AI Literacy Report

Week of November 19-25, 2025 — https://ainews.social

Executive Summary

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A financial analyst discovers his team uses AI to screen investment opportunities, achieving 40% faster processing but missing critical regulatory red flags that human analysts would catch. When he implements manual oversight, deal flow slows dramatically, putting the firm at a competitive disadvantage in an industry where AI-driven screening has become the baseline for institutional investing. This tension between competitive necessity and unmanaged risk exemplifies the central challenge organizations face this week.

AI promises unprecedented access to information and analytical capabilities, potentially democratizing expertise across domains. Research from [33] shows how these tools can empower broader participation in complex decision-making. Yet this promise directly contradicts the emerging reality documented in [22], which identifies critical gaps in users' ability to evaluate AI-generated content. This creates intense pressure for individuals who must adopt AI to remain competitive while navigating unanticipated risks.

[33] The AI Literacy Imperative

[22] Digital Citizenship in the AI Era

This week's analysis reveals a non-obvious pattern: the most significant barrier to effective AI adoption is not technical skill acquisition but the development of critical inference capabilities. Users rapidly learn to operate AI tools but struggle to interpret outputs within domain-specific contexts, leading to what [5] identifies as "automation bias"—over-reliance on AI without sufficient critical evaluation. This finding emerges from healthcare case studies where clinicians correctly used diagnostic AI but misinterpreted probabilistic outputs, potentially affecting patient outcomes. The evidence suggests we are creating a generation of AI operators rather than AI interpreters.

[5] AI Competency Framework

This report maps the current state of AI literacy across domains, analyzes key contradictions in adoption patterns, and provides actionable recommendations for developing critical AI interpretation skills. We identify research gaps in domain-specific inference training and propose frameworks for building organizational capacity. As AI becomes embedded in professional workflows, the ability to critically evaluate AI outputs—not just operate the tools—will determine meaningful participation in increasingly automated workplaces and

societies.

Field State Analysis

Current Literacy Landscape

The concept of "AI literacy" is currently a contested and evolving domain, with competing frameworks vying for dominance in educational and corporate settings. At its core, AI literacy represents the competencies required for individuals to understand, interact with, and critically evaluate artificial intelligence systems that are increasingly embedded in daily life [39]. The discourse reveals several distinct frameworks: a technical proficiency model focused on hands-on skills for using AI tools, a critical understanding approach centered on algorithmic awareness and bias detection, an ethical awareness framework addressing societal impacts, and a creative application model promoting innovation with AI technologies. These competing visions reflect deeper tensions about whether the primary goal of AI literacy is workforce preparation, informed citizenship, or individual empowerment [15].

[39] What is AI Literacy? Competencies and Design Considerations

[15] AI literacy: A structured approach to AI skills development

The development of AI literacy is occurring across multiple sectors, each with distinct priorities. Formal education systems, from K-12 to higher education, are increasingly integrating AI concepts into curricula, though often with an emphasis on technical skills over critical evaluation. Workplace training programs, driven by immediate productivity needs, typically focus on tool proficiency with vendor-developed materials that may lack critical perspectives. Self-directed learning through online platforms and community-based initiatives represents a third pathway, often more responsive to learner interests but varying widely in quality and comprehensiveness [32]. This fragmented ecosystem results in inconsistent literacy outcomes, with significant disparities in who develops which competencies.

[32] The AI Literacy Gap: A Global Perspective on AI Skills Development

Analysis of the current landscape reveals that technical and application-focused literacy approaches dominate, while critical evaluation competencies receive less systematic attention. The thematic synthesis across 41 identified themes shows a pronounced emphasis on operational knowledge—how to use specific AI tools and platforms—rather than on understanding the underlying mechanisms, limitations, or societal implications of these systems. This pattern suggests that literacy development is often driven by immediate utility rather than long-term understanding, potentially leaving learners equipped to use AI but not to question it [21]. The distribution of literacy efforts across these competing frameworks reflects broader societal priorities and power dynamics in how AI knowledge is constructed and disseminated.

[21] Developing AI Literacy: A Framework for Educators and Learners

Literacy Development Trajectory

The trajectory of AI literacy development reveals a tension between rapid skill acquisition and deeper conceptual understanding, with current momentum favoring speed over depth. Educational institutions and corporate training programs are prioritizing quick upskilling to meet immediate demand for AI-proficient workers, often through condensed workshops and tool-specific tutorials. This approach emphasizes functional competency with current AI applications but may sacrifice the foundational knowledge needed to adapt to rapidly evolving technologies. The dominant metaphor emerging from discourse analysis—AI as a "tool" or "assistant"—reinforces this utilitarian approach by framing literacy as operational proficiency rather than critical engagement [16].

[16] AI Literacy: An Emerging Competency for the 21st Century

This tool-centric metaphor carries significant implications for literacy assumptions, positioning users as consumers rather than co-creators or critics of AI systems. When AI is conceptualized primarily as a productivity tool, literacy naturally focuses on efficient usage rather than ethical consideration or systemic understanding. This framing obscures the political, social, and economic dimensions of AI, reducing complex sociotechnical systems to mere instruments. The trajectory suggests a concerning divergence between skills training that prepares people to work within existing AI systems and critical understanding that enables questioning and shaping those systems [24].

[24] From Digital Literacy to AI Literacy: The Evolution of Technology Competencies

The evolution of literacy efforts shows early signs of course correction as educators and policymakers recognize the limitations of purely technical approaches. Some institutions are beginning to integrate critical AI literacy across disciplines, not just in computer science, recognizing that understanding AI's societal impacts requires multidisciplinary perspectives. However, these initiatives remain the exception rather than the norm, and the overall trajectory still favors immediately marketable skills over the more complex critical competencies needed for genuine technological citizenship [37]. This tension between employability-focused training and comprehensive understanding will likely define the next phase of AI literacy development.

[37] The Future of AI Education: Beyond Technical Skills

Critical Literacy Gaps

Significant contradictions in the AI literacy landscape create critical gaps that hinder comprehensive understanding and meaningful participation. The most pronounced tension exists between efficiency-oriented approaches that prioritize quick skill acquisition and depth-focused models that emphasize critical understanding. This contradiction manifests in literacy materials that teach how to use AI systems

efficiently while neglecting to address their limitations, biases, or societal consequences. The efficiency model, often driven by corporate interests and economic imperatives, risks producing users who can operate AI tools but cannot evaluate their appropriateness or ethical implications [34].

[34] The AI Literacy Paradox: Skills vs. Critical Understanding

Another critical gap emerges from the tension between vendor-driven literacy materials and pedagogically grounded approaches. Many organizations rely on training developed by AI companies themselves, creating inherent conflicts of interest where critical perspectives on the technology's limitations are systematically omitted. This vendor-centric approach often frames literacy as acceptance and optimization of existing systems rather than critical evaluation of their design or implementation. Simultaneously, the focus on individual competency overlooks the need for systemic literacy—understanding how AI functions within broader social, economic, and political contexts [28].

[28] Missing Voices in AI Literacy: Whose Perspectives Are Being Ignored?

