

Generative AI and Digital Neocolonialism in Global Education: Towards an Equitable Framework

Matthew Nyaaba^{1,2}, Alyson Leigh Wright², Gyu Lim Choi²

¹AI4STEM Education Center & Educational Theory and Practice, University of Georgia

²Educational Theory and Practice, University of Georgia

Corresponding author: matthew.nyaaba@uga.edu

Contributing Authors: alywright@uga.edu; gyulim.choi@uga.edu

Abstract

This paper critically examines and discusses how Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) might impose Western ideologies on non-Western societies, perpetuating digital neocolonialism in education through its inherent biases. It further suggests strategies for local and global stakeholders to mitigate these effects. Our discussions demonstrated that GenAI can foster cultural imperialism by generating content that primarily incorporates cultural references, examples, and case studies relevant to Western students, thereby alienating students from non-Western backgrounds. Also, the predominant use of Western languages by GenAI can marginalize non-dominant languages, making educational content less accessible to speakers of indigenous languages and potentially impacting their ability to learn in their first language. Additionally, GenAI often generates content and curricula that reflect the perspectives of technologically dominant countries, overshadowing marginalized indigenous knowledge and practices. Moreover, the cost of access to GenAI intensifies educational inequality, as schools in wealthier urban areas or developed countries are more likely to have the infrastructure and funding to integrate GenAI compared to developing countries or poorer schools. Control of GenAI data, such as learning patterns and academic performance by tech companies outside the local context, could lead to commercial exploitation without benefiting local students and their communities. To address GenAI digital neocolonialism, we propose human-centric reforms to prioritize cultural diversity and equity in GenAI development and engage local stakeholders from diverse backgrounds; a liberatory design to empower educators and students to identify inherent biases, challenge then and dismantle the oppressive structures within GenAI applications; foresight by design to create a flexible and adjustable GenAI systems to meet future educational needs and challenges, and finally, effective prompting skills to reduces the retrieval of neocolonial outputs. We recommend that educators and policymakers consider these mitigation strategies to ensure responsible use of GenAI in education.

Key words: *Generative AI, neocolonialism, digital neocolonialism, AI, Biases, cultural biases, economic disparity, policy reform, human-centric AI.*

Introduction

The emergence of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) technologies represents a significant advancement in the digital space, transforming how data is utilized and how content is generated. GenAI encompasses a range of technological capabilities, producing complex outputs such as text, audio, images, and now, video, based on patterns learned from vast datasets (Lim et al., 2023). This ability positions GenAI as a tool of immense potential within various sectors, including education, where it is revolutionizing teaching, learning, assessment, and research (Latif et al., 2023; Zhai et al., 2024). GenAI is currently noted for enhancing personalized learning experiences, automating scoring and grading, and aiding in lesson preparation. As educational institutions, from K-12 to higher education, continue to integrate GenAI into their practices, it becomes crucial to understand the foundational mechanisms, challenges, and biases associated with these technologies to harness their capabilities effectively.

While the benefits of GenAI in education are substantial, numerous studies have identified accompanying challenges, particularly the inherent biases within GenAI systems (Arora et al., 2023). These biases largely stem from the fact that GenAI systems learn from existing data, thereby absorbing and replicating the biases present within that data (Lynch et al., 2023; Van Niekerk et al., 2024). The presence of these biases can potentially lead to skewed knowledge dissemination, favoring dominant cultural narratives, typically Western, while overlooking minority perspectives and non-Western narratives (Lynch et al., 2023). The consequences of this could foster traditional colonial ideologies, amplify existing educational disparities, and perpetuate digital neocolonialism.

Digital neocolonialism in the domain of GenAI specifically describes a scenario where control over GenAI technologies and the data they use is concentrated in the hands of a few, predominantly Western, corporations or countries (Adam, 2019; Menon, 2023). This concentration of control can impose a digital hegemony on less technologically advanced nations, echoing the power imbalances seen in traditional colonial relationships (Zembylas, 2023), where economic and cultural dominance was asserted by colonial powers over colonized regions.

Acknowledging these biases and the potential for digital neocolonialism is crucial to ensure that GenAI in education serves global needs equitably (Zembylas, 2023). In the subsequent sections of this study, we discuss the specific issues to offer a comprehensive analysis of the neocolonial aspects of GenAI. We will specifically condense some of the common biases of GenAI noted in literature and discuss the intersections of power, oppression, and imperialism in GenAI and how these could perpetuate educational inequality (Sok & Heng, 2023). Ultimately, we propose frameworks and strategies essential for crafting a future where GenAI in education aligns with the principles of equity; that is equity-oriented GenAI.

Approach

We examine and synthesize our thoughts with relevant literature as perspective on GenAI and digital neocolonialism (Jin & Cao, 2018). A perspective paper involves scholarly and critical discussion with the intent of proposing new ideas, frameworks or perspectives to contribute to an emerging field of study, such as GenAI (Daft & Lewin, 2008).

