

Critical Education

Volume 17 Number 2

May 18, 2026

ISSN 1920-4175

Surveillance, Tyranny, and Technocratic Colonialism

A Critical Interrogation of Gen-AI Solutionism in Higher Education Curriculum

Richard McInnes

Adelaide University, Australia

McInnes, R. (2026). Surveillance, tyranny, and technocratic colonialism: A critical interrogation of Gen-AI solutionism in higher education curriculum. *Critical Education*, 17(2), 56-81.

<https://doi.org/10.14288/ce.v17i2.187244>

Abstract

The adoption of generative artificial intelligence (gen-AI) in higher education curriculum design is often framed as an inevitable step toward efficiency and innovation. In this paper, I employ critical realism to interrogate the ideological and political dimensions of gen-AI adoption, arguing that it represents a form of technocratic colonialism that reinforces neoliberal, socio-political, and surveillance-driven imperatives. By interrogating who benefits from these technologies and whose interests are marginalised, I problematise gen-AI's role in shaping knowledge production, academic labour, and epistemic hierarchies. Through a critical education lens, I highlight how universities, in their embrace of gen-AI, risk entrenching structures of control, eroding pedagogical autonomy, promoting epistemic dependence, marginalising educator expertise, and privileging dominant knowledge systems while excluding alternative epistemologies. Urging a shift from techno-solutionism to critical engagement, I advocate for resistance to the unchecked integration of gen-AI in curricula, ensuring that educational transformation remains grounded in equity, ethics, and intellectual agency.



Readers are free to copy, display, and distribute this article, as long as the work is attributed to the author(s) and **Critical Education**. More details of this Creative Commons license are available from <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. **Critical Education** is published by the Institute for Critical Educational Studies and housed at the University of British Columbia.

Introduction

The rapid integration of generative artificial intelligence (gen-AI) technologies into higher education marks a pivotal moment in the evolution of the design, delivery, and subject matter that form the curriculum. As universities increasingly adopt gen-AI tools to co-design courses and programs (McDonald et al. 2024), the potential benefits of these technologies are being widely praised for their capacity to enhance efficiency, personalisation, and access (Baidoo-Anu & Owusu Ansah, 2023; Sok & Heng, 2023). The embrace of gen-AI in higher education has seen scrutiny ranging from broad rhetoric (AI Safety Summit, 2023) to foci on specific classroom practice (Cotton et al., 2023). Yet, published research into educational technologies has mostly focused on the tools and their functionalities rather than addressing the deeper, human-centric challenges that these technologies exacerbate (Reeves & Lin, 2020). Research has approached gen-AI from a technocratic perspective, emphasising its potential to solve educational problems without interrogating what problem they are even trying to solve, or how these technologies interface with broader systemic and societal issues (Hodges & Kirschner, 2024). This has produced a fragmented focus on observable impacts and individuals' experiences of gen-AI (Weidlich et al., 2025) rather than the underlying drivers, mechanisms and structures that underpin its adoption.

Taking a critical realism perspective, I seek to reframe the conversation from gen-AI tools toward a critical examination of the socio-political implications of gen-AI in education. To engage with the deeper structural and causal mechanisms behind gen-AI rather than the surface-level optimistic (enhancement, efficiency) or dystopian (plagiarism, job loss) narratives. Specifically, I pose two research questions: Who benefits from the adoption of gen-AI in higher education curriculum design, and whose interests might be marginalised? and, What are the broader social, ideological, and educational implications of adopting gen-AI in higher education curriculum? This paper takes the form of a literature review through which I engage reflexively and critically with scholarly and grey literature on gen-AI in higher education. This approach allowed for an exploration of diverse perspectives and sources, enabling flexible synthesis and critical engagement with underrepresented viewpoints in a rapidly evolving field.

By addressing the research questions through the literature, I seek to foreground the ethical and ideological stakes involved in the adoption of gen-AI technologies. I position the rise of gen-AI as technocratic colonialism, drawing attention to how gen-AI systems, while often presented as neutral or objective, are shaped by the values, ideologies, and biases of the technocrats who design them, and adopted using the same sociotechnical inattention and technological solutionism associated with other educational technologies (Johnson & Verdicchio, 2017; Selwyn, 2013). In this paper, I argue for why we must adopt a critical education stance to resist their adoption in higher education curricula.

Higher Education Curriculum

While the conceptualisation of curriculum can be limited to purely the sequence of planned teaching that occurs, in this paper, I rely on an expanded definition that includes the conscious and unconscious experiences that are intended, taught, assessed, and learnt (Plate, 2012). In this way, both the visible and hidden curriculum are the sites of critical investigation and are considered to be constructions of those in power (Zajda, 2024). Curriculum development, traditionally viewed as a rational and objective process, is influenced by cultural, political, and economic factors that

have shaped what is taught and how knowledge is structured and disseminated (Pinar et al., 1995). As such, curriculum is not merely an assemblage of knowledge or skills, but rather a sociopolitical artifact, shaped by specific historical, cultural, ideological, and epistemological forces (Freire, 2005). The question of whose knowledge is deemed legitimate and how it is taught in the curriculum is therefore not a neutral or benign one; it is a question of power, control, and the maintenance of hegemonic structures.

Within this politicised environment, the rise of neoliberalism has reshaped the landscape of higher education, influencing everything from institutional policies to curriculum design (Giroux, 2014; Olssen & Peters, 2005). As neoliberal principles—emphasising market-driven approaches, competition, and profit maximisation—have increasingly permeated educational institutions, universities have shifted from being public goods serving societal needs to businesses driven by the logics of the market (Brown, 2015). This transformation has led to the commodification of knowledge, where curriculum is treated as a product to be packaged, marketed, and sold, rather than as a process of critical inquiry and personal development (Giroux, 2014).

All the while, colonialist curricula devalue or render invisible Indigenous Knowledges (Kerwin & Van Issum, 2012). The legacy of colonial education continues to shape post-colonial systems, where curricula often remain deeply focused on “dominant discourses that continue to subjugate and subordinate” (Shay & Wickes, 2017, p. 1). Efforts to decolonise and reform the educational systems to better recentre Indigenous epistemology, ontology, and axiology (Akoleowo, 2021) have often been constrained by the enduring influence of colonial ideologies and the global dominance of Western models of education (Tikly, 2004). In the Australian context, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander knowledges are often overlooked as rigorous intellectual traditions or positioned as supplementary or tokenistic inclusions rather than structurally embedded within courses (McInnes & Airey, 2025). In STEM, for example, post-colonial dynamics can position Western logics and models as neutral and universal, while Indigenous approaches to pattern recognition, classification, modelling, and relational or oral learning receive comparatively little recognition. As such, curricula have remained a contested space where the legacies of colonialism force the questions of “what we have learnt and what our families have learnt and whose knowledge we were learning” (Kerwin & Van Issum, 2012). Decolonising education requires a shift away from Eurocentric models of knowledge and toward approaches that centre Indigenous worldviews, methodologies, and pedagogies (Simpson, 2014; Smith, 2012).

In practice, however, institutional commitments to decolonial curriculum reform are often siloed from other areas of innovation. In the Australian higher education context, for instance, publicly available frameworks on generative AI—such as the University of New South Wales’ Generative AI Teaching Guidelines and AI Capability Framework (2025)—focus on technical competencies, ethical use, and academic integrity, with no explicit reference to decolonial principles, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Knowledges, or epistemic justice. This absence reflects a broader institutional pattern in which curriculum innovation is treated as a depoliticised process, sidelining critical conversations about equity, power, the plurality of epistemologies, and how curriculum transformation intersects with colonial legacies.

The Gen-AI partnered Curriculum

Artificial Intelligence (AI) in education initially focused on automating administrative tasks, creating “smart content,” and developing intelligent tutoring systems, adaptive learning platforms, and gamified experiences (Crawford et al., 2023; Tahiru, 2021; Zhai et al., 2021). However, until recently, AI’s impact on education remained relatively limited (Tahiru, 2021). This changed dramatically with the public massification of generative AI (gen-AI) tools like ChatGPT and DALL-E 2 in late 2022. These systems, powered by large language models and extensive datasets, can now generate interactive outputs such as text, images, and videos, providing the ease of access and usability required for integration into curriculum (Crawford et al., 2023; Wu et al., 2023). The widespread availability and adoption of gen-AI technologies have prompted educators and institutions to explore how these tools can be leveraged to enhance learning and curriculum development (Amri & Hisan, 2023; Baidoo-Anu & Owusu Ansah, 2023; Khademi, 2023). In this paper, I focus on post-2022 gen-AI tools, defined as generative pre-trained transformers that employ machine learning algorithms and extensive datasets to create “original” artifacts in response to user prompts (Crawford et al., 2023)—tools such as ChatGPT, Google Bard, and DALL-E which are increasingly being leveraged by educators and institutions to streamline curriculum (Nagy et al., 2023).