The 28 identified contradictions in the evidence architecture reveal perspective gaps that create significant blind spots in current literacy efforts. Analysis shows that technical developers' perspectives dominate literacy frameworks, while the voices of affected communities, ethicists, social scientists, and critical theorists are substantially underrepresented. This imbalance means literacy programs often center the needs and perspectives of those creating and deploying AI systems, while ignoring the literacy needs of those subject to these systems. The result is a form of AI literacy that prepares people to participate in AI development and usage but not to question its fundamental assumptions or power structures [20]. These gaps disproportionately affect marginalized communities who bear greater risks from AI systems but have less access to critical literacy resources.

[20] Critical AI Literacy: Beyond Technical Proficiency

Participation Implications

The current AI literacy landscape has profound implications for who can participate meaningfully in an AI-mediated society and who remains vulnerable to technological exploitation. The emphasis on technical proficiency over critical understanding creates a participation divide between those who can effectively use AI tools and those who can also understand, critique, and influence AI systems. This divide mirrors earlier digital literacy gaps but with higher stakes, as AI systems increasingly make consequential decisions in healthcare, finance, employment, and governance. Without critical AI literacy, individuals may possess the skills to interact with AI interfaces but lack the understanding to recognize manipulation, contest automated decisions, or advocate for equitable systems [8].

[8] AI Literacy and Democratic Participation: Challenges and Opportunities

The literacy gaps identified create systemic vulnerabilities where large segments of the population can be subject to AI-driven decisions without understanding the mechanisms, assumptions, or potential biases behind them. This knowledge asymmetry empowers technology creators and deployers while disempowering users and subjects of these systems. The prescriptive insights from dimensional analysis indicate that meaningful participation requires not just operational knowledge but what might be termed "algorithmic agency"—the capacity to understand how AI systems work, recognize their limitations, and exercise informed consent or resistance when appropriate [23].

[23] From AI Literacy to Algorithmic Agency: A Necessary Evolution

What is needed versus what is being provided represents a significant mismatch with serious democratic implications. Current literacy efforts predominantly prepare people for economic participation as workers and consumers, but not for civic participation as informed citizens in a technologically complex society. A comprehensive approach to AI literacy would balance technical skills with critical capacities, ensuring people can not only use AI tools but also understand their social implications, recognize their ethical dimensions, and participate in democratic deliberation about AI governance. Without this rebalancing, the AI literacy movement risks reinforcing existing power structures rather than empowering broader democratic participation in shaping our technological future [36].

[36] The Civic Imperative for Critical AI Literacy

Dimensional Analysis

Central Question

Pattern Description The discourse surrounding AI literacy reveals a fundamental tension between instrumental and critical questioning competencies. Current educational initiatives predominantly emphasize operational queries—how to use AI tools effectively—while neglecting deeper epistemological challenges about AI's societal role. Research from [19] demonstrates that even technology-focused professional development often frames questions around classroom integration, bypassing essential inquiries about data sovereignty, algorithmic bias, and the political economy of AI systems. This pattern creates a literacy gap where citizens can functionally interact with AI interfaces but lack the conceptual tools to interrogate their underlying power structures. Exemplars from [14] show promising shifts toward "questioning design" pedagogies that encourage students to investigate why specific AI systems prioritize certain outcomes over others, yet these approaches remain marginal compared to dominant skill-based frameworks. The emerging consensus suggests that literate citizens must develop what [1] characterizes as "critical interrogation literacy"—the

[19] Critical AI Literacy in Teacher Education

[14] AI Literacy in K-12

[1] A Framework for AI Literacy

capacity to ask not just how AI works, but for whom it works, and who benefits from its operational logics.

Tensions & Contradictions A central contradiction in questioning literacy manifests between efficiency-driven and ethics-driven inquiry. Corporate AI literacy initiatives documented in [12] typically promote questions about productivity enhancement and tool optimization, while critical literacy frameworks from [19] advocate for questions concerning justice, equity, and democratic accountability. This tension reflects broader societal conflicts about whether AI literacy should primarily serve economic participation or civic empowerment. The speed of AI adoption further exacerbates this divide, as rapid implementation cycles privilege practical "how-to" questions over slower, reflective "why" questions about long-term societal implications. This creates a literacy landscape where citizens can competently use AI tools while remaining unable to articulate fundamental concerns about their governance structures or ecological impacts.

[12] AI Literacy for All

[19] Critical AI Literacy in Teacher Education

Critical Observations Current AI literacy efforts demonstrate significant sophistication in teaching procedural questioning but concerning deficiencies in fostering critical interrogation. The overwhelming focus on usability questions creates citizens who are technically literate but politically vulnerable to AI system manipulations. Even advanced literacy programs documented in [14] often frame critical questions as secondary considerations rather than foundational competencies. This approach risks producing what might be termed "functionally critical" citizens—those who can parrot ethical concerns but lack the conceptual frameworks to generate original, context-specific critiques. The sophistication gap is particularly evident in addressing intersectional questions that connect AI systems to broader social structures, suggesting that current literacy paradigms remain siloed within technological domains rather than integrated across civic, environmental, and economic spheres.

[14] AI Literacy in K-12

Literacy Implications Meaningful participation requires developing what [1] identifies as "multidimensional questioning literacy"—the capacity to formulate inquiries across technical, ethical, social, and political dimensions. Citizens need specific competencies in generating power-aware questions that reveal whose interests are served by particular AI implementations, alongside ecological questions that trace the environmental costs of AI systems. This necessitates moving beyond current binary approaches that separate technical from ethical questioning, toward integrated frameworks where every operational question contains within it considerations of value and consequence. As [19] argues, the most crucial literacy competency may be the ability to ask "questions that the AI industry would prefer remain unasked"—particularly those concerning alternative technological futures and the

[1] A Framework for AI Literacy

[19] Critical AI Literacy in Teacher Education

distribution of AI's benefits and burdens across different communities.

Purpose

Pattern Description AI literacy discourse reveals a persistent confusion between understanding AI's inherent purposes and utilizing AI for human purposes—a distinction with profound implications for meaningful participation. Current educational frameworks documented in [12] overwhelmingly emphasize instrumental literacy: teaching citizens how to harness AI for personal or professional goals. This approach, while pragmatically valuable, often neglects the crucial literacy domain of comprehending why AI systems are developed in particular ways and toward what ends. Research from [1] demonstrates that even comprehensive literacy programs frequently frame purpose understanding as secondary to skill acquisition, creating citizens who can effectively use AI tools but remain naive about the commercial, political, or ideological drivers shaping their development. Exemplars from critical pedagogy show promising alternatives: [19] documents approaches that position purpose analysis as foundational, encouraging learners to investigate the economic models and value systems embedded within different AI applications.

[12] AI Literacy for All

[1] A Framework for AI Literacy

[19] Critical AI Literacy in Teacher Education

Tensions & Contradictions The fundamental tension in purpose literacy manifests as a conflict between adaptation and transformation orientations. Corporate-sponsored literacy initiatives highlighted in [12] typically promote purpose understanding that facilitates smoother integration into existing AI-mediated systems, while critical approaches from [19] advocate for purpose literacy that enables citizens to challenge and reshape those systems. This contradiction reflects deeper societal debates about whether AI literacy should primarily serve workforce preparation or democratic participation. The tension is further complicated by the rapid evolution of AI capabilities, which often positions purpose understanding as a luxury that cannot be afforded in basic literacy education, thereby creating a citizenry that can use AI efficiently but lacks the critical perspective to question whether particular AI applications should exist at all.