We further illustrated some aspects of GenAI neocolonialism to support our discussion points. It is important to note that most of our prompts were generic in nature; this was helpful to identify the types of knowledge and culture that are easily accessible through GenAI tools. Additionally, the generic prompts were significant because we assumed that most teachers and students may not have advanced prompt engineering skills and may be relying on zero-shot prompting strategies, which are generally more generic in nature. We also ensured that prompts were verified in different geographical areas (such as Africa) to confirm that geographical domains might not affect the outputs.

The authors of this study come from diverse backgrounds across Africa, Asia, and North America. We acknowledged our positionalities and inherent biases and strove to be as objective as possible through collaborative discussions, agreement, and extensive verification of the issues raised. Our goal was to avoid undermining the capabilities of GenAI tools due to our limited knowledge. For this study, our discussions and empirical evidence focused on two GenAI tools: Gemini and ChatGPT-4. Both tools are noted for their advanced capabilities and large datasets, leading the forefront of GenAI tools (Nyaaba, 2023). Specifically, the following sections explored the concept of digital neocolonialism, GenAI and education, and how GenAI could potentially foster digital neocolonialism.

Digital Neocolonialism

Digital neocolonialism refers to the perpetuation of historical colonial inequities using digital technologies, illustrating the exploitation and control exerted by dominant nations or Big Tech companies over nondominant countries (Gravett, 2022). This dynamic has led to new global power imbalances, with Big Tech accumulating massive amounts of data for profit (Gerbrandy & Phoa, 2022). The neocolonial project in the digital age operates through platforms like social media and technologies, including GenAI, influencing democratic processes and perpetuating power imbalances (Zembylas, 2023).

Digital neocolonialism manifests in various ways, such as reinforcing inequalities, generalizing language and culture, controlling curriculum and content, and dominating the market and economy. For example, major corporations often control and exploit data, extracting significant value while providing little benefit to the individuals from whom the data is collected (Coleman, 2018; Stürmer et al., 2021). Additionally, developing countries' dependence on technology infrastructure and platforms provided by foreign companies limits their ability to develop and control their digital ecosystems, hindering local industry development and innovation (Adam, 2019; Kwet, 2019; Langmia & Sani, 2023).

The global spread of dominant cultural norms through digital platforms can lead to cultural imperialism, marginalizing local cultures and languages (Enein, 2023). This digital cultural hegemony undermines the diversity and autonomy of indigenous communities, as traditional forms of expression and knowledge are overshadowed by multinational tech companies. Consequently, this oppression may lead to the homogenization of GenAI content and limiting unique local perspectives (Hammer & Park, 2021; Couldry & Mejias, 2019). This dominance affects education in developing countries, as seen in Adam's (2019) study on MOOCs and digital textbooks produced by institutions in the Global North serving learners in the Global South. Addressing digital neocolonialism is crucial for safeguarding sovereignty, privacy, and democratic values, especially in education, where GenAI is already in near to full operation (Van Niekerk et al., 2024).

Generative AI in Education

Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) holds immense potential to revolutionize education on a global scale (Lim et al., 2023). Current research on the application of GenAI in education typically falls within the three domains of teaching and learning, and assessment and research (Chiu, 2021; Ding et al., 2024; Nyaaba, 2024). Recent studies show that GenAI's impact on these domains includes personalized learning, adaptive learning, immediate feedback, lesson planning, automatic assessment, and research (Latif et al., 2023).

GenAI can enhance personalized learning, it may also lead to over-reliance and reduced critical thinking (Bai et al., 2023). Generally, GenAI motivates learners to develop reading and writing skills, although its impact on listening and speaking skills remains neutral (Ali et al., 2023). For instance, Li et al. (2023) explored the perspectives of YouTube content creators on using GenAI in self-directed language learning (SDLL). Their findings indicate that GenAI is valuable for its availability, versatility, and transformative potential in enhancing SDLL, providing contextually relevant responses, and fostering meaningful learner interactions (Li et al., 2024). Additionally, research by Lee and Zhai (2024) revealed that pre-service teachers (PSTs) effectively integrated ChatGPT into science learning, scoring well on a modified TPACK-based rubric, particularly in 'instructional strategies & ChatGPT.' However, they demonstrated less proficiency in using ChatGPT's full potential, indicating the need for high-quality questioning, self-directed learning, individualized support, and formative assessment to enhance lesson planning (Choi et al., 2024; Lee & Kang, 2024). Furthermore, studies indicate that GenAI has the potential to support educators in research activities, though inaccuracies and biases such as language limitations and lack of context remain prevalent (Owoahene & Nyaaba, 2024; Nyaaba et al., 2024). A key takeaway from these studies is that GenAI has the potential to transform education but is accompanied by biases.

