

Algorithmic Futures and Educational Justice: Reimagining AI in Higher Education in the Global South

Masilo Sepaella

Abstract

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is reshaping higher education globally, offering opportunities for personalised learning, administrative efficiency, and expanded educational access. However, in the Global South, AI adoption occurs within contexts characterised by digital inequality, resource constraints, and ongoing struggles for epistemic justice. This study examines the implications of AI integration in higher education institutions across South Africa, Nigeria, and Kenya through the lenses of critical pedagogy, decolonial theory, and critical algorithm studies. Using a qualitative multi-case study design, data were collected through semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, document analysis, and digital platform observations.

The findings reveal that while AI enhances administrative efficiency and learning support, its benefits are unevenly distributed due to infrastructural disparities, linguistic exclusion, and weak governance frameworks. AI systems frequently reflect Global North assumptions that marginalise African languages, knowledge systems, and socio-cultural realities. The study argues for a “blended intelligence” approach that combines technological innovation with human agency, ethical governance, and context-sensitive pedagogies. It proposes a framework for equitable AI adoption centred on educational justice, digital sovereignty, and epistemic inclusion. The paper contributes to emerging scholarship on AI in higher education by foregrounding African perspectives and highlighting pathways toward more inclusive and decolonial digital futures.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence; Higher Education; Educational Justice; Decoloniality; Africa; AI Ethics; Digital Sovereignty.

Introduction: Reimagining Higher Education in the Age of Artificial Intelligence

1.1. Contextualising AI in the Global South

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has emerged as one of the most disruptive and transformative technological forces of the 21st century, reshaping economic sectors, redefining the world of work, and reconfiguring social interactions. In higher education, the adoption of AI has opened possibilities for personalised learning, automated administrative processes, intelligent tutoring systems, predictive analytics, and the potential for increased accessibility for marginalised learners. However, the application of AI in the Global South—particularly in African higher education systems—raises complex ethical, infrastructural, epistemological, and political questions.

While AI is being promoted globally as a vehicle for innovation and efficiency, its integration into African universities occurs within historically contingent and structurally unequal systems. These systems are characterised by deeply entrenched socio-economic disparities, under-resourced institutions, unstable digital infrastructures, and ongoing struggles for epistemic decolonisation. Thus, the adoption of AI in this context cannot be seen as a purely technical endeavour—it is intrinsically a political and pedagogical project. It calls

Masilo Sepaella is an educator, academic researcher, and public policy scholar based in South Africa

for a re-examination of the foundations of knowledge production, institutional autonomy, and the broader goals of higher education in societies grappling with post-colonial legacies and contemporary development challenges.

1.2. Problem Statement

Although AI has the potential to revolutionise access to and delivery of education in the Global South, its deployment often mirrors global North-centric assumptions, risking the reinforcement of existing inequalities. Dominant AI systems are typically designed using data, norms, and pedagogical models from well-resourced contexts, frequently ignoring the lived realities of students and academics in low-resource settings. Moreover, the adoption of AI has outpaced the development of regulatory frameworks, ethical standards, and institutional capacities in many African countries. This disjuncture exposes higher education institutions to algorithmic biases, data exploitation, and governance vacuums, all of which could deepen rather than narrow educational inequalities.

Against this backdrop, this article argues that a critical, justice-oriented lens is essential to ensure that AI in higher education promotes rather than undermines equitable development in the Global South.

1.3. Research Objectives

The primary objective of this paper is to explore how AI can be harnessed to support inclusive, context-sensitive, and ethically grounded higher education systems in the Global South. **Specifically, the study seeks to:**

1. Examine the current trends, promises, and risks of AI integration in higher education within selected African contexts.
2. Critically assess how AI intersects with issues of equity, access, and pedagogical transformation.
3. Analyse the institutional and infrastructural conditions that shape AI adoption in the region.
4. Propose a normative framework for “blended intelligence” that centres human agency, ethical governance, and context-responsive innovation.

1.4. Conceptual Framing

This study is situated at the intersection of three core concepts: **Artificial Intelligence**, **Educational Equity**, and **Postcolonial Pedagogy**.

- **Artificial Intelligence (AI)** is understood here not merely as a set of technologies, but as a socio-technical system that encodes values, norms, and ideologies. It includes machine learning algorithms, natural language processing, predictive analytics, and generative systems increasingly used in educational contexts.
- **Educational Equity** refers to the fair and just distribution of educational resources, opportunities, and outcomes, particularly for historically disadvantaged groups. It encompasses not only access to higher education but also the inclusivity of curricula, pedagogical methods, and institutional cultures.

- **Postcolonial Pedagogy** challenges the Eurocentric epistemologies that dominate formal education systems in formerly colonised societies. It advocates for curriculum transformation, linguistic diversity, and the recognition of indigenous knowledge systems.