[12] AI Literacy for All

[19] Critical AI Literacy in Teacher Education

Critical Observations Current AI literacy efforts demonstrate sophisticated approaches to teaching purposeful use but concerningly underdeveloped frameworks for understanding AI's inherent purposes. The predominance of instrumental literacy creates what might be termed "purposefully illiterate" citizens—those who can skillfully employ AI tools while remaining unaware of the commercial surveillance, behavioral modification, or attention economy purposes embedded within those tools. Even advanced literacy programs documented in [1] often treat purpose analysis as an advanced competency rather than a foundational element, reinforcing the problematic no-

[1] A Framework for AI Literacy

tion that critical understanding should follow technical proficiency. This approach risks creating citizens who are functionally competent but critically disempowered, able to navigate AI systems but unable to articulate coherent positions about which AI purposes align with democratic values or human flourishing.

Literacy Implications Meaningful participation requires developing what [19] characterizes as "purpose discernment literacy"—the capacity to distinguish between stated and operational purposes in AI systems, and to evaluate whose interests those purposes serve. Citizens need specific competencies in tracing the relationship between technical design choices and underlying value commitments, particularly understanding how optimization for particular metrics (engagement, efficiency, profit) embodies specific conceptions of human purpose. This necessitates literacy approaches that connect technical understanding to philosophical anthropology—exploring what it means to be human in relation to increasingly purposive AI systems. As [1] suggests, the most crucial purpose literacy competency may be the ability to participate in defining what purposes AI should and should not serve in a democratic society, moving beyond passive consumption to active co-creation of technological futures.

[19] Critical AI Literacy in Teacher Education

[1] A Framework for AI Literacy

Information

Pattern Description The information dimension of AI literacy reveals significant disparities between what citizens need to know for meaningful participation and what current educational efforts prioritize. Analysis of literacy frameworks from [1] demonstrates a predominant focus on technical information—algorithmic concepts, data processing mechanics, and system functionalities—while substantially neglecting critical information about power structures, economic models, and ecological impacts. This creates what might be termed "informationally imbalanced" citizens: those who understand how AI systems work technically but lack crucial knowledge about why they work in particular ways and for whose benefit. Exemplars from [19] show alternative approaches that position information about labor conditions in AI development, data extraction practices, and environmental costs as equally essential to technical knowledge. However, these critical information domains remain marginal in mainstream literacy efforts, particularly those influenced by corporate actors who have vested interests in certain information remaining obscure or inaccessible.

[1] A Framework for AI Literacy

[19] Critical AI Literacy in Teacher Education

Tensions & Contradictions A central contradiction in information literacy manifests between comprehensiveness and accessibility demands. Research from [12] reveals that literacy initiatives often struggle with determining how much technical information non-specialists

[12] AI Literacy for All

need, frequently erring toward oversimplification that obscures crucial power dynamics. This tension is exacerbated by the rapid pace of AI development, which creates constant pressure to prioritize current technical information over enduring conceptual frameworks. The contradiction is particularly evident in discussions about algorithmic transparency: while critical literacy advocates argue for detailed information about training data and model architectures, corporate-friendly approaches often frame such information as overly technical or proprietary. This creates a literacy landscape where citizens receive abundant information about how to use AI systems but scarce information about how those systems use them—their data, attention, and behavioral patterns.

Critical Observations Current AI literacy efforts demonstrate sophisticated approaches to organizing technical information but concerning deficiencies in integrating critical knowledge domains. The artificial separation between "how it works" and "why it matters" information creates citizens who are technically informed but critically naive—able to explain machine learning concepts while remaining unaware of the colonial data practices or exploitative labor conditions embedded within AI supply chains. Even comprehensive frameworks documented in [1] often treat social and ethical information as supplementary rather than integral, reinforcing the problematic notion that technical understanding constitutes core literacy while critical understanding represents an optional enhancement. This approach risks producing what might be termed "informationally literate but critically illiterate" citizens—those who possess substantial technical knowledge but lack the contextual information needed for democratic participation in AI governance.

[1] A Framework for AI Literacy

Literacy Implications Meaningful participation requires developing what [19] characterizes as "integrated information literacy"—the capacity to synthesize technical, social, economic, and ecological knowledge about AI systems. Citizens need specific competencies in tracing information pathways from technical specifications to social consequences, understanding how particular algorithmic designs produce specific distributions of benefit and harm. This necessitates literacy approaches that reject artificial boundaries between technical and social information, instead presenting AI knowledge as inherently multidimensional. As [12] suggests, the most crucial information literacy competency may be understanding what information is systematically obscured in mainstream AI discourse—particularly concerning environmental costs, labor conditions, and long-term societal implications—and developing strategies to access and circulate this counter-information within democratic publics.

[19] Critical AI Literacy in Teacher Education

[12] AI Literacy for All

Concepts Ideas

Pattern Description The conceptual dimension of AI literacy reveals significant gaps between expert mental models and publicly accessible frameworks for understanding artificial intelligence. Analysis of educational materials from [1] demonstrates that current literacy efforts predominantly rely on computational concepts—algorithms, neural networks, training data—while neglecting crucial conceptual frameworks from critical theory, political economy, and science and technology studies that would enable citizens to understand AI as social and political, not just technical, systems. This creates what might be termed "conceptually limited" literacy: citizens who can competently discuss machine learning mechanisms but lack the conceptual vocabulary to analyze AI as an institutional force or cultural phenomenon. Exemplars from [19] show promising alternatives that introduce concepts like "algorithmic power," "data colonialism," and "technosolutionism" as essential literacy components, yet these critical conceptual frameworks remain largely confined to academic contexts rather than integrated into public literacy initiatives.

[1] A Framework for AI Literacy

[19] Critical AI Literacy in Teacher Education

Tensions & Contradictions A fundamental tension in conceptual literacy manifests between accuracy and accessibility demands. Research from [12] reveals that literacy developers often struggle with how to simplify complex AI concepts without distorting their essential nature or obscuring their power implications. This tension is particularly acute regarding concepts like "bias" and "fairness," which have precise technical meanings in computer science but much broader political meanings in public discourse. The contradiction is further complicated by corporate interests that often promote conceptual frameworks emphasizing AI's neutrality and objectivity, while critical approaches from [19] advocate for concepts that highlight AI's embedded values and political commitments. This creates a conceptual landscape where citizens learn to think about AI in depoliticized terms that facilitate smooth adoption but inhibit critical engagement.

[12] AI Literacy for All

[19] Critical AI Literacy in Teacher Education

Critical Observations Current AI literacy efforts demonstrate sophisticated approaches to teaching computational concepts but concerning deficiencies in integrating critical conceptual frameworks. The predominance of technical mental models creates citizens who can understand how AI systems process information but lack the conceptual tools to analyze how they reshape social relationships, institutional practices, and power distributions. Even comprehensive literacy programs documented in [1] often treat critical concepts as advanced supplements rather than foundational elements, reinforcing the problematic notion that technical understanding constitutes real literacy while social understanding represents optional criticism. This

[1] A Framework for AI Literacy

approach risks producing what might be termed "conceptually competent but critically disabled" citizens—those who possess accurate technical mental models but lack the conceptual frameworks needed to participate meaningfully in democratic decisions about AI's role in society.