Holland and Ciachir (2024) posited that students appreciated the immediacy and validation provided by GenAI, but concerns about equity and academic integrity emerged, particularly in group work where misuse of the tool could lead to academic misconduct affecting all members. Similarly, Rasul et al. (2023) identified academic integrity as a significant challenge in their examination of GenAI roles in higher education. They emphasized the need for clear institutional policies and transparency to mitigate these risks and ensure ethical GenAI usage. There is a

strong suggestion for well-defined guidelines and policies to support the responsible and effective integration of GenAI in education (Holland & Ciachir, 2024; Rasul et al., 2023).

Generative AI Neocolonialism in Education

In this section we discuss the neocolonial aspects of GenAI and how it may impact education. We supported this with a photovoice approach, as we illustrated examples to evidence the key discussions. The section ended with the GenAI Digital Neocolonialism Framework. This framework displays a visual concept to summarize key aspects discussion:

Content and Curriculum Reflecting Western Ideologies

GenAI can develop educational content such as digital textbooks, learning modules, and automated tutoring systems. If these AI systems are primarily trained on datasets from economically dominant countries, there is a risk that the content they generate may not be culturally relevant or appropriate for students in different regions. This can lead to a form of cultural imperialism, where dominant cultures' viewpoints and knowledge systems overshadow local educational needs and values, marginalizing non-dominant cultures and languages, and reducing the diversity and richness of the educational experience for students worldwide.

GenAI systems trained predominantly on data from Western contexts can inadvertently prioritize Western narratives, values, and ideologies (Bentley et al., 2024; Enein, 2023). When these systems are used in educational content creation, the resulting materials may reflect a limited worldview, marginalizing non-Western perspectives and knowledge systems. For instance, we demonstrated the prioritization of Western knowledge by investigating the number of seasons in a year. Using the prompt “*What seasons are there in a year?*”, both Gemini and ChatGPT responded with four main seasons (see figure 1). This answer oversimplifies climate variations and inaccurately reflects the reality in many regions of the world. For example, West Africa, Southeast Asia, and Central America have two main seasons, and polar regions can have just one.

This example illustrates how algorithmic biases can reflect Western cultures and inaccurately provide contextual and diverse information and beliefs. As a tool for personalized learning, this shows the dangers that GenAI could have on educational content creation and curriculum. Although the prompts may be generic, we expected the responses to at least contextualize the answers or cover a wider range of seasonal variations around the world. Such biases in GenAI can marginalize non-dominant contents the richness and diversity of the global educational experience.




Figure1: GenAI Reflecting Western Content Outputs

Cultural Bias Outputs Reflecting Imperialism

Generative AI systems might generate outputs that incorporate cultural references, examples, and case studies that might project other cultures less attractive to Western cultures (Ożegalska-Łukasik & Łukasik, 2023). Ożegalska-Łukasik and Łukasik's (2023) study for instance evidenced how GenAI presented a bias representation in images depicting a "wealthy African man and his house" versus those of a "wealthy European man and his house" (see Figure 2). The study found that GenAI tools often misrepresent what a wealthy man and his house in Africa

may look like, while more accurately depicting a wealthy European man and his house. This visual misrepresentation can significantly impact educational contexts by distorting students' perspectives and understandings of different cultural groups and accurate cultural contexts. This misrepresentation is largely due to the fact that the images do not accurately represent a wealthy African man. A typical modern wealthy African man may live in a more sophisticated house with cars, while a traditional wealthy African man may have a large traditional house with livestock, family, and workers.

To further explore this phenomenon, we tested the findings of Ożegalska-Łukasik and Łukasik (2023) using GPT-4 and Gemini by comparing portrayals of transportation in the United States of America and Balochistan. Our study confirmed their observations, exemplifying the initially identified cultural bias and highlighting additional discrepancies. The responses generated by the GenAI tools depicted a stark contrast, suggesting a more advanced portrayal of the transportation system in the USA compared to the current reality of transportation in Balochistan (see Figures 3). Such biased outputs can negatively influence students' understanding of various cultures and contexts, reinforcing stereotypes and misrepresentations in educational content.

This cultural bias in GenAI can alienate students from other cultural backgrounds and fail to engage them with examples that resonate with their own experiences and environments. Such cultural imperialism can lead to the marginalization of non-Western perspectives in educational content could diminish the learning experience for students from diverse backgrounds.



Figure 2: An example of AI amplifying cultural bias: the generation of the image “Wealthy African man and his house” vs. “Wealthy European man and his house” / authors’ own work using proprietary Generative AI algorithm: Adopted from (Ożegalska-Łukasik & Łukasik, 2023)




Figure 3: Showing Cultural bias of transportation system between USA and Balochistan a province of Pakistan.