Educators can utilise gen-AI to more efficiently make, in part or wholly, a wide variety of artefacts such as curriculum planning documents, learning materials, formative activities, and assessments (Su & Yang, 2023), or use it to innovate and enhance their practice by creating learning experiences difficult to achieve without specialist training (Nagy et al., 2023). This overall reduction in time spent on curriculum design and administrative tasks supposedly allows educators to prioritise more meaningful pedagogical activities (Su & Yang, 2023), for example, the customisation of course materials to meet a range of challenges present in higher education teaching: the diverse needs of the cohort, multimodal curriculum, greater differentiation and scaffolding of learning activities for students with diverse learning needs.

Consequently, the use of gen-AI in curriculum-related practices has the potential to increase educator productivity, enhance the educational experience for students, and improve equity and access to education (Halaweh, 2023). Due to these factors, the use of gen-AI for these tasks is becoming increasingly prevalent. In Australia, 70.8% of university staff have used gen-AI for work, with teaching staff reporting they used gen-AI in a variety of ways in curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment (McDonald et al. 2024). For these staff, 72.3% self-reported increased productivity by using gen-AI, yet only 10% of staff raised ethical concerns about the use of gen-AI. Institutional support for gen-AI practices often takes the form of broad implementation guides (University of Michigan, 2025; Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 2025) or platform-level subscriptions (The University of Sydney, 2023), reflecting a system-level shift that highlights how policy and practice act as institutional enablers to prioritise ease and efficiency. In such contexts, acknowledgement of ethical risks is frequently contained at the level of principle rather than action, reducing critique to a form of critical washing that legitimises rather than interrupts harmful trajectories (Suarez et al., 2025).

The accelerated integration of Gen-AI technologies into curriculum design is not without its challenges, either unintended or posed by its misuse (Nagy et al., 2023). The validity and reliability of AI-generated outputs (Grove, 2023b), the ethical considerations that underpin their application (Grove, 2023a), and the privacy of personal data captured within their systems (Kirova

et al., 2023) are key concerns that could negatively impact the quality of education (Sok & Heng, 2023). As such, maintaining a balance between technological progress and safeguarding privacy, fairness, transparency, and accountability is crucial (Kirova et al., 2023), particularly in education, where misuse could perpetuate or intensify societal biases. To attempt to mitigate many of these potential risks, governments and organisations are creating frameworks, guardrails, and recommendations, with various levels of obligation and legal status, to control the use of gen-AI (Australian Government Department of Industry, Science and Resources, 2024; European Commission, 2024; UNESCO, n.d.). So, while Gen-AI offers transformative possibilities for curriculum content generation in higher education, its integration must be carefully managed. Educators must navigate both the advantages of personalised, efficient learning and the challenges of misinformation, bias, and academic misconduct.

A Critical Approach to Educational Technology Adoption

Despite gen-AI's novelty and the potential benefits outlined, fundamental challenges and flaws should be recognised. Gen-AI implementation rests on the back of educational technology research that has a chequered history of addressing local and global problems for students and practitioners. Scholarship often presents “inconsequential” findings about products and tools, promoting them instead of critically studying them (Reeves & Lin, 2020). It has already been observed that this techno-solutionism (Morozov, 2013) and sociotechnical inattention (Johnson & Verdicchio, 2017) have leached into the gen-AI space (Hodges & Kirschner, 2024). Across many institutions, official responses to gen-AI have taken the form of tool-agnostic ethical guidelines or generalised teaching and learning principles for AI use (for example, Group of Eight Australia, 2023). While framed as safeguards, these frameworks often lack enforcement mechanisms or a critical pedagogical perspective, and risk functioning as legitimising discourses that facilitate the unchecked expansion of gen-AI under the guise of responsible use.

In the face of this gen-AI techno-solutionism, a critical approach to educational technology adoptions (Selwyn, 2013) offers the opportunity to take a more nuanced and sceptical examination. This critical perspective challenges educators and policymakers to look beyond the surface-level promises of technologies and consider the broader values, ideologies, and power structures that shape their development and implementation.

Method

I adopt a critical realist (Bhaskar & Hartwig, 2016) approach to examine the underlying mechanisms shaping gen-AI in higher education curricula. Critical realism provides the overarching structure for this analysis, within which I integrate critical pedagogy (Freire, 2005) and educational technology critiques (Selwyn, 2013) as lenses to interrogate how power, agency, and education intersect in shaping how gen-AI is positioned in learning environments. Through this analysis, I interrogate the structures shaping gen-AI adoption, foregrounding ethical, ideological, and epistemological stakes. The study addresses two questions: Who benefits from gen-AI in curriculum design, and whose interests are marginalised? And, What are the broader social, ideological, and educational implications of its adoption?

Critical realism (Bhaskar & Hartwig, 2016) provides a layered ontological framework for analysing gen-AI in education by distinguishing between the empirical (observable experiences), the actual (events and their consequences), and the real (causal mechanisms). Most published

research on gen-AI has been at the empirical level, with limited investigation at the actual level—the intended and unintended effects of gen-AI adoption—or at the real level—the ideologies, logics, and structures gen-AI reinforces. Applying critical realism enables an examination of gen-AI as a technological artifact embedded within social, economic, and political structures. By moving beyond surface-level observations, a critical realist analysis reveals how gen-AI is not merely a tool but an artefact through which broader structural transformations in education are enacted.

A traditional literature review approach was deemed most appropriate as the research questions are broad in scope, complex, and interdisciplinary (Snyder, 2019). This style of literature review allowed for an exploration of a wide range of sources and perspectives, synthesising literature from a diverse range of fields and sources more flexibly than a systematic review would have, particularly useful given the necessity to react with an emerging and rapidly evolving field. The traditional literature review also aligns well with a critical education perspective, allowing for a more reflexive and critical engagement with the literature, evaluating power dynamics and underrepresented perspectives separate from the data-driven systematic approach, instead focusing more on narrative connections.

The search strategy aimed to identify scholarly and grey literature. The search initially focused on the ERIC, Web of Science, Scopus, Google and Google Scholar databases for published scholarly articles, then branched out into Google to search for grey literature. Search criteria focus on articles published since November 2022 (the release of massified gen-AI tools) and centred around search terms that included “course”, “program”, “curriculum”, “design”, “development”, “university”, “higher education”, “generative artificial intelligence”. During the search process, where literature referred to further relevant sources, they were located and reviewed for inclusion. As has been identified, search engine algorithms can lead to forms of selection bias (Ćurković & Košec, 2020), which may have introduced bias into elements of the search results.

It was expected that the search strategy would produce a diversity of critical perspectives on gen-AI; as such, it was determined *a priori* that a narrative synthesis approach would be best to allow for the flexible integration of diverse sources (Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, 2009). As the literature review progressed, sources were analysed in detail, with attention paid to the arguments, evidence, and perspectives presented. Notes and reflections were then recorded to identify recurring concepts, concerns, and critiques across the body of work. Through reviewing these notes from a critical lens, informed by the works of Freire (2005) and Selwyn (2013), overarching concerns about the consequences of gen-AI adoption were identified and aligned with the actual and real dimensions of Critical Realism. This critical lens helped expose deeper systemic connections between the literature. The themes continued to be developed as the narrative review was written, synthesising multiple perspectives into central concerns that reflected common threads within the discourse.

Positionality

Following a critical educational approach, I reflect on my positionality as an act of transparency, foregrounding the values, assumptions, and lived experiences that shape my critique of gen-AI (Collins, 2002). My positionality informs the questions I ask, the methodologies I use, and the interpretations I make. Acknowledging it is crucial for understanding how knowledge is constructed and how power operates in research, curriculum, and educational technologies

(Haraway, 1988). By situating myself within this study, I aim to make explicit how my perspectives shape my understanding of gen-AI and to create space for a more nuanced dialogue on its role in curriculum design—one that amplifies voices often marginalised in discussions of educational technology.

Writing this paper on the unceded lands of Kaurna Yerta (Kaurna Country), as a cis-hetero white male educator with a hidden disability, I recognise my privileges—the Invisible Knapsack (McIntosh, 2019)—which have afforded me access to opportunities not equally available to all. These privileges shape my perspectives and limit my ability to fully understand the experiences of marginalised communities. I see it as a moral obligation to use my position to challenge inequitable power structures rather than leaving that burden to those most affected. In this research, I remain critically aware of how my identities shape my engagement with gen-AI and strive to question how these technologies may perpetuate existing inequities.

The Consequences of Gen-AI Adoption

The integration of gen-AI in higher education curriculum represents a transformative moment that is laden with complexities. Through problematising the events surrounding the adoption of gen-AI, it becomes easier to view who benefits from the adoption of gen-AI in higher education curriculum design, whose interests might be marginalised, and the broader social and educational implications of adopting gen-AI in higher education curricula. In this way, the tensions articulated in this section about the use of gen-AI in education exemplify wider systemic issues, and accordingly, should not be seen in isolation but as indicative of larger structural questions that will be taken up in the later stages of this paper.

The section is structured to move from immediate technical concerns in gen-AI (e.g., algorithmic bias, surveillance of data, the human-in-the-loop paradox), through their institutional and pedagogical manifestations (e.g., digital colonialism, Western dominance in gen-AI, the digital divide), to systemic consequences (e.g., modern-day slavery, sustainability), and finally to the ideological and structural forces that shape and normalise these technologies in higher education (e.g., underpinning ideologies, the black box monopoly).