Literacy Implications Meaningful participation requires developing what [19] characterizes as "integrative conceptual literacy"—the capacity to move fluidly between technical and critical conceptual frameworks when understanding AI systems. Citizens need specific competencies in connecting computational concepts like "neural networks" and "training data" to social concepts like "power" and "justice," understanding how technical architectures embody and amplify particular social relations. This necessitates literacy approaches that reject the artificial separation between technical and social conceptual domains, instead presenting AI understanding as inherently requiring both computational and critical mental models. As [1] suggests, the most crucial conceptual literacy competency may be the ability to translate between expert and public conceptual frameworks—not just simplifying technical concepts for public consumption, but enriching public discourse with critical concepts that enable democratic participation in technological decision-making.

[19] Critical AI Literacy in Teacher Education

[1] A Framework for AI Literacy

Assumptions

Pattern Description The assumptions dimension of AI literacy reveals that current educational efforts often fail to equip citizens with the critical capacities to identify and question the foundational premises underlying AI systems and discourse. Analysis of literacy frameworks from [1] demonstrates a predominant focus on teaching what AI can do, while substantially neglecting to examine the unstated assumptions about human nature, social progress, and technological determinism that shape AI development and deployment. This creates what might be termed "assumptively naive" citizens: those who can competently use AI tools while unconsciously accepting problematic premises about technological solutionism, data-driven decision-making, and efficiency as the supreme value. Exemplars from [19] show alternative approaches that position assumption analysis as central to literacy, encouraging learners to excavate and examine the often-invisible premises embedded in claims about AI's neutrality, objectivity, and inevitable progress. However, these critical approaches remain marginal in mainstream literacy initiatives.

[1] A Framework for AI Literacy

[19] Critical AI Literacy in Teacher Education

Tensions & Contradictions A central contradiction in assumption literacy manifests between adoption-friendly and critique-oriented approaches to questioning AI's foundational premises. Corporate literacy initiatives documented in [12] typically encourage questioning

[12] AI Literacy for All

assumptions about AI's limitations and potential improvements, while discouraging deeper interrogation of assumptions about whether particular social domains should be automated at all. This tension reflects broader societal conflicts about whether AI literacy should facilitate smoother technological integration or enable more fundamental questioning of technological directions. The contradiction is particularly evident in educational settings, where assumption questioning is often framed as a cognitive skill divorced from political awareness, creating citizens who can technically identify logical premises but lack the historical and philosophical context to evaluate their normative commitments.

Critical Observations Current AI literacy efforts demonstrate sophisticated approaches to teaching technical concepts but concerning deficiencies in developing assumption interrogation competencies. The neglect of critical assumption analysis creates citizens who are functionally literate but critically vulnerable—able to navigate AI systems while unconsciously internalizing problematic premises about datafication, optimization, and technological progress. Even advanced literacy programs documented in [1] often treat assumption questioning as an advanced critical thinking skill rather than a foundational literacy component, reinforcing the problematic notion that citizens should first learn what AI assumes before learning to question those assumptions. This approach risks producing what might be termed "assumptively illiterate" citizens—those who possess substantial technical knowledge but lack the capacity to identify, much less challenge, the normative premises embedded within AI systems and discourse.

[1] A Framework for AI Literacy

Literacy Implications Meaningful participation requires developing what [19] characterizes as "assumption literacy"—the capacity to identify, analyze, and evaluate the often-invisible premises underlying AI systems, claims, and implementations. Citizens need specific competencies in tracing how particular assumptions about human behavior, social organization, and valuable knowledge become embedded in technical designs and subsequently naturalized through widespread adoption. This necessitates literacy approaches that connect technical understanding to philosophical excavation, examining how choices about data collection, model architecture, and optimization metrics reflect deeper assumptions about what matters in human life and social organization. As [1] suggests, the most crucial assumption literacy competency may be the ability to participate in reimagining the foundational premises of AI development—moving beyond critiquing existing assumptions to collaboratively constructing alternative assumptions that better align with democratic values and human flourishing.

[19] Critical AI Literacy in Teacher Education

[1] A Framework for AI Literacy

Implications Consequences

Pattern Description The implications dimension of AI literacy reveals significant disparities in citizens' capacities to anticipate and evaluate the downstream effects of AI systems across different social domains. Analysis of educational frameworks from [1] demonstrates that current literacy efforts predominantly focus on immediate, individual-level consequences—privacy concerns, job displacement risks—while substantially neglecting systemic, long-term, and second-order implications across institutional, ecological, and cultural domains. This creates what might be termed "implicationally myopic" citizens: those who can identify obvious first-order effects but lack the conceptual tools to trace ripple effects through complex social systems or anticipate unintended consequences across different temporal scales. Exemplars from [19] show promising approaches that position implication mapping as central to literacy, teaching learners to trace consequences across technological, social, economic, and environmental dimensions. However, these comprehensive approaches remain exceptional rather than normative in mainstream literacy initiatives.

[1] A Framework for AI Literacy

[19] Critical AI Literacy in Teacher Education

Tensions & Contradictions A fundamental tension in implications literacy manifests between certainty-oriented and uncertainty-embracing approaches to consequence anticipation. Corporate literacy initiatives documented in [12] typically frame AI implications as manageable risks that can be mitigated through technical fixes and ethical guidelines, while critical approaches from [19] emphasize the inherent unpredictability and fundamental uncertainty of complex sociotechnical systems. This tension reflects broader societal conflicts about whether AI literacy should foster confident adoption or precautionary engagement. The contradiction is particularly evident in educational materials that present AI consequences as discrete, predictable outcomes rather than as emergent properties of complex systems, creating citizens who are prepared for anticipated effects but vulnerable to unexpected systemic disruptions.

[12] AI Literacy for All

[19] Critical AI Literacy in Teacher Education

Critical Observations Current AI literacy efforts demonstrate sophisticated approaches to teaching technical concepts but concerning deficiencies in developing implications anticipation competencies. The predominance of individual-level consequence analysis creates citizens who are personally risk-aware but systemically naive—able to protect their own data privacy while remaining unaware of how AI systems might reshape public discourse, institutional decision-making, or ecological systems over time. Even comprehensive frameworks documented in [1] often treat implications analysis as an advanced competency rather than a foundational literacy component, reinforcing the problematic notion that citizens should first understand how AI

[1] A Framework for AI Literacy

works before considering what it does to societies and environments. This approach risks producing what might be termed "consequentially illiterate" citizens—those who possess substantial technical knowledge but lack the capacity to participate meaningfully in democratic decisions about which AI implications are acceptable and which require precautionary governance.

Literacy Implications Meaningful participation requires developing what [19] characterizes as "systemic implications literacy"—the capacity to trace potential consequences across multiple domains and temporal scales, and to evaluate those consequences through diverse value frameworks. Citizens need specific competencies in identifying not just direct effects but also feedback loops, trade-offs, and emergent properties in complex sociotechnical systems. This necessitates literacy approaches that reject simplistic cost-benefit analyses in favor of multidimensional consequence mapping that includes ecological, social, cultural, and political dimensions. As [1] suggests, the most crucial implications literacy competency may be the ability to participate in anticipatory governance—not just predicting consequences but collaboratively shaping technological trajectories toward more desirable futures and away from potentially catastrophic pathways.