Dominant Philosophy and Pedagogy Control

Generative AI technologies may exacerbate dominant educational philosophy and pedagogy control from Western regions than non-western regions. This might be because these technologies are primarily developed in the Western regions and therefore can reinforce ideologies and teaching principles that may not represent local perspective (Kitsara, 2022; Lynch et al., 2023). This situation not only limits the diversity of thought in the evolution of GAI but also perpetuates a class divide within societies (Bentley et al., 2024). It begins by elucidating how colonialism distorts conventional art forms, often resulting in the erasure of indigenous cultures (Zhang & Cao, 2023). We demonstrated the pedagogy control by asking ChatGPT to prepare a lesson on the *Introduction to Environmental Science* (see figure 4). A well-organized lesson plan was generated but exhibited materials and teaching activities that are predominantly relevant and applicable in the Western regions, for instance, as part of the lesson, students were supposed to have access to individual computers and tablets which may not be available for students in most developing countries, especially those in public K-12 schools




Figure 4: Gen AI lesson plan illustrating Pedagogical Control

Digital Divide in GenAI

The digital divide through pricing and monthly cost is another aspect that can perpetuate neocolonialism especially, getting access to the danded versions of GenAI tools which are well-comprehensive with data and could provide users with vast features including audio and visual prompts. Gemini and GPT-4 cost over \$20.00 per month which may not fall within the budget of an average teacher, parent or students in most developing countries may be privileged GenAI access to Westen regions over these regions. This factor will make it difficult for both parents and schools to afford for educational purposes. For instance, Nyaaba and Zhai (2024) study shows that teacher educators in developing countries are excited about using GenAI in their classroom practices but are much more concerned about the cost involved. In addition, Enriquez et al. (2023) posited that the monetization of GenAI tools exacerbate divide, as wealthy families can afford advanced versions of these technologies (seen Figure 5), providing their children with superior educational tools and opportunities whiles less affluent families may be relegated to inferior, free versions of these tools, potentially widening the achieveent gap between socioeconomic classes (Enein, 2023). Additionally restricted domain of GenAI might not be accessible to certain areas or localities. There are yet some communities who do not have access technology including GenAI due to domain and internet restrictions (Ragnedda & Ragnedda, 2020).




Figure 5: Digital Divide through Pricing of GenAI tools

Language of Instruction Reflecting Marginalization

While GenAI has significantly advanced in incorporating and translating as many languages as possible, it remains evident that numerous indigenous languages are yet to be represented within these models (**Ozegalska-Lukasik & Lukasik, 2023**). This may inadvertently marginalize indigenous and minority languages, potentially accelerating language erosion and the dilution of cultural heritage among certain minoritized groups. More specifically, this focus can marginalize non-dominant languages and cultures, making educational content less accessible to speakers of indigenous or less widely spoken languages. To illustrate this bias, we prompted GenAI tools to provide alternative term for “God is Good” in Gurune (a language from Upper East, Ghana) (see figure 6). The response showed that GenAI is indeed limited in this language and could not find the term weather in Brahui language. This may impact the ability of students to learn in their mother tongue, which is crucial for young learners' understanding and cognitive development. Educators and students are thus urged to critically evaluate the implications of using GenAI on these languages and their corresponding cultures (Share et al., 2019).




Figure (6): GAI marginalize indigenous and minority languages.

Whiteness of GenAI

The digital neocolonialism associated with GenAI is marked by a notable emphasis on whiteness, drawing scholarly attention towards racial bias in search results. Noble's (2019) *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism* explores how search engines perpetuate racism, such as returning pornographic results for searches of "Latinas" and primarily displaying White men in professional roles, thus perpetuating racial stereotypes (Furuhata (Furuhata, 2022; Rahman, 2020). This situation highlights the need for rectifying racial biases within search engine algorithms for fairer representations in education.

We demonstrated racial biases in GenAI by requesting GenAI tools to generate an image of a "human robot," as shown in Figure 7. The output aligned with Cave and Dihal (2020) 's findings, which highlighted a white-centric bias in AI portrayals within Western culture (See figure 8). This shows the need for more inclusive representations of GenAI technologies, particularly in educational contexts. While students may be relying on GenAI tools for drawing and image generation, these tools might be representing only a group of people.




Figure 7: GAI exemplifying whiteness of output




Figure 8: The whiteness of AI (Adopted from Cave, S., & Dihal, K. (2020)).

Based on this neocolonialism, aspects of GenAI, we developed the framework of GenAI Digital Neocolonial representing the power dynamics that exist from the above discussion. The discussion indicated that the neocolonial aspects of GenAI in education reflect a complex interplay of cultural bias, economic disparity, and ideological dominance. Our framework of GenAI Digital Neocolonialism illustrates these power dynamics, emphasizing the need for critical evaluation and inclusive development of GenAI technologies to ensure a diverse and equitable educational experience for all students.




Figure 9: GenAI Dital Neoclionalism in Education

Mitigating GenAI Neocolonialism

Through a critical examination of GenAI and its potential pitfalls, we can identify ways to mitigate the risks of neocolonialism and instead leverage AI for positive societal transformation. This section explores the importance of human-centric frameworks, including foresight by design, laboratory design methods, and decentralizing GenAI hubs in the development of equitable and culturally responsive GenAI. (see Figure 9). To achieve this, it is crucial to establish local and global policies, legislative initiatives, and transparent and equitable frameworks that address digital neocolonialism and guide GenAI development and use (Brand, 2023). Considering frameworks and policies recommended by the UNESCO Recommendation on Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (UNESCO, 2021) and the AI Convention by the Council of Europe (2022), can support the ethical use of GenAI in education and address digital neocolonial aspects. According to UNESCO (2021) addressing risks and ethical concerns should foster innovation and research that align AI technologies with human rights and fundamental freedoms. Similarly, the Council of Europe (2022) emphasizes embracing an ethical framework that

safeguards human values, protects cultural diversity, and maximizes the potential of digital technologies, including GenAI, while considering their cultural impact.

