology. Basil Blackwell.
19) DeCamp, M., & Lindvall, C. (2020). Latent bias and the implementation of artificial intelligence in medicine. Journal of American Medical Informatics Association, 27(12), 2037–2041.
20) Duan, Y., Edwards, J. S., & Dwivedi, Y. K. (2019). Artificial intelligence for decision making in the era of big data – evolution, challenges and research agenda. International Journal of Information Management, 48, 63–71.
21) Dwivedi, Y. K., Hughes, L., Ismagilova, E., Aarts, G., Coombs, C., Crick, T., Duan, Y., Dwivedi, R., Edwards, J., Eirug, A., Galanos, V., Ilavarasan, P. V., Janssen, M., Jones, P., Kar, A. K., Kizgin, H., Kronemann, B., Lal, B., Lucini, B., & Williams, M. D. (2021). Artificial Intelligence (AI): Multidisciplinary perspectives on emerging challenges, opportunities, and agenda for research, practice and policy. International Journal of Information Management, 57, Article 101994.
22) Eke, D. O., Wakunuma, K., & Akintoye, S. (Eds.). (2023a). Introducing responsible AI in Africa. In Social and cultural studies of robots and AI (pp. 1–11). Palgrave Macmillan.
23) Eke, D. O., Chintu, S. S., & Wakunuma, K. (2023b). Towards shaping the future of responsible AI in Africa. In D. O. Eke, K. Wakunuma, & S. Akintoye (Eds.), Social and cultural studies of robots and AI (pp. 169–191). Palgrave Macmillan.
24) Floridi, L. (2010). The philosophy of information. Oxford University Press.
25) Flowers, J. (2019). Strong and weak AI: Deweyan considerations. In Proceedings in Association for Advancement of Artificial Intelligence Spring Symposium: Towards conscious AI systems (pp. 80–85). AAAI Press.
26) Galaz, V., Metzler, H., Daume, S., Olsson, A., Lindström, B., & Marklund, A. (2023). AI could create a perfect storm of climate misinformation. Nature Climate Change, 13, 500–502.
27) Ganascia, J. G. (2010). Epistemology of AI revisited in the light of the philosophy of information. Knowledge, Technology & Policy, 23(1), 1–15.
28) Gettier, E. (1963). Is justified true belief knowledge? Analysis, 23(6), 121–123.
29) Gill, S. S., Xu, M., Ottaviani, C., Patros, P., Bahsoon, R., Shaghaghi, A., Golec, M., Stankovski, V., Wu, H., Abraham, A., Singh, M., Mehta, H., Ghosh, S. K., Baker, T., Parlikad, A. K., Lutfiyya, H., Kanhere, S. S., Sakellariou, R., Dustdar, S., & Uhlig, S. (2022). AI for next generation computing: Emerging trends and future directions. Internet of Things, 19, Article 100514.

30) Gunn, H., & Lynch, M. P. (2021). The internet and epistemic agency. In J. Lackey (Ed.), Applied epistemology (pp. 389–408). Oxford University Press.
31) Ha, L., Andreu Perez, L., & Ray, R. (2021). Mapping recent development in scholarship on fake news and misinformation, 2008 to 2017: Disciplinary contribution, topics, and impact. American Behavioural Scientist, 65(2), 290–315.
32) Hamlyn, D. (2004). Epistemology, history of. In Encyclopaedia of philosophy. Macmillan.
33) Hauser, L. (2016). Artificial intelligence. In J. Fieser & B. Dowden (Eds.), Internet encyclopaedia of philosophy. utm.edu (Original work published 2016).
34) Hill, J., Harris, C., & Clegg, A. (2024). Methods for using Bing's AI-powered search engine for data extraction for a systematic review. Research Synthesis Methods, 15(2), 347–353.
35) Hollanek, T. (2020). AI transparency: A matter of reconciling design with critique. AI & Society, 35(2), 1–9.
36) Huang, W., & Smith, P. (2023). AI in academic publishing: Challenges and ethical considerations. Learned Publishing, 36(2), 215–225.
37) Hume, D. (1976). A treatise on human nature (L. A. Selby-Bigge, Ed.). Clarendon. (Original work published 1739).