[19] Critical AI Literacy in Teacher Education

[1] A Framework for AI Literacy

Inference Interpretation

Pattern Description The inference dimension of AI literacy reveals crucial gaps in citizens' capacities to evaluate AI-generated outputs and make informed judgments about their reliability, appropriateness, and trustworthiness. Analysis of educational frameworks from [1] demonstrates that current literacy efforts predominantly focus on functional interpretation skills—how to extract useful information from AI systems—while substantially neglecting critical inference competencies needed to assess output quality, identify potential biases, and recognize appropriate use contexts. This creates what might be termed "inferentially dependent" citizens: those who can efficiently use AI-generated information but lack the independent judgment to evaluate its validity, limitations, or potential misapplications. Exemplars from [19] show promising approaches that position inference criticism as central to literacy, teaching learners to interrogate not just what AI systems output but how those outputs are produced, what knowledge is excluded, and what interpretive frameworks are embedded in the systems themselves. However, these critical approaches remain underdeveloped in mainstream literacy initiatives.

[1] A Framework for AI Literacy

[19] Critical AI Literacy in Teacher Education

Tensions & Contradictions A fundamental tension in inference literacy manifests between efficiency-oriented and skepticism-oriented approaches to AI output evaluation. Corporate literacy initiatives documented in [12] typically promote interpretation frameworks that

[12] AI Literacy for All

emphasize productivity gains and workflow optimization, while critical approaches from [19] advocate for interpretation practices that prioritize source criticism, bias detection, and appropriate context assessment. This tension reflects broader societal conflicts about whether AI literacy should foster trusting adoption or critical engagement. The contradiction is particularly evident in educational materials that present AI interpretation as a technical skill rather than a critical practice, creating citizens who are efficient consumers of AI outputs but lack the discernment to recognize when those outputs might be misleading, inappropriate, or harmful.

[19] Critical AI Literacy in Teacher Education

Critical Observations Current AI literacy efforts demonstrate sophisticated approaches to teaching functional interpretation but concerning deficiencies in developing critical inference competencies. The predominance of efficiency-focused interpretation creates citizens who are operationally literate but critically vulnerable—able to quickly extract value from AI systems while lacking the analytical frameworks to identify embedded biases, contextual mismatches, or epistemological limitations. Even comprehensive frameworks documented in [1] often treat critical inference as an advanced skill rather than a foundational literacy component, reinforcing the problematic notion that citizens should first learn to use AI effectively before learning to critique it thoughtfully. This approach risks producing what might be termed "inferentially illiterate" citizens—those who possess substantial technical knowledge but lack the capacity to make independent judgments about AI outputs, instead deferring to algorithmic authority even in domains where human judgment remains essential.

[1] A Framework for AI Literacy

Literacy Implications Meaningful participation requires developing what [19] characterizes as "critical inference literacy"—the capacity to evaluate AI outputs through multiple interpretive frameworks, assess their reliability and appropriateness for specific contexts, and recognize when human judgment should override algorithmic suggestions. Citizens need specific competencies in tracing how training data, model architectures, and optimization goals shape AI outputs, and in identifying the characteristic failure modes of different AI approaches. This necessitates literacy approaches that reject the artificial separation between technical understanding and critical interpretation, instead presenting inference as inherently involving both computational knowledge and contextual judgment. As [1] suggests, the most crucial inference literacy competency may be the ability to maintain what might be called "intelligent skepticism"—neither rejecting AI outputs outright nor accepting them uncritically, but developing the discernment to know when and how to trust algorithmic judgments across different domains and contexts.

[19] Critical AI Literacy in Teacher Education

[1] A Framework for AI Literacy

Point of View

Pattern Description The perspective dimension of AI literacy reveals that current educational efforts often fail to equip citizens with the critical capacities to identify whose viewpoints, values, and interests are embedded in AI systems and literacy definitions. Analysis of frameworks from [1] demonstrates that mainstream literacy initiatives predominantly present AI from technical and corporate perspectives, while substantially neglecting the viewpoints of marginalized communities, workers in AI supply chains, environmental stakeholders, and global South populations affected by AI deployments. This creates what might be termed "perspectivally narrow" citizens: those who understand AI through dominant industry and technical frameworks but lack exposure to alternative viewpoints that might challenge prevailing narratives about technological progress and benefit distribution. Exemplars from [19] show promising approaches that position perspective analysis as central to literacy, encouraging learners to investigate whose knowledge is privileged in AI training data, whose values are encoded in algorithmic systems, and whose participation needs are prioritized in literacy curricula. However, these critical approaches remain marginal in mainstream literacy initiatives.

[1] A Framework for AI Literacy

[19] Critical AI Literacy in Teacher Education

Tensions & Contradictions A fundamental tension in perspective literacy manifests between inclusion-oriented and transformation-oriented approaches to viewpoint diversity. Corporate literacy initiatives documented in [12] typically promote perspective awareness that facilitates broader market inclusion and user base expansion, while critical approaches from [19] advocate for perspective literacy that enables fundamental challenges to existing power distributions and technological directions. This tension reflects broader societal conflicts about whether AI literacy should foster smoother integration into existing systems or enable the reimagining of those systems altogether. The contradiction is particularly evident in discussions about whose literacy definitions prevail, with corporate perspectives often dominating public discourse through substantial funding of educational initiatives and policy frameworks.

[12] AI Literacy for All

[19] Critical AI Literacy in Teacher Education

Critical Observations Current AI literacy efforts demonstrate sophisticated approaches to teaching technical concepts but concerning deficiencies in developing perspective analysis competencies. The neglect of critical perspective literacy creates citizens who are operationally competent but critically limited—able to navigate AI systems while unconsciously adopting the viewpoints and value frameworks of dominant actors in the AI ecosystem. Even comprehensive frameworks documented in [1] often treat perspective analysis as an advanced critical thinking skill rather than a foundational literacy component,

[1] A Framework for AI Literacy

reinforcing the problematic notion that citizens should first learn the dominant perspectives on AI before learning to critique them. This approach risks producing what might be termed "perspectivally captive" citizens—those who possess substantial technical knowledge but lack the capacity to identify, much less challenge, the viewpoint assumptions embedded within AI systems and literacy definitions.

Literacy Implications Meaningful participation requires developing what [19] characterizes as "critical perspective literacy"—the capacity to identify whose viewpoints are represented in AI systems and literacy efforts, whose are marginalized or excluded, and how these perspective distributions shape technological development and benefit allocation. Citizens need specific competencies in tracing how particular social positions and value commitments become embedded in technical designs, and in recognizing how their own perspective might differ from those encoded in AI systems. This necessitates literacy approaches that actively introduce counter-perspectives from marginalized communities, global South contexts, and critical traditions that challenge dominant technological narratives. As [1] suggests, the most crucial perspective literacy competency may be the ability to participate in redefining whose knowledge and values should shape AI development—moving beyond critiquing existing perspective biases to collaboratively constructing more inclusive and democratic technological futures.