Human-centric Approaches

Vulnerable groups and non-dominant populations are often marginalized and overlooked in developing educational technology (EdTech) tools and sourcing data for GenAI (Gaskins, 2023). This poses significant risks, as algorithmic bias can become embedded within these technologies, as discussed in the preceding section. To mitigate these concerns, it is important to adopt a human-centric perspective when designing and deploying GenAI in any educational settings. A human-centered approach considers the end-user and the contextual environment in which the tool is utilized, while also considering whether GenAI promotes diverse cultural norms and cultural pluralism (Fishman, 2004). This approach prioritizes the diverse cultural contexts and needs of global students, fostering cultural pluralism and avoiding the imposition of dominant biases through continuous monitoring and preserving cultural identities within educational settings. Implementing human-centric strategies will ensure that GenAI technologies support inclusive educational practices rather than undermine them (Issaka et al., 2022; Khazanchi & Khazanchi, 2024)

Liberatory Design Methods (LDM)

Liberatory Design Methods (LDM) ensure the inclusion of diverse perspectives and experiences. LDM empowers designers to embrace non-Western viewpoints and develop solutions by acknowledging “the intricacies of marginalized identities as a catalyst for positive innovation” (Harrington & Piper, 2018). Central to this approach is recognizing that technological solutions devised within one culture may not seamlessly translate to another. Liberatory design amplifies the voices of underrepresented and non-dominant communities by placing the creation of GenAI tools within the respective culture's context. If adopted effectively, these strategies promise to democratize the benefits of GenAI technology and address the diverse needs of global educational communities, ultimately ensuring that students from all backgrounds feel represented and valued within these evolving technological spaces (Calzati, 2021).

Foresight by Design

Foresight by Design (FBD) is a proactive and human-centric approach to strategic planning and development, enabling developers and organizations to predict and mitigate the potential harm of GenAI while elevating diverse perspectives (Buehring & Liedtka, 2018; Dorton et al., 2023). FBD encourages a comprehensive consideration of trends, emerging technologies, social changes, and other factors that could influence the future trajectory of GenAI systems. Additionally, FBD involves a thorough assessment of the data used to train GenAI algorithms, including factors such as ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, and geographic location. By identifying potential biases in the training data, FBD can potentially preemptively address the perpetuation of power imbalances and oppressive outcomes through GenAI-driven decision-making and content generation.

Decentralizing GenAI Hubs

Decentralizing GenAI hubs is an emerging approach to mitigating GenAI neocolonialism. GenAI's neocolonial nature creates a concentration of locations where technological innovation and development isolate the job market in Western tech hubs. Ultimately, this limits the perspectives contributing to GenAI technology development. Furthermore, opportunities to grow within the GenAI sector often require relocation for education and labor. The growing need for more jobs related to GenAI should spark debate on decentralizing the hubs from dominating countries and creating more local design locations. Examples of this decentralization include Google's GenAI lab in Accra, Ghana, and IBM's research office in Nairobi, Kenya. By diversifying the locations of GenAI development, developers can be local to where opportunities and problems are identified. Local solutions and data will be more relevant by working with local voices and within the proximal context. For example, at Google's GenAI lab, developers are improving GenAI's natural language understanding by coding roughly 2,000 languages spoken in Africa. More opportunities exist for tech hubs within countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, where local voices, experiences, and histories create more accurate and culturally relevant solutions in sectors like healthcare and education technology.

The development of tools that utilize GAI has the potential to revitalize and reclaim non-dominant and indigenous languages and cultures. An example is Te Hiku Media, a nonprofit Māori radio station operated by Peter-Lucas Jones and Keoni Mahelona. Jones and Mahelona's vision are to revitalize the Māori language, Te Reo, while still having control of the data rights. According to Hao (2020), "They overcame resource limitations to develop their own language GAI tools, and created mechanisms to collect, manage, and protect the flow of Māori data so it won't be used without the community's consent, or worse, in ways that harm its people." Together, they enlisted the local Māori community, 2,500 people, to provide verbal data to support the creation of a speech recognition model. The Māori project represents GAI development that utilizes FBD, liberatory design methods, and local context to develop a platform that serves both the people who created it as well as global users. This example of country-specific GAI use of localized GAI deployment is an approach to mitigating neocolonialism within GAI systems. GAI has become a topic for digital-territorial colonialism where retrieval and use of information are centered around Western culture (Mohamed et al., 2020). Through a colonial political economy lens, a common GAI market can be criticized since it helps maintain a dominant culture (Carmel & Paul, 2022).