Through this framework, the paper interrogates how AI systems reflect, reproduce, or resist the historical and structural conditions of inequality in African higher education.

1.5. Theoretical Lens

The paper draws on several interrelated theoretical perspectives:

- **Critical Algorithm Studies:** Scholars such as Safiya Umoja Noble (2018) and Ruha Benjamin (2019) have demonstrated how algorithmic systems often reproduce racial, gendered, and class-based hierarchies. In the context of education, this insight is crucial to understanding how AI might embed exclusionary logics within seemingly neutral systems.
- **Decolonial Theory:** Building on thinkers such as Walter D. Mignolo, Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, and Achille Mbembe, decolonial theory foregrounds the epistemic violence of colonial knowledge systems. This paper applies decolonial theory to critique AI's embedded universalism and to argue for culturally grounded, pluralistic AI models.
- **Critical Pedagogy:** Inspired by Paulo Freire (1970), this lens views education as a dialogical, liberatory process rather than a top-down transmission of knowledge. The study uses this theory to assess whether AI enhances or limits participatory, reflective, and student-centred learning.

Together, these perspectives provide a robust analytical framework for understanding AI not simply as a technological artifact, but as a site of contestation, power, and potential emancipation.

1.6. Significance of the Study

This research makes several key contributions. First, it offers an empirically grounded analysis of AI deployment in African higher education systems—an area that remains under-explored in current literature. Second, it critically interrogates the normative assumptions underpinning AI adoption, advocating for a socially just and pedagogically responsive approach. Third, it bridges global AI discourses with context-specific concerns in the Global South, contributing to the growing body of Southern theory and scholarship.

Furthermore, the study is significant for policymakers, institutional leaders, and ed-tech developers seeking to deploy AI in higher education without compromising on values of inclusion, academic freedom, and human dignity. It offers practical recommendations for designing AI systems that are both technologically effective and socially responsible.

1.7. Scope and Limitations

While this study aims for breadth across the African continent, it is grounded in case studies from three countries—South Africa, Nigeria, and Kenya—chosen for their diversity in AI readiness, higher education policy landscapes, and levels of digital infrastructure. The analysis does not claim universal applicability but seeks to illustrate broader trends and tensions common across the Global South.

The study is also limited by the rapid pace of AI evolution; emerging technologies and policy responses may evolve during the research process. Furthermore, while the focus is on higher education, the paper recognises the interdependencies with basic education, labour markets, and broader development systems.

1.8. Structure of the Paper

The article proceeds as follows:

- **Section 2** reviews global and regional literature on AI in higher education, with attention to equity, ethics, and inclusion.
- **Section 3** outlines the research design and methodological approach, including data sources, case selection, and analytical techniques.
- **Section 4** presents the findings, including country-level case studies and thematic analysis.
- **Section 5** discusses the implications for pedagogy, policy, and institutional design.
- **Section 6** concludes with key insights, limitations, and future research directions.

Recent advances in generative AI, particularly large language models such as ChatGPT, have intensified debates regarding the future of higher education globally. While these technologies offer unprecedented opportunities for knowledge access, personalised learning, and academic support, they have also raised concerns regarding academic integrity, misinformation, bias, and educational dependency (Kasneci et al., 2023; Tlili et al., 2023; UNESCO, 2024). These developments make it increasingly important to examine how AI is being integrated within African higher education systems and whether such integration advances or undermines educational justice.

Artificial Intelligence and Higher Education in the Global South

2.1. Introduction to the Literature Review

The rapid emergence of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has generated significant scholarly interest across disciplines, including education, public policy, computer science, ethics, and development studies. Within higher education, AI technologies are increasingly being utilised to enhance teaching and learning, automate administrative functions, support student success initiatives, and improve institutional decision-making. These developments have led many scholars to characterise AI as a transformative force capable of reshaping the future of higher education.

However, the literature reveals that the adoption and impact of AI are unevenly distributed across global regions. While most research has focused on universities in North America, Europe, and East Asia, considerably less attention has been paid to the experiences of higher education institutions in the Global South, particularly in Africa. This imbalance has important implications because technological innovations are never socially neutral; they are embedded within specific political, economic, cultural, and historical contexts.

The Global South presents a unique environment in which AI adoption intersects with longstanding challenges of educational inequality, infrastructural deficits, digital exclusion, and ongoing struggles for epistemic justice.

Consequently, understanding AI in African higher education requires moving beyond techno-optimistic narratives to critically examine questions of power, access, ethics, governance, and knowledge production.