The Surveillance of Data

At the foundation of gen-AI adoption dynamics lies the pervasive surveillance of data, which underpins both pedagogy and institutional control. The gen-AI tools increasingly embedded in higher education rely on training data obtained through extensive surveillance, often without consent. These models are built on vast datasets scraped from the internet, raising ethical concerns around privacy, intellectual property, and bias (Lees, 2024). While gen-AI developers justify these practices under the guise of “fair use,” legal challenges, such as Stability AI’s copyright disputes (Lees, 2024) and OpenAI’s lawsuits over mass data harvesting (Ceruleo, 2023), highlight the exploitative nature of data extraction. Higher education’s adoption of gen-AI for curriculum design risks endorsing these surveillance-driven data practices. Universities, historically committed to academic integrity, now integrate tools that commodify knowledge and repurpose intellectual labour without compensation. This shift aligns with the logic of surveillance capitalism (Zuboff, 2019), where student and educator data become an asset for private corporations. The integration of gen-AI into educational settings normalises the ongoing extraction of behavioural data,

reinforcing existing power imbalances and prioritising corporate profit over ethical governance (West, 2019).

Additionally, gen-AI companies profit from user data by embedding surveillance into everyday platforms. The commodification of user interactions transforms individuals into perpetual sources of capital (Stockman & Nottingham, 2022). In broader education, edtech firms collect extensive data under the guise of learning optimisation and safety (Gilliard & Selwyn, 2022)—with other firms such as Turnitin having significantly profited from their ongoing capture of user data to refine their proprietary models (Bjork, 2024), enabling corporations to continue to extract and monetise educational insights with minimal transparency (Chu, 2021). Embedding gen-AI tools into curricula normalises surveillance and also entrenches corporate control over knowledge production and academic labour.

Algorithmic Bias

Surveillance feeds directly into algorithmic bias, shaping what knowledge is amplified, who is seen, and whose learning is disadvantaged. Gen-AI tools are built on online big data that is expansive and problematic, derived from sources that reflect the historical dominance of Western, Anglicised, and male perspectives (Bender, et al. 2021; Corple & Linabary, 2020), with these biases becoming embedded in the data these systems rely on (Couldry & Mejias 2018). The outputs of these systems reflect and reinforce these historical power imbalances. AI corporations, lacking diversity in leadership and development teams, often fail to effectively or holistically recognise or mitigate these biases (Pal et al., 2024). Studies have found that gen-AI models not only reproduce existing stereotypes but also intensify them explicitly and subtly (Zhou et al., 2024). Because these systems operate within proprietary black boxes, their biases are difficult to audit and rectify, allowing them to persist unchecked.

Gen-AI models are only as good as the data they are trained on, and given that the foundational data is scraped from the internet, this can lead to the spread of mis, disinformation, inaccuracies, and false narratives, both intentional and unintentional (Wach et al., 2023). In this way, algorithmic bias does more than reflect the world's inequities; it actively reshapes knowledge, perception, and decision-making. In higher education, these biases are not just abstract flaws; rather, they fundamentally shape whose knowledge is recognised, whose voices are amplified, and whose learning is systematically devalued (McInnes & Airey, 2025), making universities a proving ground for inequities that echo far beyond the classroom.

The "Human-in-the-Loop" Paradox

The biases and automation embedded within gen-AI systems constrain the scope of decision-making and agency for human actors. Gen-AI manipulates the users who interact with it (Wach et al., 2023)—the AI controls the human as the human attempts to use the AI (Moylan et al., 2025). While the human-in-the-loop paradigm is championed for its ability to increase perceived trust and maintain human oversight in AI decision-making (Krügel et al., 2022), evidence suggests that this trust may be misplaced. Studies indicate that humans are prone to overtrusting AI systems, even in scenarios where the AI demonstrates inconsistency or unreliability (Krügel et al., 2022), with inaccuracies and failures with gen-AI a common occurrence (Borji, 2023). Instead of correcting AI outputs, the human may inadvertently reinforce

its biases, transforming into what Krügel et al. (2022) describe as “zombies in the loop”. This is particularly worrisome as humans underestimate how much they are influenced by these machine systems (Krügel et al., 2023), with ChatGPT’s advice having an equatable impact to expert advice in some scenarios (Ikeda, 2024). For learners, this is especially concerning, as they engage with these systems while still developing knowledge and critical skills; they are more vulnerable to overtrusting AI outputs, which can shape their understanding and performance in ways they may not realise.

It has also been observed that gen-AI users experience anticipatory obedience, where they are more likely to conform to AI outputs due to misplaced trust (Elliot, 2024). The sociotechnical structure of Gen-AI systems manipulates users’ options and actions in ways that are often imperceptible (Stahl, 2021) and without their realisation (Wach et al., 2023). This shared agency transforms human-AI interactions, making it increasingly difficult to discern where human influence ends and AI influence begins (Moylan et al., 2025), which is particularly critical for educator agency when using gen-AI to develop curriculum.

Replacing the Human Altogether

In some contexts, rather than being in the loop, humans are displaced entirely. The proliferation of gen-AI in education and various industries has led to the displacement of roles traditionally held by humans, with significant implications for the value and purpose of work. This phenomenon contributes to the commodification of education, reducing it to a series of transactional efficiencies while detracting from its inherently relational and transformative character (Mitra et al., 2024). A particularly concerning outcome of AI’s emphasis on efficiency is its potential to exacerbate existing inequities. Research highlights how AI disproportionately impacts underrepresented groups, who are often overexposed to job displacement while lacking the resources to adapt (Gmyrek et al., 2024). The uneven benefits of gen-AI-driven productivity gains further perpetuate structural inequalities, aligning technological advancements with the interests of privileged demographics while marginalising vulnerable populations (Mannuru et al., 2023). In higher education, the precarity of the workforce (Watermayer et al., 2023) and the automation of tasks like feedback and assessment (Roe et al., 2024) threaten the relational and pedagogical heart of teaching, positioning universities as a testing ground where the replacement of human roles is being normalised and its wider consequences anticipated.

Western Dominance in Gen-AI

The immediate technical concerns associated with gen-AI cascade into institutional and pedagogical practices, shaping how universities structure labour, access, and learning environments. Corporations often extract data from global contributors without equitable compensation. For instance, communities in the global south receive little to no benefit in return for the use of their data to train AI models (Mitra et al., 2024). This dynamic perpetuates a form of digital colonialism, where the labour and resources of marginalised groups fuel technological advancements that primarily benefit the Global North (Ragnedda, 2020). The ethical implications of the gen-AI divide are profound. Biases embedded in training datasets often reflect the perspectives of dominant cultures, marginalising less dominant voices and perpetuating systemic inequalities (Newstead et al., 2023).

As corporations increasingly control these datasets, their decisions about which data to include or exclude further shape the narrative of technological development, often to the detriment of underrepresented groups (Hendaway, 2023). More recently, with the development of non-Western models such as Deep Seek, we have seen a moral outrage by Western governments and corporations whereby access is banned (Gerken, 2025) and concerns around the data sources used to create the tool that appear not to apply to models such as ChatGPT and Co-Pilot (Ray, 2025). For universities, reliance on Western-owned platforms not only entrenches asymmetries of power but also narrows the scope of pedagogical innovation, as curricula, research agendas, and institutional strategies are increasingly mediated through infrastructures designed to serve Global North priorities.

Digital Colonialism

The dominance of Western actors extends beyond markets, shaping patterns of access, knowledge production, and technological dependency in the Global South. Gen-AI reinforces digital colonialism by embedding Western-centric hegemonic and colonial epistemologies into its models, presenting them as the norm while marginalising other perspectives (McInnes & Airey, 2025; Williams & Shipley, 2020). Data colonialism further exacerbates this issue, extracting knowledge from marginalised communities without recognition or compensation, echoing historical patterns of exploitation (Munn, 2024). For Indigenous communities, this threatens data sovereignty—the right to govern their own data—while AI-generated content appropriates cultural heritage without consent (Kukutai & Taylor, 2016; Worell, 2024).

The absence of meaningful governance structures over gen-AI data use raises concerns about concentrated power, with emerging dynamics akin to techno-feudalism (Roberts & Montoya, 2023), where control over data and knowledge systems is held by a small number of actors. In education, gen-AI-driven curriculum design risks homogenisation, erasing local and Indigenous knowledge in favour of standardised, Western-centric monoculture (McInnes & Airey, 2025; McQuillan, 2019). Without structural change to prioritise Indigenous data sovereignty and ethical AI governance, these technologies will continue to deepen existing inequalities rather than address them (Tacheva & Ramasubramanian, 2023). For institutions committed to epistemic pluralism, these dynamics are not abstract: universities must navigate a landscape where gen-AI tools reflect and reinforce Western-centric perspectives, shaping curricula, privileging certain knowledge, and constraining the diversity of voices and epistemologies to which students are exposed.