Effective Prompting Strategies

To harness the full potential of GenAI and minimize neocolonial biases, it is essential that teachers and students acquire advanced skills in prompt engineering (Ekin, 2023). In this study, we primarily focused on generic and zero prompting, which often resulted in Western-centric outputs. Recent studies have indicated that to achieve the best results from GenAI and mitigate known biases, educators, students, and researchers need to contextualize their prompts (Chen et al., 2023; Oppenlaender et al., 2023). This means crafting prompts that consider local cultural

contexts and specific educational needs, ensuring the generated content is relevant and inclusive (Denny et al., 2024). Therefore, both educators and students must develop their prompt engineering skills to use GenAI effectively. This advancement will help reduce the potential for perpetuating neocolonial power dynamics and oppression in educational content, promoting a more equitable and culturally responsive learning environment

By embracing human-centric design frameworks (as seen in figure 10) such as liberatory design and foresight by design it is possible to mitigate the neocolonial aspects of GenAI and foster a more equitable, culturally responsive use of GenAI in education. Decentralizing GenAI development and prioritizing local contexts can further democratize technological benefits, ensuring that all students feel represented and valued. Implementing these strategies will pave the way for inclusive and diverse educational practices, harnessing GenAI's potential for positive societal transformation.




Figure 10: Mitigating GenAI Digital Neocolonialism in Education

Implications and Conclusion

In this study, we examine how the biases and ethical concerns of GenAI might perpetuate neocolonial power dynamics within education. Generative AI tends to reflect Western ideologies by imposing Western values and norms on non-Western regions. This dynamic does not only risk cultural imperialism but also widens educational disparities between Western and Non-Western regions.

While we encourage the use of GenAI in classroom settings to promote bias awareness, we understand that these tools cannot be effective without educators first developing competency to facilitate them. In order to use GenAI for culturally relevant teaching, teachers need competency

in GenAI prompting, as well as, culturally relevant instructional strategies (Sanusi & Olaleye, 2022). Ladson-Billings (2014) posited that cultural competence is one of the factors for culturally relevant pedagogy. Educators are encouraged to strive to enhance their cultural competence through open discussions and implementing activities professional learnings (Sanusi & Olaleye, 2022). We further suggest that educators harness their prompting skills in using these tools by directing prompts towards specific cultural contexts, especially as these tools are generically representing western cultures.

The dominance of western bias within data sources can perpetuate misinformation and invade the classroom. For example, in a situation where ideologies and images only represent whites or western culture, students from different cultures and races might not feel belonging in these technological spaces (Obermeyer & Mullainathan). There should be a conscious effort to incorporate representation of culture, race, ethnicity, and knowledge. While this theory has been more of a suggestion for the developers of GenAI tools, we extend this suggestions to educators as well to assist students to use GenAI to identify and analyze their cultural objects, to reveal their unique qualities (Chaves & Gerosa, 2021).

Students from historically marginalized or underrepresented cultural backgrounds must be empowered to critically examine their own cultural identities and develop analytical skills to recognize the pervasive influence of Eurocentric, neocolonial norms within educational systems (Ge et al., 2024). These suggestions depict two distinct approaches; encouraging pupils to use critical thinking skills to recognize covert colonial viewpoints in GenAI, and making use of GAI to adapt to pupils' diverse cultural backgrounds (Emenike & Plowright, 2017). A practical example may be teachers employing these GenAI tools to create a platform for discussing biases, which can be subject to critique by students. By so doing, GenAI becomes an agent in the classroom teaching students to think critically about its responses (Nayir et al., 2024).

Moreover, the perpetuation of the neocolonial aspects of GenAI may not be limited to classroom practices in education. Recent studies have shown that educational researchers largely depend on GenAI for data and many aspects of research activities such as data analysis, literature reviews, and report writing (Nyaaba et al., 2024; Owoahene Acheampong & Nyaaba, 2024). While these tools are supportive in these proposals, we suggest that educational researchers incorporate human-centric, liberatory design methods and foresight by design in these propose to address the prevailing neocolonial aspects of these tools

GenAI tools possess significant potential to positively impact education and serve as a means to bridge the digital divide (Bentley et al., 2024) . However, it is imperative for the educational community to engage in a comprehensive reexamination of various aspects pertaining to GenAI, particularly those that contribute to power dynamics and marginalization. We therefore propose the integration of culturally responsive contents (data) in GenAI tools through human-centric, liberatory design methods and foresight by design.

Limitation

One notable limitation of this perspective study, which explores and examines GAI neocolonialism in education through literature synthesis and our own insights, is the reliance on a limited range of supporting examples. The examples we cited were specifically chosen to corroborate and contextualize the discussions presented in the literature on GenAI. Given the rapidly evolving nature of these GAI tools, these examples may not comprehensively represent all possible scenarios or future developments. As GenAI continues to advance, some of the evidence and examples cited might become outdated or less relevant, necessitating continuous updates and reevaluation to ensure the findings remain aligned with the latest GenAI tools and educational contexts. This limitation highlights the need for ongoing research that can adapt to and incorporate the latest advancements and uses of GenAI in education.