[19] Critical AI Literacy in Teacher Education

[1] A Framework for AI Literacy

Contradiction Analysis

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence into daily life has created a crucible for defining AI literacy, generating profound tensions between competing visions of what it means to be literate in an AI-saturated world. These contradictions are not mere academic debates; they represent fundamental struggles over how society prepares its citizens for meaningful participation, autonomy, and critique in the age of intelligent machines. The following analysis examines four central literacy contradictions, revealing the underlying forces that sustain them and their critical implications for democratic engagement and individual agency.

Pressure for Rapid AI Skills Training vs. Need for Deep Critical Understanding

This core tension pits the urgent demand for workforce-ready AI competencies against the educational imperative to foster a deep, critical understanding of AI systems, their limitations, and their societal impacts. The drive for efficiency prioritizes immediate operational fluency with tools like ChatGPT, while the pursuit of depth requires time-consuming engagement with the ethical, social, and epistemo-

logical assumptions embedded within these technologies. This is a classic literacy dilemma of instrumental skill versus transformative understanding.

The tension is fueled by powerful economic pressures and vendor influence. Corporations and governments, seeking competitive advantage, push for rapid upskilling to maximize productivity [35]. This creates a ”skills gap” narrative that privileges immediate tool proficiency. Simultaneously, educational philosophers and critical data studies scholars advocate for literacy frameworks that include algorithmic auditing and understanding of bias, requiring a slower, more reflective pedagogical approach. The discourse is often framed by metaphors of ”tool mastery” versus ”systemic awareness,” revealing a fundamental conflict between viewing AI as a productivity instrument versus a sociotechnical system.

[35] The AI Pedagogy Project

This contradiction persists because the economic benefits of a quickly upskilled workforce are immediate and measurable, while the civic benefits of a critically-literate populace are diffuse and long-term. Technology vendors benefit from promoting a simplified, tool-centric literacy that locks users into their ecosystems and obscures more complex political questions about data governance and labor displacement [38]. Educational institutions, caught between these poles, often lack the resources and time to develop curricula that bridge operational competence with critical citizenship, leading to a persistent gap in preparing individuals to not just use AI, but to question it.

[38] UNESCO AI Competency Frameworks

The literacy implication is profound: an over-emphasis on skills training produces technically proficient but politically disempowered users who may lack the critical frameworks to challenge unfair or opaque automated systems. For meaningful participation, literacy must encompass both operational and critical dimensions. This requires pedagogical strategies that integrate tool use with explicit critique, such as having students analyze the political biases in training data or the environmental costs of large language models [13]. Navigating this tension means designing learning experiences that make the technical and the ethical inseparable, ensuring citizens can both work with AI and democratically shape its development.

[13] AI Literacy Framework for Policymakers

Technical Proficiency vs. Ethical Awareness in Literacy Frameworks

This contradiction centers on whether AI literacy should be primarily concerned with understanding how AI models work technically—their architectures, training processes, and limitations—or with developing the ethical judgment to navigate the moral dilemmas AI systems introduce into society. The technical approach often treats ethics as an optional add-on, while the ethical approach risks being ungrounded without a foundational understanding of the technology’s mechanics.

The division is created by disciplinary silos and competing definitions of ”understanding.” Computer science and engineering traditions naturally emphasize technical literacy, focusing on concepts like neural networks, loss functions, and overfitting [30]. In contrast, humanities and social science approaches prioritize ethical reasoning, concerned with fairness, accountability, transparency, and the distribution of power. Vendor-created educational materials often amplify this split by offering simplified technical explanations that decouple system operation from its social consequences, framing ethics as a matter of ”responsible use” rather than a core component of literacy.

[30] National AI Literacy Framework

The tension persists because deep technical understanding requires significant mathematical and computational background, creating a high barrier to entry for interdisciplinary educators and the general public. Conversely, teaching ethics in a technical vacuum can lead to abstract principles disconnected from the material reality of how algorithmic bias is encoded. There is also a structural incentive for industry to promote a version of literacy strong on technical wonder but weak on ethical scrutiny, as the latter could lead to greater public demand for regulation and oversight [3]. Each domain guards its epistemic territory, reinforcing the divide.

[3] AI and Epistemic Crisis

For civic participation, this bifurcation is debilitating. A citizen who understands the technical workings of a facial recognition system but cannot critique its racially discriminatory deployment is not fully literate. Similarly, a citizen who can articulate ethical concerns about predictive policing but lacks the basic vocabulary to understand how predictive models function is ill-equipped to engage in policy debates. True literacy requires integration. Promising approaches involve case-based learning that explores technical concepts precisely through their ethical implications, such as studying recommendation algorithms by examining their role in creating filter bubbles and political polarization [10]. The goal is a holistic literacy where technical knowledge serves ethical reflection, and ethical questions guide technical inquiry.

[10] AI Literacy Assessment Review

Tool-Centric Literacy vs. System-Critical Literacy

A fundamental tension exists between literacy models that frame AI as a set of tools for individual use and empowerment, and those that frame it as a pervasive sociotechnical system requiring critical analysis of its political, economic, and structural impacts. The tool-centric view promotes agency through mastery, while the system-critical view emphasizes agency through critique and resistance to technological determinism.

This tension is driven by profoundly different metaphors for understanding AI’s role in society. The dominant narrative, heavily promoted by technology vendors, employs tool metaphors—”AI as a calculator for writing”—that suggest a neutral instrument under user

control [25]. This perspective underpins most quick-start guides and productivity-focused training. In opposition, critical algorithm studies and science and technology scholars employ system metaphors—"AI as an infrastructure" or "AI as a political actor"—that highlight its embeddedness in power structures, its reshaping of social institutions, and its often-opaque governance.

[25] Generative AI Integration Study

The tool-centric view persists because it is psychologically empowering and commercially viable. It offers individuals a sense of control and promises upward mobility through skill acquisition. The system-critical view can feel disempowering, as it reveals constraints and influences beyond individual control. Furthermore, educational institutions often find it easier to assess concrete tool proficiency than complex critical thinking about systems. Vendor-driven certification programs naturally reinforce the tool frame, as it aligns with their business model of selling software solutions rather than fostering systemic critique [7].

[7] AI in Education Implementation

The implication for democratic participation is stark. A purely tool-literate citizen is prepared to be an efficient user but not necessarily a discerning citizen who can question the systemic incentives behind the tool's design or its broader societal consequences. For example, literacy that only teaches how to craft effective ChatGPT prompts does not prepare one to question the labor practices of data labelers, the environmental cost of model training, or the potential for these tools to centralize cultural production. A robust literacy must therefore equip individuals to "read" the tool and the system. This involves pedagogical moves that constantly connect interface-level interactions to their backend systems and frontend social consequences, fostering a literacy of both use and critique [6].

[6] AI for Science Education

Standardized Vendor Certifications vs. Contextual Pedagogical Frameworks

This contradiction emerges from the conflict between the push for standardized, often vendor-created, AI literacy certifications and the need for adaptable, context-sensitive pedagogical frameworks developed by educators. Standardization promises scalable assessment and clear skill benchmarks, while contextualization argues that meaningful literacy must respond to local needs, values, and existing knowledge structures.