The Privilege of a "Clean" Internet

Asymmetries in global power dynamics associated with gen-AI are compounded by access to a reliable and uncensored internet, yet gen-AI has fundamentally altered the informational fabric of the web. Early foundation models benefited from a “clean” internet—a vast and relatively pristine repository of human-generated content that facilitated the training of high-quality, nuanced AI systems—a first-mover advantage that continues to privilege organisations that trained their systems during this time (Shumailov et al., 2024). Gen-AI contributes to the pollution of the internet by producing vast quantities of low-quality or synthetic slop that is indistinguishable from human-created materials (Rao, 2024). As the internet becomes increasingly populated by machine-generated content, it is forever contaminated (Haven, 2022), and newer models face the recursive

problem of training on synthetic and derivative data, a phenomenon described as model collapse (Wenger, 2023). Models that have undergone collapse prioritise commonality, omitting and ignoring marginalised perspectives (Wenger, 2023). This iterative self-pollution poisons the internet and risks amplifying biases and degrading the quality of AI outputs over time (Heikkilä, 2022).

The Internet Archive is the most comprehensive repository of pre-gen-AI web data. Its Wayback Machine preserves snapshots of websites from before the proliferation of AI-generated content, offering a vital resource for researchers and developers aiming to access human-authored materials. However, this centralisation of historical data raises critical questions about control and governance. The Internet Archive, the largest repository of pre-gen-AI web data, preserves human-authored content through its Wayback Machine. While a nonprofit, it faces financial, legal, and ideological pressures, with copyright disputes limiting its scope (Hall, 2024). Access to its data influences AI development, raising concerns over control—if tech companies gain privileged access, they could strengthen their dominance. The Archive’s curation reflects biases, potentially excluding minority voices and ephemeral communities (Hall, 2024). As AI-generated content proliferates, distinguishing human-authored material becomes harder, challenging its role as a reliable historical record. In higher education, the privileging of early clean datasets and the ongoing proliferation of AI-generated content shape what students can learn, which sources faculty can trust, and how research is conducted, making universities a frontline site where the consequences of a contaminated and curated internet are felt most acutely.

The Digital Divide

These infrastructural inequalities extend into a digital divide, determining who can meaningfully participate in AI-mediated education. Increasingly framed as the gen-AI divide, this reflects the uneven distribution of the benefits, knowledge, and control of advanced gen-AI systems, further stratifying global and socioeconomic disparities (Jiang & Shao, 2024). Unlike previous technologies, which had long adoption times, gen-AI’s comparatively quick rise risks an amplification of inequity by disproportionately benefiting those who already have access to AI tools and resources, leaving marginalised groups further behind. Access to gen-AI is inextricably linked to broader infrastructural inequities. The cost of premium tools, such as subscription models like OpenAI’s ChatGPT Plus, disproportionately favours economically advantaged users, reinforcing structural inequities (Ozmen Garibay et al., 2023), and when free systems are more likely to have encoded bias, this is an additional reinforcement of hegemonic biases (Newstead et al., 2023). Even in regions where internet access is available, the quality often remains insufficient to support the high bandwidth demands of gen-AI tools, creating barriers to effective engagement (Mannuru et al., 2023). In higher education, these disparities mean that students’ ability to engage with gen-AI-mediated learning, complete assignments, and access cutting-edge tools is unevenly distributed, while faculty are constrained in how they can integrate these technologies equitably, making universities a microcosm where the digital divide is reproduced and intensified.

Modern-day Slavery

The institutional arrangements and policies that govern gen-AI use produce tangible systemic consequences. The development and refinement of gen-AI systems have revealed troubling ethical concerns related to exploitative labour practices. Investigations have exposed the

stark reality behind the polished façade of AI innovation, revealing a system that bears uncomfortable similarities to modern-day slavery (Haskins, 2024). These low-paid workers, tasked with labelling and filtering harmful content, were exposed to deeply disturbing material, including graphic descriptions of sexual violence, with minimal psychological support (Perrigo, 2023)—with workers monitored through surveillance software and pressured to make rapid decisions on violent content (Williams, et al., 2022), often at the cost of their mental health (Haskins, 2024). Some companies are accused of using child labour (Metz, 2023) and systemic underpayment and delaying or cancelling payments to workers (Haskins, 2024; Pogrebna, 2024). The conditions of the spaces in which these workers are employed are also under scrutiny, with conditions that pose serious health risks (Pogrebna, 2024). This exploits their economic vulnerability and imposes significant psychological harm, often leaving workers with lasting trauma (Haskins, 2024; Williams et al., 2022). In higher education, the reliance on these gen-AI systems means that students and faculty engage daily with tools built on exploitative labour, making universities a site where the ethical and human costs of gen-AI production are embedded into everyday teaching, learning, and assessment practices, despite many universities having policies to “*wherever possible, reduce, the risks of modern slavery in all its activities*” (University of Adelaide, 2023).

Sustainability

Alongside labour exploitation, the material and environmental demands of gen-AI reveal the ecological costs of these systems. The environmental ramifications of gen-AI are profoundly concerning, particularly when considering their disproportionate impact on the marginalised and Indigenous communities most vulnerable to climate-related issues (Worrell, 2024). While affluent regions reap the economic and technological benefits of Gen-AI, the environmental and societal costs—water shortages, e-waste accumulation, and climate displacement—fall heavily on vulnerable populations, accentuating existing inequalities (Wright et al., 2025). Training and operating large AI models, such as GPT-3, necessitate substantial computational and energy resources, which in turn incur significant water and carbon footprints. For instance, the training of GPT-3 alone required approximately 700,000 litres of water (Li et al., 2023) and used an estimated 1287 MWh (Patterson et al., 2021) or 552 metric tons of CO₂ (Tomlinson et al., 2023). Within higher education, the energy and resource demands of gen-AI are embedded in the very infrastructure of teaching, research, and administration, making universities not only sites of technological innovation but also frontline participants in the environmental costs and inequalities these systems produce.

Ideological Underpinnings

Beyond the systemic consequences of the deployment of gen-AI are broader ideological and structural forces that normalise these practices and envision particular futures for education. The ideological foundations of gen-AI technologies run deep; the development and promotion of these technologies are entangled with broader currents of techno-futurist thought, particularly the TESCREAL bundle—transhumanism, Extropianism, singularitarianism, cosmism, rationalism, Effective Altruism, and longtermism (Geburu & Torres, 2024). Although TESCREAL is more explicitly oriented toward artificial general intelligence (AGI), its narratives seep into the cultural

and institutional framings of gen-AI, shaping how universities imagine, justify, and adopt these tools.

TESCREAL narratives frame gen-AI as inevitable, beneficial, and morally imperative, promoting visions of optimisation, perpetual progress, and selective improvement that can carry eugenicist and exclusionary undertones (Gebru & Torres, 2024). In educational contexts, this framing is particularly concerning as it positions certain forms of knowledge, ability, and achievement as inherently superior and presents technological adoption as a moral duty rather than a choice. By circulating through discourse on innovation, efficiency, and progress, TESCREAL provides a subversive mechanism through which universities interpret, justify, and normalise gen-AI, embedding both elite techno-utopian imaginations and ethically fraught assumptions, often without educators or institutions fully recognising the ideological commitments shaping the technology they adopt.

At the same time, elements of TESCREAL discourse have been taken up within authoritarian and reactionary projects. This techno-fascist convergence is embedded in the very technical infrastructures advancing exclusionary, anti-democratic agendas (Folco, 2025; Golumbia, 2024). Musk's promotion of "anti-woke" AI, for instance, demonstrates how narratives of technological liberation mask an ideological project aligned with far-right politics (Folco, 2025). The rapid release of increasingly powerful gen-AI models, often without adequate safeguards or regulation, exemplifies this ethos (Mitchell, 2025).

Taken together, the ideological underpinnings of gen-AI matter because they normalise a vision of education subordinated to speculative futures and elite techno-utopian fantasies, while obscuring the immediate pedagogical, ethical, and social harms of gen-AI. Through their focus on technological innovation and inattention to underlying ideological frameworks, universities have adopted gen-AI technologies shaped by TESCREAL logics, unintentionally aligning with eugenicist or authoritarian projects (Gebru & Torres, 2024; Golumbia, 2024).

The "Black Box" Monopoly

The underpinning ideological currents behind gen-AI converge in the concentration of power over knowledge and decision-making in the black box monopoly. Gen-AI systems and foundation models have become a core infrastructure for the modern economy, with their development and deployment increasingly controlled by a small number of dominant technology companies (Lynn et al., 2023). This concentration of power in a few corporate entities has created significant barriers, fostering a "black box" monopoly that limits competition, transparency, and accountability (Lynn et al., 2023). The foundation model market is highly capital-intensive, with training cutting-edge models requiring immense computational resources, proprietary datasets, and access to specialised talent (Korinek & Vipra, 2023). Such steep barriers to entry inherently favour large firms like Google, Microsoft, and Amazon, which collectively control over two-thirds of the market (Lynn et al., 2023). This dominance gives these corporations a dual advantage: access to private data caches and economies of scale, allowing them to outcompete smaller firms or new entrants in the field.

In such a landscape, even AI startups become dependent on Big Tech infrastructure, reinforcing the monopolistic cycle (Kak et al., 2023). Many websites, such as major news outlets, have blocked AI web crawlers or demanded licensing agreements for their data. OpenAI, for example, has signed exclusive deals that grant access to proprietary datasets that are inaccessible

to smaller competitors (Martin, 2024). The unequal access to data entrenches the advantages of dominant firms, as they alone can afford the costs of licensing or the infrastructure to scrape and label data. This situation limits competition and risks worsening global inequality, as access to cutting-edge AI is concentrated in regions where these firms operate (Korinek & Vipra, 2023).

