

Session 4.

Applying LLMs in academic research

Co-construction, distributed cognition & relational attribution

Prof. Ken Spours, College of Education, Capital Normal University
& UCL Institute of Education

November 2025



Session aims & initial participant discussion



Aims of Session 4

- **Introduction to key concepts** - researcher/LLM co-construction, distributed cognition & relational attribution
- **Harness participant experience** of LLMs in research to date
- **The role of Collaborative Critical Praxis (CCP)** as a rapid recursive activity
- Understand how to use **LLMs in the research process** – opportunities/risks
- Understand **distributed cognition and relational attribution** as CCP activities
- Create LLM-related **methodological annexes** for staff and students.
- **Identify dimensions of institutional support for CCP** – not doing this alone.

Discussing existing LLM research practices

Group work

How have you used LLMs for research?

What benefits have you experienced?

What are the perceived risks?

Feedback prior to formal presentation

Collaborative critical praxis applied to the research process



CCP – a short rapid cycle applied to the research process

Stage of relationship

1. Ideological, moral & political foundation

Collaborative Critical Praxis

Defining the guiding principles and desired disposition of the machine.

2. Articulation & Shaping

Structuring the exchange through – question, context and dispositional engineering.

3. Generation & Production

Mandating the machine to present evidence-based counterarguments (where appropriate).

4. Assessment & Critique

Assessing machine outputs against input objectives and desired academic style (not an affective relationship).

5. Rapid recursive lamination

Repeated questioning - requiring the machine to make clear train of thinking, provide accurate sources (with URLs) and to calibrate responses.

6. Criticality-based partnership

Maintaining collaborative critical praxis, including identifying human intellectual labour and the machine computational labour.

Risk reduction of distorted HI-MI research relationships

CCP stages

Stage 1 (Ethico-Political Foundation)
& Stage 2 (Articulation & Shaping)

Stage 4 (Critical Audit)
& Stage 5 (Rapid Recursive Lamination)

Stage 6 (Final Product & Attribution)

Purpose

Confront risks of deskilling and ideological drift – researcher imposed ethical framework and theoretical boundaries via – question prompt, context and dispositional engineering.

Confront risks of hallucination and opacity - repeatedly verifies the LLM's generated sources and logic, then feeds human corrections back into the Machine.

Confronts the risk of authorship erosion - assertion of epistemic authority by making the final critical judgment and formally documenting the Machine's specific contribution.

Stages of research & the role of the Machine

| RESEARCH STAGE | LLM MECHANISM |
|--|--|
| 1. Topic & Question Formulation | Literature mapping; gap identification |
| 2. Literature Review | Source summarisation; theoretical comparison |
| 3. Methodology Design | Protocol drafting; method explanation |
| 4. Data Collection & Coding (Qual/Quant) | Code generation; data cleaning scripts |
| 5. Data Analysis & Interpretation | Statistical support; thematic coding prompts |
| 6. Writing & Drafting | Section drafting; argument elaboration |
| 7. Editing & Language Refinement | Clarity, grammar, tone adjustment |
| 8. Dissemination & Publication Prep | Journal formatting; abstract optimisation |

Distributed cognition & relational attribution



Distributed Cognition System

Distributed Cognitive System - emerging from the disciplined distribution of the Human Intellect (HI) and the Machine Intellect (LLM as a cognitive artifact).

Human Intellect (HI) - acts as the **director** to provide the ethical frame and critical telos (purpose).

Machine Intellect (MI) - acts as the **executor** using rapid computational labour and synthesis at scale.

Fusion Intellect (FI) - the **accelerated completion** of complex cognitive tasks that neither HI & MI could achieve as efficiently alone.

Relational attribution – recognizing Machine labour

1. **Human intentionality** - the initial **question, context and dispositional prompts** and subsequent **critical interventions**(corrections and rejections) made during the distributed cognition process.
2. **Machine labour** – key points of the machine's computational contribution.
3. **Synthesis** - creating a **transparent account** of the dialectic of HI & MI & how a **Fusion Intellect** has been achieved.
4. **Benefits of reflection** – compelling the researcher to reflect on the use of MI and fusion possibilities and to recognize distributed cognition.

Distributed cognition and HI attribution activities

| Research stage | Machine activity | Examples of role of the Machine |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| 1. Topic Formulation | Maps trends; flags gaps; suggests keywords | Clarifies AI suggested gaps; affirms human framing of question |
| 2. Literature Review | Summarises; clusters themes; extracts citations | Notes AI aided scope; affirms human selection & interpretation |
| 3. Methodology Design | Generates code; drafts protocols; explains methods | States AI provided templates; affirms human design & justification |
| 4. Data Coding | Cleans data; tags codes; runs prelim analyses | Reports AI coding & affirms human audit & refinement |
| 5. Analysis | Runs stats; suggests themes; visualises patterns | Distinguishes AI pattern detection from human interpretation |
| 6. Writing | Drafts text; refines grammar; adjusts tone | Identifies AI drafting; affirms human argument & voice |
| 7. Revision | Simulates reviews; flags inconsistencies; formats refs | Acknowledges AI for rehearsal/formatting; affirms human judgment |
| 8. Dissemination | Adapts abstracts; translates terms; optimises layout | Confirms AI assisted formatting; affirms human review & responsibility |

Methodological Annex to support relational attribution

1. Define Purpose & Prompt – what did you ask of the Machine?

State research telos, ethical boundaries, and record full dispositional prompt.

2. Explicitly explains respective roles

Document who did what: researcher's judgment vs. machine's execution.

3. Audit & verify outputs

Account main steps taken to validate MI-generated content (sources, code, claims).

4. Map the 'Lamination Path'

Trace how HI critically shaped MI output to achieve Fusion Intellect (FI).

5. Attribute relationally

Explain the Machine's contribution – not as co-author, but as cognitive artifact under human direction.

Institutional support of CCP

Institutional mediation action

1. Establish CNU Ethical Guidelines

2. Training & Support

3. Community & Exchange

4. Attribution & Transparency

Mechanisms for CCP Support

Formal Policy Integration of the CCP framework, suggesting its six stages as the ethical minimum.

Offering Training Support focused on all stages of CCP.

Encouraging **Communities of Practice, Inter-disciplinary Exchange and Learning** to peer-review the methodological annexes and reflect on the HI-MI Synthesis.

Creating a **Standardised Methodological Annex template** that documents the dialectic of HI & MI as a cognitive artifact, including Human intentionality and the machine's specific contribution.

Preparation for Session 5



Reading for Session 5 – LLMs and teaching

- Williams, A. (2025). Integrating artificial intelligence into higher education assessment. *Intersection: A Journal at the Intersection of Assessment and Learning*, 6(1) Early View.
- Beale, R. (2025) *The Revolution Has Arrived: What the Current State of Large Language Models in Education Implies for the Future*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.02180. Available at: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.02180> (Accessed: 30 October 2025).