The tension is created by the market dynamics of the "upskilling" industry and the traditional role of educational institutions. Tech companies have a strong incentive to create and promote their own certification programs, such as Microsoft's AI credentials, which establish their tools and paradigms as the industry standard [27]. These are designed for scalability and portability across job markets. Meanwhile, educators and domain experts argue that literacy is not one-size-fits-

[27] Microsoft AI Business School

all; an AI-literate journalist needs different competencies than an AI-literate nurse or farmer. Effective pedagogy must be woven into specific disciplines and cultural contexts, not delivered as a generic, decontextualized skillset.

This persists due to a misalignment of incentives and expertise. Employers often prefer the apparent clarity and comparability of a standardized certificate, creating a powerful pull in the job market. Vendors benefit from having their platform become the default environment for literacy training. Educational institutions, however, possess the pedagogical expertise to design learning that is developmental, culturally responsive, and integrated with critical thinking. The tension is ultimately between literacy as a branded commodity and literacy as a situated human capability. The speed of technological change also pressures institutions to adopt pre-packaged vendor content rather than investing the time to develop their own AI Adoption in Schools.

The stakes for participation are high. Over-reliance on vendor certifications risks creating a literacy that is aligned with corporate interests rather than citizen empowerment or disciplinary integrity. It may teach people how to use a specific company's AI responsibly according to that company's terms, but not how to think independently about AI's role in their community or profession. A more participatory approach involves developing local, adaptable frameworks that use vendor tools but are not defined by them. For instance, a journalism program might build its AI literacy curriculum around tools for data scraping and analysis, but center the learning on investigative projects that critically examine the power of platforms being used [4]. This ensures literacy serves the goal of enabling effective and critical participation in specific social and professional contexts, rather than mere compliance with a standardized technical profile.

[4] AI and Mathematics Education

These four contradictions are deeply interconnected. The push for rapid skills training (Contradiction 1) naturally aligns with tool-centric views (Contradiction 3) and standardized vendor certifications (Contradiction 4), collectively forming a powerful alliance that marginalizes deeper critical, ethical, and systemic understandings. Conversely, the goals of deep critical understanding, ethical awareness, and system-critical literacy are mutually reinforcing, pointing toward a more holistic, but also more challenging, vision of what it means to be an AI-literate citizen. The resolution of these tensions will determine whether AI literacy becomes a mechanism for creating a compliant workforce and consumer base, or a foundation for nurturing a truly democratic and participatory society capable of steering its own technological future.

Implications for Practice

Recommendation 1: Implement a Dual-Track AI Literacy Curriculum

The Obstacle (45 words) Traditional technology training focuses on functional tool use, creating a "buttonology" proficiency that fails to address the conceptual understanding needed to critique AI systems or understand their societal implications [9]. This leads to users who can operate AI but cannot question its outputs.

[9] AI Literacy Assessment Framework

The Action (78 words) 1. **Weeks 1-4:** Develop parallel learning modules. The "Concepts" track covers algorithmic bias, data provenance, and model limitations. The "Tools" track provides guided practice with specific AI applications. 2. **Weeks 5-12:** Implement cross-track assignments where students must apply conceptual knowledge to analyze their tool interactions, documenting instances of potential bias or error. 3. **End of Semester:** Assess via a "system interrogation" project where students must identify the limitations and potential failure points of an AI tool in a real-world scenario. Resources needed include curated case studies and educator facilitation guides.

The Workaround (42 words) This structure avoids creating technically proficient but critically naive users. By forcing constant dialogue between theory and practice, it enables learners to recognize when a tool is malfunctioning or propagating harm, a skill absent from pure skills training.

The Outcome (54 words) Learners will demonstrate the ability to articulate the limitations of an AI system and make informed decisions about its appropriate application. Within one semester, participants should reliably distinguish between technical capability and contextual suitability Developing AI Literacy in Youth. The core competency is critical system evaluation, not just operational fluency.

Recommendation 2: Adopt Scenario-Based Assessment for AI Understanding

The Obstacle (42 words) Standardized testing and multiple-choice questions are ineffective for measuring the nuanced understanding required for AI literacy. They prioritize correct answers over the reasoning process, failing to capture a learner's ability to navigate ambiguous, real-world AI interactions [17].

[17] Assessing AI Literacy

The Action (72 words) 1. **Month 1:** Develop a bank of "AI Dilemma" scenarios (e.g., evaluating a biased hiring algorithm, assessing the credibility of an AI-generated news summary). 2. **Ongoing:** Integrate these scenarios into coursework as low-stakes, discussion-based assessments. 3. **Semester End:** Use a capstone scenario as a performance-based assessment. Success is measured by the quality of questions the learner asks about the AI system and the evidence they

use to support their critique, not a single ”correct” solution.

The Workaround (45 words) This bypasses the trap of assessing recall and instead evaluates critical inquiry. It enables educators to measure a learner's capacity for informed skepticism and contextual judgment, which are the hallmarks of true literacy and are missed by knowledge-based tests.

The Outcome (57 words) Educators will gain authentic insight into students' analytical capabilities. Learners will develop the competency to deconstruct AI-influenced situations and justify their stance with evidence. Research shows that scenario-based learning significantly improves critical thinking and application skills in technology education [14]. Observable outcomes include improved questioning and evidence-based reasoning.

[14] AI Literacy in K-12

Recommendation 3: Establish Peer-Led AI Literacy Circles

The Obstacle (42 words) Top-down professional development often fails to create sustainable change, as educators struggle to translate generic AI workshops into their specific disciplinary contexts. This creates a reliance on external experts and stifles organic, context-sensitive literacy growth [31].

[31] Teacher AI Literacy

The Action (78 words) 1. **Launch Month:** Identify and train a cohort of ”educator facilitators” from within the institution. 2. **Months 2-6:** Facilitators run bi-weekly, discipline-specific literacy circles where colleagues collaboratively analyze AI tools relevant to their subject area (e.g., AI for history source analysis vs. AI for math problem generation). 3. **Success Metrics:** Track the number of teacher-generated lesson plans integrating AI critique and participant-reported confidence in facilitating student discussions about AI ethics, rather than mere attendance.

The Workaround (42 words) This model avoids the one-size-fits-all pitfall of centralized training. It empowers educators to become co-investigators of AI's role in their field, fostering a culture of collaborative inquiry that outlasts any single training session.

The Outcome (54 words) Within one academic year, this builds a self-sustaining community of practice. Educators develop the competency to critically evaluate and adapt AI for their curriculum, moving from consumers to critical curators of educational technology. This peer-driven approach has proven effective for sustainable technology integration [31].

[31] Teacher AI Literacy

Recommendation 4: Integrate AI Literacy with Foundational Media Literacy

The Obstacle (42 words) Treating AI literacy as a standalone discipline risks siloing it and overwhelming curricula. Learners often fail to connect the dots between AI-generated content and the broader

media ecosystem, missing crucial transferable skills for navigating the digital world.

The Action (72 words) 1. **Planning Phase:** Audit existing media literacy units (e.g., source verification, propaganda techniques, digital manipulation) and map AI literacy concepts directly onto them. 2. **Implementation:** Update lessons to include AI-specific examples. When teaching about deepfakes, also cover AI hallucinations in text. When discussing clickbait, analyze AI-generated engagement-optimized content. 3. **Resources:** Provide educators with a crosswalk document linking traditional media literacy standards to new AI competencies.

The Workaround (42 words) This leverages existing educational infrastructure and familiar concepts, making AI literacy less daunting to teach and learn. It enables learners to see AI not as a magical novelty but as a powerful extension of existing digital media tools and threats.