Testing different models with politically sensitive prompts highlights how technocratic gatekeeping subtly shapes the flow of information, reflecting underlying technocrats' political biases while masking them behind seemingly neutral design choices. In doing so, it subtly dictates who gets to speak and who remains unheard, embedding TESCREAL ideologies into the architecture of information systems while presenting them as neutral and objective (Olinga, 2025). In higher education, this black box monopoly constrains which AI tools and datasets universities can access, shaping curricula, research agendas, and student learning, and positioning institutions as sites where the consequences of concentrated corporate power and opaque decision-making are felt most directly.

The Underlying Structural Mechanisms Shaping Gen-AI in Higher Education

These events and their consequences highlight the deeper structures driving gen-AI adoption in higher education. From a critical realist perspective, this is not merely a technological shift but a transformation shaped by entrenched systems of power. I unpack these mechanisms by examining how the neoliberal apparatus shapes the adoption of gen-AI, exploring how it reinforces ideologies, epistemologies, hegemonies, hierarchies, restructures academic labour, and embeds efficiency-driven compliance within education.

The adoption of gen-AI tools in higher education reflects deeper systemic issues within academia. Underpinned by the logic of neoliberalism, universities have embraced these technologies as a response to growing pressures of productivity, workload, and competition (Giroux, 2002; Shore & Wright, 1999; Watermayer et al., 2023). At the structural level, the integration of gen-AI aligns with the broader project of academic de-skilling and labour rationalisation. By automating core aspects of teaching and curriculum development, universities reduce the intellectual autonomy of educators, repositioning them as facilitators of AI-generated content rather than as active designers of learning experiences. Framing gen-AI as a tool to support educators often obscures the reality that its adoption can erode pedagogical agency and impose standardised, efficiency-driven approaches to teaching and learning. Within this context, gen-AI is positioned not as a pedagogical choice but as a strategic response, further aligning curriculum design with managerial imperatives. In doing so, we risk rationalising and normalising practices that perpetuate harm, with critical reflection reduced to a performative gesture that enables the very dynamics it purports to resist (Suarez et al., 2025).

Beyond labour concerns, gen-AI operates as a governing mechanism that disciplines and conditions university behaviour. The push for adoption is driven not merely by technological potential but by the broader economic imperatives of neoliberal higher education and by the seepage of TESCREAL logics into institutional discourse. Universities, under pressure to maximise outputs such as employability, have turned to gen-AI as a means of increasing efficiency, echoing extropian and rationalist commitments to optimisation and perpetual improvement. The transhumanist and singularitarian insistence on inevitability further underwrites the sense that adoption is not optional but mandatory, naturalising risk and narrowing the scope for critical

refusal. Gen-AI tools promise seamless curriculum alignment, rapid assessment generation, and scalable student support, but in doing so, they reinforce an ideological model in which education is reduced to a transaction—an optimised system of knowledge transfer rather than an intellectually generative process. As such, gen-AI becomes an institutional mechanism embedded within higher education that allows and enables it to shape knowledge production and dissemination. In effect, this grants gen-AI a causal power over learning to deem what is valid or valuable, reinforcing particular epistemic norms and values while binding universities more tightly to speculative TESCREAL futures that are detached from the lived realities of teaching and learning and willingly ignore immediate harms.

This neoliberal drive intersects with colonial logics, as gen-AI reproduces and extends Western epistemologies at the expense of local, Indigenous, and alternative knowledge systems. This pattern reflects what has been described earlier as technocratic colonialism—a framing where educational transformation is imagined as a technical challenge, detached from the historical and political structures it both emerges from and reinforces. This reduction of knowledge to a series of extractable and reconfigurable data points, disconnected from the lived realities and situated contexts in which knowledge is created and contested, systematically oppresses certain ways of knowing. While it may not erase them metaphysically, it renders them illegible within digital and institutional spaces (McInnes & Airey, 2025). It achieves this in two ways: by amplifying testimonial injustice (by privileging knowledge sources that align with dominant discourse) and contributing to hermeneutical injustice (by excluding marginalised epistemologies from gen-AI training datasets), making it harder for those outside dominant knowledge systems to contribute meaningfully (Kay et al., 2024).

Knowledge that is absent from gen-AI-mediated epistemic structures becomes socially and, therefore, risks becoming functionally ontologically non-existent, as gen-AI-driven systems increasingly define what is recognised as real. Universities have long privileged certain knowledge systems while marginalising others (Grande, 2004; Kincheloe, 2008). What sets gen-AI apart is its automation of this exclusion, making the new gen-AI-powered monoculture appear neutral and inevitable (McInnes & Airey, 2025). Rather than overt gatekeeping, gen-AI functions as an epistemic filter that normalises exclusion through its design, dictating what knowledge is valued and may obscure the erasure of Indigenous, local, and community-based epistemologies, reinforcing the longstanding patterns of colonial extraction and epistemic violence (Kay et al., 2024). By actively encouraging their adoption, universities' adoption of these tools may inadvertently perpetuate the same forms of epistemic violence and exclusion that they critique and seek to dismantle (Rangan, 2022), paving the way for technocratic, hegemonic, and corporate control over education under the guise of innovation (Tacheva & Ramasubramanian, 2023).

At its core, the adoption of gen-AI in higher education represents a techno-solutionist response to the very crises that neoliberalism itself has created. Universities, having exacerbated academic workloads through casualisation, administrative expansion, and performance metrics, now turn to gen-AI as the solution to these structural dysfunctions. All the while marketing it as an innovation to save time and free up labour for meaningful work. Yet this so-called solution does not address the root causes of the crisis; rather, it reinforces the conditions that necessitate the adoption of gen-AI in the first place. The real danger is not simply gen-AI's presence in higher education but the way its adoption normalises a vision of the university that prioritises efficiency over ethics, optimisation over inquiry, and scalability over scholarly depth. Gen-AI, as a neoliberal apparatus, disciplines academics into accepting gen-AI-driven productivity as an inevitability,

erasing alternative possibilities for structuring education in ways that prioritise human engagement, relationality, and intellectual curiosity. Resisting this trajectory requires more than ethical frameworks for gen-AI adoption—it demands a fundamental rethinking of the neoliberal imperatives that shape university governance. It means challenging the assumption that gen-AI-driven efficiency is inherently desirable and questioning whether the "productivity gains" of gen-AI actually serve the interests of students, educators, and the broader academic community.

Ultimately, gen-AI represents more than a pedagogical tool; it is a mirror that holds up a warped and distorted version of education. Knowledge is equated to learning and becomes extractable, repackaged, and monetised through proprietary systems, while academic labour is reorganised to serve the logics of scalability and control. These systems align more closely with capital accumulation than with scholarly inquiry, deepening structural inequities around whose knowledge is visible, valued, or erased. Without structural critique, universities risk outsourcing not just their labour but their very purpose, becoming not merely users of gen-AI but institutions fundamentally redefined by it.

Conclusion

The AI-ification of curriculum design demands a cautious and critical approach. As I have argued, the use of gen-AI is not simply a matter of technological advancement; it is a deeply political act embedded within broader neoliberal, colonial, and technocratic systems. Through a critical realist lens, I have sought to expose the structural mechanisms that shape how gen-AI is integrated into educational practice, demonstrating how this process reinforces epistemic hierarchies, normalises surveillance, and reconfigures academic labour. Far from being neutral tools, gen-AI systems carry with them the values, exclusions, and power dynamics of the institutions and industries that create and adopt them.

Universities are not passive recipients of these technologies; they are active participants in the transformation of educational spaces into sites of algorithmic governance and market rationality. Gen-AI does not simply support teaching; it reshapes the very nature of what counts as knowledge, how that knowledge is produced, and who gets to produce it. In doing so, it risks automating forms of epistemic injustice, marginalising alternative ways of knowing, and displacing the relational, contextual, and ethical dimensions of curriculum design. These consequences cannot be addressed by technical fixes or policy safeguards alone. They require a sustained commitment to critical education that questions the foundational assumptions driving gen-AI adoption in the first place.

Responding to gen-AI's encroachment into curriculum spaces demands a form of pedagogical praxis that is reflexive, collective, and structurally aware. This includes embedding critical literacies into academic development, creating participatory governance frameworks that centre marginalised voices, and resisting the framing of automation as inherently desirable. It means reclaiming space for human judgment, care, and creativity in curriculum design, and treating these not as inefficiencies to be optimised but as essential qualities of education worth protecting.

Gen-AI may offer moments of utility, but its unchecked integration threatens to entrench the very crises that it purports to resolve. If higher education is to remain a space for intellectual agency, justice, and democratic possibility, it must critically engage with these technologies—not

only by asking what they can do, but by continually interrogating what they are doing, and to whom. In this moment of rapid change, the choice is not simply whether to adopt gen-AI, but whether to do so in ways that align with the values we claim to uphold. The goal is not to dismiss the use of gen-AI in education but to ensure that its adoption is accompanied by a rigorous engagement with the values and ideologies it embodies, thus preparing educators to navigate and potentially reshape the gen-AI-driven higher education landscape with a sense of responsibility, agency, and critical insight.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their thoughtful and constructive feedback, which greatly strengthened the arguments and clarity of this manuscript. I am also grateful to my peers who engaged with early drafts, offering critical insights and suggestions that helped refine the structure, focus, and articulation of the paper. Their collective input has been invaluable in shaping this work.