38) Ihejirika, C. I. (2015). Ethico-epistemological implications of artificial intelligence for humanity. Sophia: An African Journal of Philosophy and Public Affairs, 16(1), 1–24.
39) Ijiomah, C. (2013). Conceptualizing epistemology. In K. Ojong & E. John (Eds.), Living issues in epistemology (pp. 10–32). El-johns Publishers.
40) Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. Nature Machine Intelligence, 1, 389–399.
41) Johnson, R., & Patel, A. (2024). AI interpretability and trust in decision-making. Tech Ethics Press.
42) Kaplan, A., & Haenlein, M. (2019). Siri, Siri, in my hand: Who's the fairest in the land? On the interpretations, illustrations, and implications of artificial intelligence. Business Horizons, 62, 15–25.
43) Kizza, J. M. (2024). Security in wireless networks and devices. In J. M. Kizza (Ed.), Guide to computer network security (pp. 443–473). Springer International Publishing.
44) Kosovskaya, T. (2018). Predicate calculus as a tool for AI problems solution: Algorithms and their complexity. Intelligent System, 3, 1–20.
45) Lambooy, J. (2004). The transmission of knowledge, emerging networks, and the role of universities: An evolutionary approach. European Planning Studies, 12(5), 643–657.
46) Leone, D., Schiavone, F., Appio, F. P., & Chiao, B. (2021). How does artificial intelligence enable and enhance value co-creation in industrial markets? An exploratory case study in the healthcare ecosystem. Journal of Business Research, 129, 849–859.
47) Luo, X., Tong, S., Fang, Z., & Qu, Z. (2019). Frontiers: Machines vs. humans: The impact of artificial intelligence chatbot disclosure on customer purchases. Marketing Science, 38(6), 937–947.
48) Luxton, D. D. (2016). An introduction to artificial intelligence in behavioural and mental health care. In D. D. Luxton (Ed.), Artificial intelligence in behavioural and mental health care (pp. 1–26). Elsevier.
49) Lynch, M. P. (2016, March 28). Teaching in the time of Google. The Chronicle of Higher Education. http://chronicle.com/article/Teaching-in-the-Time-of-Google/236180
50) Martin, T., & Singh, R. (2024). The ontology of machine knowledge: Philosophical perspectives. AI and Cognition Publishing.
51) McCarthy, J., Minsky, M. L., Rochester, N., & Shannon, C. (2006). A proposal for the Dartmouth Summer Research Project on

Artificial Intelligence, August 31, 1955. AI Magazine, 27(4), 12.
52) Omoregbe, J. (2001). Philosophy of mind: An introduction to philosophical psychology. Joja Educational Research and Publishers.
53) Onah, A. U. (2025). Artificial intelligence and knowledge: Implications for knowledge. Journal of Philosophy, Policy and Strategic Studies, 2, 134-143.
54) Peterson, A. (2025). AI and the problem of knowledge collapse. AI and Society, 40, 3249-3269.
55) Quine, W. V. O. (1969). Ontological relativity and other essays. Columbia University Press.
56) Rezaei, M. (2025). Artificial intelligence in knowledge management: Identifying and addressing the key implementation challenges. Technological Forecasting & Social Change, 217, 124183.
57) Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (2021). Artificial intelligence: A modern approach (4th ed.). Pearson.
58) Schlosser, M. (2019). Agency. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2019/entries/agency/
59) Storey, V. (2025). Knowledge management in a world of generative AI: Impact and implications. ACM Transactions on Management Information Systems. https://doi.org/10.1145/3719209
60) Turing, A. (1950). Computing machinery and intelligence. Mind, 49, 433–460.
61) Uzoigwe, E., & Sanga, I. (2025). The epistemological foundations of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and its relevance for contemporary scholarship. Pinisi Journal of Art, Humanity and Social Studies, 5(1), 149-159.
62) Zhou, J., Zhang, Y., Luo, Q., Parker, A. G., & De Choudhury, M. (2023). Synthetic lies: Understanding AI-generated misinformation and evaluating algorithmic and human solutions. Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, 1–20.