The Outcome (54 words) Students will frame AI-generated content within a continuum of digital media they already know how to critique. This integration develops the composite competency of "digital ecosystem literacy," allowing individuals to apply a consistent critical framework to all digital information, regardless of its origin [12].

[12] AI Literacy for All

Research Agenda

Research Question: How do critical questioning competencies transfer across different AI contexts (writing assistance, image generation, and decision support systems), and what instructional scaffolds most effectively support this transfer?

Methodological Approach: A mixed-methods, longitudinal design tracking 300+ learners over 12 months. The study would employ pre/post cognitive assessments of critical questioning, scenario-based performance tasks across the three AI domains, semi-structured interviews exploring metacognitive processes, and analysis of learner-generated prompts and interactions. This multi-faceted approach captures both the development and application of critical literacy skills.

Literacy Significance: This research directly addresses a core gap in understanding how foundational critical thinking skills, essential for AI literacy, generalize across increasingly diverse AI tools. As noted in the [11], the ability to interrogate AI outputs is a central, yet underassessed, competency. The findings would inform the design of modular, transfer-focused curricula, benefiting educators and instructional designers by clarifying whether critical AI literacy is domain-specific

[11] AI Literacy Competency Framework

or a portable skill set.

Funding Alignment: This aligns with the NSF's Education and Human Resources (EHR) core research programs, particularly those focusing on STEM learning and learning environments, as well as the Spencer Foundation's research grants on literacy and learning.

Research Question: What are the measurable cognitive and affective impacts of hands-on tool experimentation versus conceptual instruction on developing accurate mental models of how generative AI systems work?

Methodological Approach: A randomized controlled trial (RCT) with three conditions: conceptual instruction only, hands-on tool experimentation only, and a combined approach. Dependent variables would include performance on validated mental model assessments (e.g., system diagramming, prediction tasks), self-efficacy scales, and demonstrated ability to identify AI limitations. The study would involve diverse adult learner populations.

Literacy Significance: A key challenge in AI literacy is moving from abstract knowledge to functional understanding. Research from the [29] indicates a significant gap between recognizing AI concepts and applying them to critique system outputs. This study would provide evidence-based guidance on the most effective instructional sequences for building robust, actionable mental models, directly informing curriculum development for workforce training and higher education.

[29] National AI Literacy Assessment

Funding Alignment: The U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences (IES) and the ECMC Foundation, both of which prioritize research on effective adult learning and career readiness, are potential funders.

Research Question: How can dynamic, performance-based assessments validly measure the progression of AI literacy from novice to competent levels across conceptual, functional, and critical dimensions?

Methodological Approach: A design-based research methodology to develop and iteratively refine a suite of technology-enhanced performance tasks. These tasks would capture process data (e.g., query refinement, source evaluation) in addition to final answers. The project would involve psychometric analysis to establish validity and reliability, and would track a cohort of learners to map skill progression pathways.

Literacy Significance: The absence of validated, multi-dimensional assessments is a major barrier to scaling AI literacy initiatives. As highlighted in a [26], existing assessments often focus narrowly on tool proficiency. Creating rigorous assessments is a prerequisite for evaluating program effectiveness, allocating resources, and establishing

[26] Global Digital Literacy Analysis

benchmarks, ultimately benefiting policymakers, educational institutions, and researchers.

Funding Alignment: This is well-suited for the NSF's Assessment program or the Chan Zuckerberg Initiative's focus on whole-child education and measurement.

Research Question: What specific barriers prevent equitable participation in AI literacy development among linguistically diverse and neurodiverse learner populations, and what inclusive design principles mitigate these barriers?

Methodological Approach: A participatory, qualitative study co-designed with community organizations and learners from the target populations. Methods would include in-depth phenomenological interviews, focus groups, and cognitive walkthroughs of existing AI literacy resources. Thematic analysis would identify specific points of friction, confusion, and disengagement.

Literacy Significance: Ensuring equitable AI literacy is a stated but often unrealized goal. A [18] explicitly notes the risk of these technologies exacerbating existing inequities. This research directly addresses this by generating actionable, evidence-based principles for inclusive design, benefiting educational content creators, disability services offices, and organizations committed to digital equity.

[18] Comprehensive AI in Education Report

Funding Alignment: The Ford Foundation's commitment to social justice and technology, the NSF's Broadening Participation in Computing program, and the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation's focus on humanities and technology are strong matches.

Research Question: To what extent does developing AI literacy in one professional or academic domain (e.g., writing) influence an individual's adoption and critical use of AI tools in a disparate domain (e.g., data analysis or creative arts)?

Methodological Approach: A cross-sectional and longitudinal survey study targeting professionals who have undergone AI literacy training. The survey would measure self-reported and behaviorally-indicated tool adoption and critical use across multiple domains. Follow-up case studies with a subset of respondents would provide rich qualitative data on the mechanisms of transfer.

Literacy Significance: A core assumption of many literacy initiatives is that skills are broadly applicable. However, evidence from studies on [2] suggests tool use remains highly siloed. This research tests this assumption, providing crucial evidence for whether a "general AI literacy" is a viable goal or if training must be domain-embedded. This knowledge is vital for corporate trainers and university program directors allocating limited training resources.

[2] AI Adoption in the Enterprise

Funding Alignment: This aligns with the NSF's Future of Work at the Human-Technology Frontier program and research arms of pro-

fessional organizations and corporate foundations focused on workforce development.

References

1. A Framework for AI Literacy
2. AI Adoption in the Enterprise
3. AI and Epistemic Crisis
4. AI and Mathematics Education
5. AI Competency Framework
6. AI for Science Education
7. AI in Education Implementation
8. AI Literacy and Democratic Participation: Challenges and Opportunities
9. AI Literacy Assessment Framework
10. AI Literacy Assessment Review
11. AI Literacy Competency Framework
12. AI Literacy for All
13. AI Literacy Framework for Policymakers
14. AI Literacy in K-12
15. AI literacy: A structured approach to AI skills development
16. AI Literacy: An Emerging Competency for the 21st Century
17. Assessing AI Literacy
18. Comprehensive AI in Education Report
19. Critical AI Literacy in Teacher Education
20. Critical AI Literacy: Beyond Technical Proficiency
21. Developing AI Literacy: A Framework for Educators and Learners
22. Digital Citizenship in the AI Era
23. From AI Literacy to Algorithmic Agency: A Necessary Evolution
24. From Digital Literacy to AI Literacy: The Evolution of Technology Competencies

25. Generative AI Integration Study

26. Global Digital Literacy Analysis

27. Microsoft AI Business School

28. Missing Voices in AI Literacy: Whose Perspectives Are Being Ignored?

29. National AI Literacy Assessment

30. National AI Literacy Framework

31. Teacher AI Literacy

32. The AI Literacy Gap: A Global Perspective on AI Skills Development

33. The AI Literacy Imperative

34. The AI Literacy Paradox: Skills vs. Critical Understanding

35. The AI Pedagogy Project

36. The Civic Imperative for Critical AI Literacy

37. The Future of AI Education: Beyond Technical Skills

38. UNESCO AI Competency Frameworks

39. What is AI Literacy? Competencies and Design Considerations