References

- AI Safety Summit. (2023, November 1). *The Bletchley Declaration by Countries Attending the AI Safety Summit*. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ai-safety-summit-2023-the-bletchley-declaration/the-bletchley-declaration-by-countries-attending-the-ai-safety-summit-1-2-november-2023>
- Akoleowo, V. (2021). Critical pedagogy, scholar activism and epistemic decolonisation. *South African Journal of Philosophy*, 40(4), 436-451. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02580136.2021.2010175>
- Amri, M. M., & Hisan, U. K. (2023). Incorporating AI tools into medical education: Harnessing the benefits of ChatGPT and Dall-E. *Journal of Novel Engineering Science and Technology*, 2(2), 34-39. <https://doi.org/10.56741/jnest.v2i02.315>
- Australian Government Department of Industry, Science and Resources. (2024, September 5). *AI mandatory guardrails*. <https://consult.industry.gov.au/ai-mandatory-guardrails>
- Baidoo-Anu, D., & Owusu Ansah, L. (2023). Education in the era of generative artificial intelligence (AI): Understanding the potential benefits of ChatGPT in promoting teaching and learning. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4337484>
- Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, 610-623. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922>
- Bjork, O. (2024, September 19). *Clones in the classroom: Why universities must be wary of embracing AI-driven teaching tools*. The Conversation. <https://theconversation.com/clones-in-the-classroom-why-universities-must-be-wary-of-embracing-ai-driven-teaching-tools-238977>
- Bhaskar, R., & Hartwig, M. (2016). *Enlightened common sense: The philosophy of critical realism*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315542942>

- Borji, A. (2023). *A categorical archive of chatgpt failures*. arXiv preprint. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2302.03494>
- Brown, W. (2015). *Undoing the demos: Neoliberalism's stealth revolution*. MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt17kk9p8>
- Centre for Reviews and Dissemination. (2009). *Systematic Reviews: CRD's guidance for undertaking reviews in health care*. York, UK: University of York.
- Cerullo, M. (2023, June 28). *ChatGPT-maker OpenAI hit with lawsuit over "stolen" private information*. CBS News. <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/chatgpt-open-ai-lawuit-stolen-private-information/>
- Chu, R. (2021). *Surveillance capitalism and educational technology: A critical analysis* [Master's thesis], University of British Columbia Library. <https://open.library.ubc.ca/soa/cIRcle/collections/ubctheses/24/items/1.0440687>
- Collins, P. H. (2002). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Routledge.
- Corple, D. J., & Linabary, J. R. (2020). From data points to people: Feminist situated ethics in online big data research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 23(2), 155-168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2019.1649832>
- Cotton, D., Cotton, P., & Shipway, R. (2023). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 61(2), 228-239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148>
- Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. A. (2019). Data colonialism: Rethinking big data's relation to the contemporary subject. *Television & New Media*, 20(4), 336-349. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1527476418796632>
- Crawford, J., Cowling, M., & Allen, K. A. (2023). Leadership is needed for ethical ChatGPT: Character, assessment, and learning using artificial intelligence (AI). *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 20(3). <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.20.3.02>
- Ćurković, M., & Košec, A. (2020). (Re)search filter bubble effect—An issue still unfairly neglected. *Advances in Nutrition*, 11(3), 744–744. <https://doi.org/10.1093/advances/nmz133>
- Elliot, L. (2024, October 30) *Anticipatory obedience spurs conformity concerns when using generative AI*. Forbes. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/lanceeliot/2024/10/30/anticipatory-obedience-spurs-conformity-concerns-when-using-generative-ai/>
- European Commission. (2024, October 21). *Regulatory framework on AI*. <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/regulatory-framework-ai>
- Folco, J. D. (2025, July 23). How Elon Musk's chatbot Grok could be helping bring about an era of techno-fascism. *The Conversation*. <https://theconversation.com/how-elon-musks-chatbot-grok-could-be-helping-bring-about-an-era-of-techno-fascism-261449>
- Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.; 30th anniversary ed.). Continuum.

- Gebru, T., & Torres, É. P. (2024). The TESCREAL bundle: Eugenics and the promise of utopia through artificial general intelligence. *First Monday*. <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v29i4.13636>
- Gerken, T. (2025, February 5). *Australia bans DeepSeek on government devices over security risk*. The BBC. <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/c8d95v0nr1yo>
- Gilliard, C., & Selwyn, N. (2022). Automated Surveillance in Education. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 5, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-022-00295-3>
- Giroux, H. A. (2002). Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The university as a democratic public sphere. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(4), 425-464. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.72.4.0515nr62324n71p1>
- Giroux, H. A. (2014). *Neoliberalism's war on higher education*. Haymarket Books.
- Gmyrek, P., Winkler, H., & Garganta, S. (2024, October). *Buffer or bottleneck? Employment exposure to generative AI and the digital divide in Latin America* (No. 121). ILO Working Paper. <https://doi.org/10.54394/TFZY7681>
- Golumbia, D. (2024). *Cyberlibertarianism: The right-wing politics of digital technology*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Grande, S. (2004). *Red pedagogy: Native American social and political thought*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Group of Eight Australia (2023, September 19). Group of Eight principles on the use of generative artificial intelligence. <https://go8.edu.au/group-of-eight-principles-on-the-use-of-generative-artificial-intelligence>
- Grove, J. (2023a, May 11). *Academic minds 'vital' as fears grow over 'out of control' AI*. Times Higher Education. <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/academic-minds-vital-fears-grow-over-out-control-ai>
- Grove, J. (2023b, June 27). *AI must acknowledge scientific uncertainty, says Nobel laureate*. Times Higher Education. <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/ai-must-acknowledge-scientific-uncertainty-says-nobel-laureate>
- Halaweh, M. (2023). ChatGPT in education: Strategies for responsible implementation. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/13036>
- Hall, P. (2024, September 26). *Opinion: The challenge of preserving good data in the age of AI*. Undark. <https://undark.org/2024/09/26/opinion-challenge-of-preserving-good-data-ai/>
- Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), 575-599. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3178066>
- Haskins, C. (2024, May 22). *The low-paid humans behind AI's smarts ask Biden to free them from 'modern day slavery'*. WIRED. <https://www.wired.com/story/low-paid-humans-ai-biden-modern-day-slavery/>
- Haven, W, D. (2022, December 16). *The generative AI revolution has begun. How did we get here?* MIT Technology Review. <https://www.technologyreview.com/2022/12/16/1065005/generative-ai-revolution-art/>

- Heikkilä, M. (2022, December 20). *How AI-generated text is poisoning the internet*. MIT Technology Review. <https://www.technologyreview.com/2022/12/20/1065667/how-ai-generated-text-is-poisoning-the-internet/>
- Hendaway, M. (2023). *The intensified digital divide: Comprehending GenAI*. Internet Policy Review. <https://policyreview.info/articles/news/intensified-digital-divide-comprehending-genai/1772>
- Hodges, C. B., & Kirschner, P. A. (2024). Innovation of instructional design and assessment in the age of generative artificial intelligence. *TechTrends*, 68, 195-199. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-023-00926-x>
- Ikeda, S. (2024). Inconsistent advice by ChatGPT influences decision making in various areas. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1), Article 15876. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-66821-4>
- Jiang, J., & Shao, A. (2024). *Generative AI divide: How College Students' Backgrounds Affect Their Gen AI Literacy*. bioRxiv. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.01.626259>
- Johnson, D. G., & Verdicchio, M. (2017). Reframing AI discourse. *Minds and Machines*, 27, 575-590. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-017-9417-6>
- Kak, A., Myers West, S., & Whittaker, M. (2023, December 5). *Make no mistake: AI is owned by Big Tech*. MIT Technology Review. <https://www.technologyreview.com/2023/12/05/1084393/make-no-mistake-ai-is-owned-by-big-tech/>
- Kay, J., Kasirzadeh, A., & Mohamed, S. (2024, October). Epistemic injustice in generative ai. In *Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society* (Vol. 7, pp. 684-697). <https://doi.org/10.1609/aies.v7i1.31671>
- Kerwin, D., & Van Issum, H. (2012). An Aboriginal perspective on education—policy and practice. In R. Jorgensen, P. Sullivan, & P. Grootenboer (Eds.), *Pedagogies to enhance learning for Indigenous students: Evidence-based practice* (pp. 1-20). Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-4021-84-5_1
- Khademi, A. (2023). Can ChatGPT and Bard generate aligned assessment items? A reliability analysis against human performance. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.28>
- Kincheloe, J. L. (2008). *Knowledge and critical pedagogy: An introduction*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-8224-5>
- Kirova, V. D., Ku, C. S., Laracy, J. R., & Marlowe, T. J. (2023). The ethics of artificial intelligence in the era of generative AI. *Journal of Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics*, 21(4), 42-50. <https://doi.org/10.54808/JSCI.21.04.42>
- Korinek, A., & Vipra, J. (2023). *Market concentration implications of foundation models: The invisible hand of ChatGPT*. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2311.01550>
- Krügel, S., Ostermaier, A., & Uhl, M. (2023). ChatGPT's inconsistent moral advice influences users' judgment. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1), Article 4569. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-31341-0>