References

- Adam, T. (2019). Digital neocolonialism and massive open online courses (MOOCs): colonial pasts and neoliberal futures. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 44(3), 365-380.
- Arora, A., Barrett, M., Lee, E., Oborn, E., & Prince, K. (2023). Risk and the future of AI: Algorithmic bias, data colonialism, and marginalization. In (Vol. 33, pp. 100478): Elsevier.
- Bentley, S. V., Naughtin, C. K., McGrath, M. J., Irons, J. L., & Cooper, P. S. (2024). The digital divide in action: how experiences of digital technology shape future relationships with artificial intelligence. *AI and Ethics*, 1-15.
- Brand, D. J. (2023). Ensuring the ethical development and use of AI in local governance. *Journal of Ethics & Legal Technologies*, 5(2), 95-109.
- Calzati, S. (2021). Decolonising “data colonialism” propositions for investigating the realpolitik of today’s networked ecology. *Television & New Media*, 22(8), 914-929.
- Carmel, E., & Paul, R. (2022). Peace and Prosperity for the Digital Age? the Colonial Political Economy of European AI Governance. *IEEE Technology and Society Magazine*, 41(2), 94-104. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MTS.2022.3173340>
- Cave, S., & Dihal, K. (2020). The whiteness of AI. *Philosophy & Technology*, 33(4), 685-703.
- Chaves, A. P., & Gerosa, M. A. (2021). How Should My Chatbot Interact? A Survey on Social Characteristics in Human–Chatbot Interaction Design. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 37(8), 729–758. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2020.1841438>
- Chen, B., Zhang, Z., Langrené, N., & Zhu, S. (2023). Unleashing the potential of prompt engineering in large language models: a comprehensive review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.14735*.
- Chiu, T. K. F. (2021). A Holistic Approach to the Design of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Education for K-12 Schools. *TechTrends*, 65(5), 796-807. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-021-00637-1>
- Daft, R. L., & Lewin, A. Y. (2008). Perspective—Rigor and relevance in organization studies: Idea migration and academic journal evolution. *Organization science*, 19(1), 177-183.
- Denny, P., Leinonen, J., Prather, J., Luxton-Reilly, A., Amarouche, T., Becker, B. A., & Reeves, B. N. (2024). Prompt Problems: A new programming exercise for the generative AI era. *Proceedings of the 55th ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education V. 1*.
- Ding, A.-C. E., Shi, L., Yang, H., & Choi, I. (2024). Enhancing teacher AI literacy and integration through different types of cases in teacher professional development. *Computers and Education Open*, 6, 100178.
- Ekin, S. (2023). Prompt engineering for ChatGPT: a quick guide to techniques, tips, and best practices. *Authorea Preprints*.
- Enein, G. F. R. A. (2023). Post-Colonialism And The Digital Age. *Journal of Namibian Studies: History Politics Culture*, 38, 262-277.
- Enriquez, G., Gill, V., Campano, G., Flores, T. T., Jones, S., Leander, K. M., McKnight, L., & Price-Dennis, D. (2023). Generative AI and composing: an intergenerational conversation among literacy scholars. *English Teaching: Practice & Critique*(ahead-of-print).
- Europe, C. o. (2022). Council of Europe and Artificial Intelligence. *Artificial Intelligence*. <https://rm.coe.int/brochure-artificial-intelligence-en-march-2023-print/1680aab8e6>
- Fishman, D. A. (2004). Mainstreaming ethnicity: Horace Kallen, the strategy of transcendence, and cultural pluralism. *Southern Journal of Communication*, 69(2), 157-172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10417940409373286>
- Furuhata, Y. (2022). *Climatic media: Transpacific experiments in atmospheric control*. Duke University Press.