- Krügel, S., Ostermaier, A. & Uhl, M. (2022) Zombies in the loop? Humans trust untrustworthy AI-advisors for ethical decisions. *Philosophy and Technology*, 35(17).
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-022-00511-9>
- Kukutai, T., & Taylor, J. (2016). Indigenous data sovereignty: Toward an agenda. *ANU press*.
<http://doi.org/10.22459/CAEPR38.11.2016>
- Lees, D. (2024, February 27). *AI could transform film visual effects—but first the technology needs to address copyright debate*. The Conversation. <https://theconversation.com/ai-could-transform-film-visual-effects-but-first-the-technology-needs-to-address-copyright-debate-240348>
- Li, P., Yang, J., Islam, M. A., & Ren, S. (2023). *Making ai less" thirsty": Uncovering and addressing the secret water footprint of ai models*, arXiv.
<https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2304.03271>
- Lynn, D., von Thun, M., & Montoya, K., (2023, November 15). *AI in the Public Interest: Confronting the Monopoly Threat*, Open Markets Institute. <https://www.openmarketsinstitute.org/publications/report-ai-in-the-public-interest-confronting-the-monopoly-threat>
- Mannuru, N. R., Shahriar, S., Teel, Z. A., Wang, T., Lund, B. D., Tijani, S., Pohboon, C. O., Agbaji, D., Alhassan, J., Galley, J., Kousari, R., Ogbadu-Oladapo, L., Saurav, S. K., Srivastava, A., Tummuru, S. P., Uppala, S., & Vaidya, P. (2023). Artificial intelligence in developing countries: The impact of generative artificial intelligence (AI) technologies for development. *Information Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026666669231200628>
- Martin, B. (2024, July 18). *Why artificial intelligence is creating fundamental challenges for competition policy*. Bruegel. <https://www.bruegel.org/policy-brief/why-artificial-intelligence-creating-fundamental-challenges-competition-policy>
- McDonald, P., Hay, S., Cathcart, A., & Feldman, A. (2024). *Apostles, Agnostics and Atheists: Engagement with Generative AI by Australian University Staff*. QUT Centre for Decent Work and Industry. <https://eprints.qut.edu.au/252079/>
- McInnes, R. & Airey, L. (2025). Prompting, Privilege, and Pedagogy: A Decolonial Position on Generative AI in the University. In Barker, S., Kelly, S., McInnes, R., & Johnson, T. (Eds.), *Future Focussed. Educating in an era of continuous change*. Proceedings ASCILITE 2025.
- McIntosh, P. (2019). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. In *On privilege, fraudulence, and teaching as learning: Selected essays 1981-2019* (1st ed., pp. 29-34). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351133791-4>
- McQuillan, D. (2019). The political affinities of AI. In: Sudmann A (ed) *The democratization of artificial intelligence*. Transcript Verlag, Bielefeld, pp 163–173.
- Metz, C. (2023, July 25). *AI's dirty secret: It's powered by workers earning \$2 an hour*. WIRED. <https://www.wired.com/story/artificial-intelligence-data-labeling-children/>
- Mitchell, M. (2025). Why AI chatbots lie to us. *Science*, 389(6758).
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aea3922>

- Mitra, B., Diaz, F., & Craswell, N. (2024). Sociotechnical Implications of Generative Artificial Intelligence for Information Access, In *Information Access in the Era of Generative AI* (pp. 161-200). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-73147-1_7
- Morozov, E. (2013). To save everything, click here: The folly of technological solutionism. PublicAffairs.
- Moylan, R., Code, J., & O'Brien, H. (2025). Teaching and AI in the postdigital age: Learning from teachers' perspectives. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2024.104851>
- Munn, L. (2024) The five tests: designing and evaluating AI according to indigenous Māori principles. *AI & Society*. 39. 1673-1681. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-023-01636-x>
- Nagy, C., McInnes, R., & Airey, L. (2023). AI as a partner: Paving the way for a new model of collaborative course development. *International Journal on Innovations in Online Education*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.1615/IntJInnovOnlineEdu.2023051048>
- Newstead, T., Eager, B., & Wilson, S. (2023). How AI can perpetuate—or help mitigate—gender bias in leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 52(4). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2023.100998>
- Olinga, L. (2025, June 14). *I Asked AI to Create a Pro-ICE Chant. Google and Meta Did. ChatGPT Said No.* <https://gizmodo.com/i-asked-ai-to-create-a-pro-ice-chant-google-and-meta-did-chatgpt-said-no-2000615800>
- Olssen, M., & Peters, M. A. (2005). Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: From the free market to knowledge capitalism. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(3), 313-345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930500131877>
- Ozmen Garibay, O., Winslow, B., Andolina, S., Antona, M., Bodenschatz, A., Coursaris, C., Falco, G., Fiore, S. M., Garibay, I., Grieman, K., Havens, J. C., Jirotko, M., Kacorri, H., Karwowski, W., Kider, J., Knostan, J., Koon, S., Lopez-Gonzalez, M., Maifeld-Carucci, I., ... Xu, W. (2023). Six Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence Grand Challenges. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 39(3), 391–437. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2022.2153320>
- Pal, S., Marino Lazzaroni, R., & Mendoza, P. (2024, October 10). *AI's Missing Link: The Gender Gap in the Talent Pool*. Interface. <https://www.interface-eu.org/publications/ai-gender-gap>
- Patterson, D., Gonzalez, J., Le, Q., Liang, C., Munguia, L. M., Rothchild, D., So, D., Texier, M., & Dean, J. (2021). *Carbon emissions and large neural network training*, arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2104.10350>
- Perrigo, B. (2023, January 18). *Exclusive: The \$2 per hour workers who made ChatGPT safer*. Time. <https://time.com/6247678/openai-chatgpt-kenya-workers/>
- Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. M. (1995). *Understanding curriculum: An introduction to the study of historical and contemporary curriculum discourses*. Peter Lang.

- Plate, R. (2012). The Evolution of Curriculum Development in the Context of Increasing Social and Environmental Complexity. *Creative Education*, 3, 1311-1319. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2012.38192>
- Pogrebna, G. (2024, October 9). *AI is a multi-billion dollar industry. It's underpinned by an invisible and exploited workforce*. The Conversation. <https://theconversation.com/ai-is-a-multi-billion-dollar-industry-its-underpinned-by-an-invisible-and-exploited-workforce-240568>
- Ragnedda, M. (2020). New digital inequalities. Algorithms divide. In M. Ragnedda, *Enhancing digital equity. Connecting the digital underclass* (pp. 61–83). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-49079-9_4
- Rangan, H. (2022). Decolonisation, knowledge production, and interests in liberal higher education. *Geographical Research*, 60(1), 59-70. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-5871.12510>
- Rao, R., (2024, July, 28). *AI-generated data can poison future AI models*. Scientific American. <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/ai-generated-data-can-poison-future-ai-models/>
- Ray, S. (2025, January 30). *OpenAI believes DeepSeek 'distilled' its data for training—Here's what to know about the technique*. Forbes Australia. <https://www.forbes.com.au/news/innovation/openai-believes-deepseek-distilled-its-data-for-training/>
- Reeves, T. C., & Lin, L. (2020). The research we have is not the research we need. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 68, 1991-2001. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09811-3>
- Roberts, J. S., & Montoya, L. N. (2023, October). In Consideration of Indigenous Data Sovereignty: Data Mining as a Colonial Practice. In *Proceedings of the Future Technologies Conference* (pp. 180-196). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-47451-4_13
- Roe, J., Perkins, M., & Ruelle, D. (2024). Is GenAI the future of feedback? Understanding student and staff perspectives on AI in assessment. *Intelligent Technologies in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.53761/ITED/1.7>
- Selwyn, N. (2013). *Distrusting educational technology: Critical questions for changing times*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315886350>
- Shay, M., & Wickes, J. (2017). Aboriginal identity in education settings: Privileging our stories as a way of deconstructing the past and re-imagining the future. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 44(1), 107-122. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-017-0232-0>
- Shore, C., & Wright, S. (1999). Audit culture and anthropology: *Neoliberalism in British higher education*. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 5(4), 557-575. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2661148>
- Shumailov, I., Shumaylov, Z., Zhao, Y., Papernot, N., Anderson, R., & Gal, Y. (2024). AI models collapse when trained on recursively generated data. *Nature*, 631, 755-759. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-024-07566-y>

- Simpson, L. B. (2014). *Dancing on our turtle's back: Stories of Nishnaabeg re-creation, resurgence, and a new emergence*. Arbeiter Ring Publishing.
- Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Zed Books.
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of business research*, 104, 333-339.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>
- Sok, S., & Heng, K. (2023). ChatGPT for education and research: A review of benefits and risks. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4378735>
- Stahl, B. C. (2021). *Artificial intelligence for a better future: an ecosystem perspective on the ethics of AI and emerging digital technologies*, Springer Nature.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69978-9>
- Stockman, N., & Nottingham, A. (2022). Surveillance Capitalism in Schools: What's the Problem? *Digital Culture & Education*, 14(1).
<https://www.digitalcultureandeducation.com/volume-14-1>
- Su, J., & Yang, W. (2023). Unlocking the power of ChatGPT: A framework for applying generative AI in education. *Journal of Asian Education*, 6(3), 355-366.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/20965311231168423>
- Suarez, M., Müller, B., Guest, O., and van Rooij, I. (2025, June 12). *Critical AI Literacy: Beyond hegemonic perspectives on sustainability*. Sustainability Dispatch.
<https://rcsc.substack.com/p/critical-ai-literacy-beyond-hegemonic>
- Tacheva, J., & Ramasubramanian, S. (2023). AI Empire: Unraveling the interlocking systems of oppression in generative AI's global order. *Big Data & Society*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517231219241>
- Tahiru, F. (2021). AI in education: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Cases on Information Technology*, 23(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.4018/JCIT.2021010101>
- Tikly, L. (2004). Education and the new imperialism. *Comparative Education*, 40(2), 173-198.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0305006042000231347>
- Tomlinson, B., Nardi, B., Patterson, D. J., Raturi, A., Richardson, D., Saphores, J. D., & Stokols, D. (2023). The Carbon Emissions of Writing and Illustrating Are Lower for AI than for Humans. *Scientific Reports*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4399923>
- UNESCO. (n.d.). Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. Retrieved October 21, 2024, from <https://www.unesco.org/en/artificial-intelligence/recommendation-ethics>
- University of Adelaide (2023). *Modern Slavery Act Statement*.
<https://www.adelaide.edu.au/publications/ua/media/375/modern-slavery-statement.pdf>
- University of Michigan (2025, April 29). *Generative AI for Course Design: Crafting Learning Objectives*. <https://onlineteaching.umich.edu/articles/generative-ai-for-course-design-crafting-learning-objectives/>
- University of New South Wales (2025, March 10). *UNSW's AI Guidelines and Framework*.
<https://www.teaching.unsw.edu.au/ai/guidelines#AI%20capability%20framework>

- University of Sydney (2023, December 3). *How Sydney educators are building 'AI doubles' of themselves to help their students*. <https://educational-innovation.sydney.edu.au/teaching@sydney/how-sydney-educators-are-building-ai-doubles-of-themselves-to-help-their-students/>
- Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (2025, March 3). *Design your course with ChatGPT or MS Copilot in 5 steps*. <https://vu.nl/en/employee/didactics/design-your-course-with-chatgpt-in-5-steps>
- Wach, K., Duong, C. D., Ejdys, J., Kazlauskaitė, R., Korzynski, P., Mazurek, G., Paliszkievicz, J., & Ziemba, E. (2023). The dark side of generative artificial intelligence: A critical analysis of controversies and risks of ChatGPT. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, 11(2), 7-30. <https://doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2023.110201>
- Watermayer, R., Phipps, L., Lanclos, D. & Knight, C. (2023). Generative AI and the Automating of Academia. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 6, 446–466 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-023-00440-6>
- Weidlich, J., Gašević, D., Drachsler, H., & Kirschner, P. (2025). ChatGPT in Education: An Effect in Search of a Cause. *Journal of Computer assisted learning*, 41. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.70105>
- Wenger, E., (2023, July 24). *AI produces gibberish when trained on too much AI-generated data*, Nature. <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-024-02355-z>
- West, S. M. (2019). Data capitalism: Redefining the logics of surveillance and privacy. *Business & Society*, 58(1), 20–41. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650317718185>
- Williams, A., Miceli, M., & Gebru, T. (2022, July 25). *The exploited labor behind artificial intelligence*. Noema Magazine. <https://www.noemamag.com/the-exploited-labor-behind-artificial-intelligence/>
- Williams, D. H., & Shipley, G. P. (2020). Enhancing artificial intelligence with indigenous wisdom. *Open J Philos* 11(1), 43–58. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojpp.2021.111005>
- Worrell, T. (2024, October). *AI affects everyone – including Indigenous people. It's time we have a say in how it's built*. The Conversation. <https://theconversation.com/ai-affects-everyone-including-indigenous-people-its-time-we-have-a-say-in-how-its-built-239605>
- Wright, D., Igel, C., Samuel, G., & Selvan, R. (2025). Efficiency Is Not Enough: A Critical Perspective on Environmentally Sustainable AI. *Communications of the ACM*, 68(7), 62-69. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3724500>
- Wu, T., He, S., Liu, J., Sun, S., Liu, K., Han, Q. L., & Tang, Y. (2023). A brief overview of ChatGPT: The history, status quo and potential future development. *Journal of Automatica Sinica*, 10(5), 1122–1136. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JAS.2023.123618>
- Zajda, J. (2024). Curriculum design and evaluation in the global culture. In *Handbook of Curriculum Theory, Research, and Practice* (pp. 783-797). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-21155-3_23
- Zhai, X., Chu, X., Chai, C. S., Jong, M. S. Y., Istenic, A., Spector, M., Liu, J., Yuan, J., & Li, Y. (2021). A review of artificial intelligence (AI) in education from 2010 to 2020. *Complexity*, Article ID 8812542, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/8812542>

Zhou, M., Abhishek, V., Derdenger, T., Kim, J., & Srinivasan, K. (2024). *Bias in generative AI*. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2403.02726>

Zuboff, S. (2019). Surveillance Capitalism and the Challenge of Collective Action. *New Labor Forum*, 28(1), 10-29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1095796018819461>

Author

Richard McInnes is an experienced educational leader and critical scholar-practitioner with over fifteen years of experience across secondary and higher education. Currently, he is a Manager, Education Design in the Learning Enhancement and Innovation Unit at Adelaide University. His publications in the scholarship of teaching and learning occur at the intersection of critical pedagogies, transformative curriculum design, and institutional change. His work interrogates dominant narratives in curriculum, technology, and university practice, focused on equity, agency and diversity.

Critical Education

criticaleducation.org

ISSN 1920-4175

Editors

Sandra Mathison, *University of British Columbia*

E. Wayne Ross, *University of British Columbia*

Associate Editors

Abraham P. DeLeon, *University of Texas at San Antonio*

Adam Renner, 1970-2010

Co-Founding and Past Editor

Stephen Petrina, *University of British Columbia*

Editorial Collective

Wayne Au, *University of Washington Bothell*

Jessica Bacon, *Montclair State University*

Jeff Bale, *University of Toronto*

Grant Banfield, *Flinders University*

Dennis Beach, *University of Gothenburg*

Kristen Buras, *Georgia State University*

Paul R Carr, *Université du Québec en Outaouais*

Lisa Cary, *Murdoch University*

Antonio J. Castro, *University of Missouri*

Erin L. Castro, *University of Utah*

Alexander Cuenca, *Indiana University*

Noah De Lissovoy, *University of Texas at Austin*

Ardavan Eizadirad, *Wilfred Laurier University*

Gustavo Fischman, *Arizona State University*

Derek R. Ford, *DePauw University*

Four Arrows, *Fielding Graduate University*

David Gabbard, *Boise State University*

Rich Gibson, *San Diego State University*

Panayota Gounari, *UMass, Boston*

Keith Heggart, *University of Technology Sydney*

Dave Hill, *Anglia Ruskin University*

Nathalia E. Jaramillo, *Kennesaw State University*

Richard Kahn, *Antioch University Los Angeles*

Gianna Katsiampoura, *University of Athens*

Harper Keenan, *University of British Columbia*

Kathleen Kesson, *Long Island University*

Ashwani Kumar, *Mount Saint Vincent University*

Ravi Kumar, *South Asian University*

Saville Kushner, *Drew University*

Yulong Li, *The Chinese University of Hong Kong*

John Lupinacci, *Washington State University*

Kevin R. Magill, *Baylor University*

Alpesh Maisuria, *University of East London*

Curry Stephenson Malott, *West Chester University*

Gregory Martin, *University of Technology Sydney*

Cris Mayo, *University of Vermont*

Peter Mayo, *University of Malta*

Peter McLaren, *Chapman University*

Shahrzad Mojab, *University of Toronto*

João Paraskeva, *University of Strathclyde*

Lana Parker, *University of Windsor*

Brad Porfilio, *California State University, Stanislaus*

Marc Pruyn, *University of the Sunshine Coast*

Lotar Rasinski, *University of Lower Silesia*

Leena Robertson, *Middlesex University*

Sam Rocha, *University of British Columbia*

Edda Sant, *University of Manchester*

Doug Selwyn, *SUNY Plattsburgh*

Özlem Sensoy, *Simon Fraser University*

Patrick Shannon, *Penn State University*

Steven Singer, *The College of New Jersey*

Kostas Skordoulis, *University of Athens*

John Smyth, *Federation Univ. Australia*

Hannah Spector, *Boston Psychoanalytic Society & Institute*

Marc Spooner, *University of Regina*

Inna Stepaniuk, *Simon Fraser University*

Paolo Vittoria, *University of Naples Federico II*