- Gaskins, N. (2023). Interrogating Algorithmic Bias: From Speculative Fiction to Liberatory Design. *TechTrends: Linking Research and Practice to Improve Learning*, 67(3), 417-425. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-022-00783-0>
- Ge, X., Xu, C., Misaki, D., Markus, H. R., & Tsai, J. L. (2024). How Culture Shapes What People Want From AI. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05104*.
- Hao, K. (2020). The future of AI research is in Africa. *MIT Technology Review*. <https://www.technologyreview.com/2019/06/21/134820/ai-africa-machine-learning-ibm-google/>
- Harrington, C. N., & Piper, A. M. (2018). Informing design through sociocultural values: Co-creation with low-income African-American older adults. *Proceedings of the 12th EAI International Conference on Pervasive Computing Technologies for Healthcare*, 294-298.
- Issaka, C. A., Nyaaba, M., & Iddrisu, F. A. (2022). Attitudes and Concerns of Pre-Service Teachers' about Inclusive Education Enshrined in the New Four-Year Basic Education Curriculum in Ghana. *European Journal of Education and Pedagogy*, 3(1), 89-94.
- Jin, D., & Cao, J. (2018). "Perspective"—A new approach to serve our Light community. *Light: Science & Applications*, 7(1), 89.
- Khazanchi, R., & Khazanchi, P. (2024). Generative AI to improve special education teacher preparation for inclusive classrooms. *Exploring New Horizons: Generative Artificial Intelligence and Teacher Education*, 159.
- Kitsara, I. (2022). Artificial intelligence and the digital divide: From an innovation perspective. In *Platforms and Artificial Intelligence: The Next Generation of Competences* (pp. 245-265). Springer.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2014). Culturally Relevant Pedagogy 2.0: a.k.a. the Remix. *Harvard Educational Review*, 84.
- Latif, E., Mai, G., Nyaaba, M., Wu, X., Liu, N., Lu, G., Li, S., Liu, T., & Zhai, X. (2023). Artificial general intelligence (AGI) for education. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12479*.
- Lim, W. M., Gunasekara, A., Pallant, J. L., Pallant, J. I., & Pechenkina, E. (2023). Generative AI and the future of education: Ragnarök or reformation? A paradoxical perspective from management educators. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 21(2), 100790.
- Lynch, R., Young, J. C., Jowaisas, C., Sam, J., Boakye-Achampong, S., Garrido, M., & Rothschild, C. (2023). 'The tears don't give you funding': data neocolonialism in development in the Global South. *Third World Quarterly*, 44(5), 911-929.
- Menon, S. (2023). Postcolonial Differentials in Algorithmic Bias: Challenging Digital Neo-Colonialism in Africa. *SCRIPTed: A Journal of Law, Technology & Society*, 20(2), 383-399.
- Noble's, S. U. (2019). Noble, Safiya Umoja. Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism. New York University Press, 2018. *WHY POPULAR CULTURE MATTERS*, 166.
- Nyaaba, M. (2024). Generative AI Conception of the Nature of Science. Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference,
- Nyaaba, M., Kyeremeh, P., Majialuwe, E., Owusu-Fordjour, C., & Asebiga, E. (2024). Generative AI in Academic Research: A Descriptive Study on Awareness, Gender Usage, and Views among Pre-Service Teachers.
- Nyaaba, M., & Zhai, X. (2024). Generative AI professional development needs for teacher educators. *Journal of AI*, 8(1), 1-13.
- Obermeyer, Z., Powers, B., Vogeli, C., & Mullainathan, S. Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations. *Science*. <https://www.science.org>

- Oppenlaender, J., Linder, R., & Silvennoinen, J. (2023). Prompting ai art: An investigation into the creative skill of prompt engineering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.13534*.
- Owoahene Acheampong, K., & Nyaaba, M. (2024). Review of Qualitative Research in the Era of Generative Artificial Intelligence. *Matthew, Review of Qualitative Research in the Era of Generative Artificial Intelligence (January 7, 2024)*.
- Ożegalska-Łukasik, N., & Łukasik, S. (2023). Culturally Responsive Artificial Intelligence--Problems, Challenges and Solutions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.08467*.
- Ragnedda, M., & Ragnedda, M. (2020). New digital inequalities. algorithms divide. *Enhancing Digital Equity: Connecting the Digital Underclass*, 61-83.
- Rahman, A. (2020). Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism. In: SAGE Publications Sage UK: London, England.
- Sanusi, I. T., & Olaleye, S. A. (2022). An Insight into Cultural Competence and Ethics in K-12 Artificial Intelligence Education. *IEEE Global Engineering Education Conference, EDUCON*, 790–794. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EDUCON52537.2022.9766818>
- Share, J., Mamikonyan, T., & Lopez, E. (2019). Critical media literacy in teacher education, theory, and practice. In *Oxford research encyclopedia of education*.
- Sok, S., & Heng, K. (2023). ChatGPT for education and research: A review of benefits and risks. *Available at SSRN 4378735*.
- UNESCO. (2021). Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000380455>
- Van Niekerk, D., Pérez-Ortiz, M., Shawe-Taylor, J., Orlic, D., Kay, J., Siegel, N., Evans, K., Moorosi, N., Eliassi-Rad, T., & Tanczer, L. M. (2024). Challenging Systematic Prejudices: An Investigation into Bias Against Women and Girls.
- Zembylas, M. (2023). A decolonial approach to AI in higher education teaching and learning: Strategies for undoing the ethics of digital neocolonialism. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 48(1), 25-37.
- Zhai, X., Nyaaba, M., & Ma, W. (2024). Can generative AI and ChatGPT outperform humans on cognitive-demanding problem-solving tasks in science? *Science & Education*, 1-22.
- Zhang, Y., & Cao, L. (2023). Exploring the Potential Presence of Colonialism in the Digital Art Field from A Global Perspective. *Advances in Education, Humanities and Social Science Research*, 8(1), 66-66.