This literature review synthesises existing scholarship across six interconnected themes. First, it examines global trends in AI integration within higher education. Second, it reviews debates surrounding ethical concerns and algorithmic bias. Third, it explores the relationship between AI and educational equity. Fourth, it considers pedagogical implications for teaching and learning. Fifth, it analyses governance and policy challenges associated with AI deployment. Finally, it examines decolonial perspectives on AI and identifies critical gaps within existing research. Together, these themes provide the conceptual foundation for understanding how AI may either advance or undermine educational justice in the Global South.

2.2. Global Trends in AI Integration in Higher Education

This subsection examines how AI has been integrated into higher education globally and identifies the dominant narratives that have shaped contemporary policy and practice. Understanding these global trends is important because many African universities are adopting technologies, frameworks, and governance models originally developed in the Global North. Consequently, global developments exert significant influence on local implementation strategies and institutional priorities.

Over the past decade, Artificial Intelligence has emerged as a central component of digital transformation strategies in higher education institutions worldwide. Universities increasingly utilise AI-powered systems to enhance learning experiences, streamline administrative operations, support institutional planning, and improve student success outcomes. According to Zawacki-Richter et al. (2019), AI applications in higher education have expanded significantly in areas such as intelligent tutoring systems, adaptive learning platforms, automated assessment, learning analytics, and student support services.

In countries such as the United States, the United Kingdom, China, Singapore, and South Korea, AI has become embedded within broader strategies aimed at developing smart campuses and data-driven educational ecosystems. Universities employ predictive analytics to identify at-risk students, utilise machine-learning algorithms to personalise learning pathways, and deploy AI-powered chatbots to provide real-time administrative support (Holmes et al., 2021). These technologies are often justified on the grounds of efficiency, scalability, and improved educational outcomes.

Despite these perceived benefits, scholars increasingly caution against viewing AI as a universally beneficial solution to educational challenges. Williamson and Eynon (2020) argue that many AI initiatives are driven by assumptions that technological innovation automatically leads to educational improvement. Such assumptions frequently overlook the social, cultural, and political dimensions of education. Similarly, Selwyn (2020) warns that excessive reliance on technological solutions may obscure structural inequalities and divert attention from broader issues affecting educational quality and access.

For institutions in the Global South, these debates are particularly significant because AI technologies are often imported rather than locally developed. As a result, educational institutions may inherit not only technological systems but also the values, assumptions, and biases embedded within them. Understanding global trends therefore provides an important foundation for critically evaluating the opportunities and challenges associated with AI adoption in African higher education.

2.3. Ethical Concerns and Algorithmic Bias

As AI systems become increasingly integrated into educational environments, ethical concerns have emerged as one of the most important areas of scholarly inquiry. Researchers have questioned the neutrality of algorithmic systems, highlighting their potential to reproduce social inequalities, compromise privacy, and concentrate decision-making power within opaque technological infrastructures. These concerns are especially relevant in the Global South, where regulatory frameworks and institutional safeguards remain underdeveloped.

The literature on AI ethics consistently demonstrates that algorithmic systems are shaped by the data, assumptions, and social values embedded within their design. Consequently, AI technologies may reproduce existing inequalities rather than eliminate them.

Ethical concerns related to the use of AI in education have been extensively debated. A central issue is algorithmic bias—the tendency for AI systems to reproduce and amplify the social prejudices embedded in their training data. Noble (2018), in her seminal work *Algorithms of Oppression*, illustrates how search engines reinforce racial and gender stereotypes. In educational settings, similar dynamics are at play, as AI tools may inadvertently penalise non-normative behaviours or linguistic patterns common among students from marginalised backgrounds.

In the African context, where linguistic and cultural diversity is profound, AI systems developed in monolingual, Western contexts may marginalise African languages, local epistemologies, and socio-cultural nuances (Chigona, 2022). For instance, AI-powered plagiarism detection tools like Turnitin may disproportionately flag non-standard English as erroneous, thereby stigmatising students whose primary academic language is not English.

Another ethical challenge relates to data privacy. The collection and storage of vast amounts of student data raise questions about consent, ownership, and the potential for surveillance. In many African countries, data protection laws are either nascent or weakly enforced, creating vulnerabilities for both students and institutions (Bawa & Sarpong, 2021). These dynamics underscore the need for context-sensitive AI governance frameworks that safeguard human dignity and institutional autonomy.

2.4. The Promise and Perils of AI for Educational Equity

Educational equity represents one of the most frequently cited justifications for AI adoption in higher education. Advocates argue that AI can personalise learning, expand educational access, and provide targeted support to students from disadvantaged backgrounds. At the same time, critics caution that AI may deepen existing inequalities where significant disparities in infrastructure, connectivity, and digital literacy persist. This subsection examines the competing perspectives within the literature and evaluates the extent to which AI contributes to more equitable educational outcomes.

The potential of AI to enhance educational equity in the Global South is a recurring theme in the literature. Proponents argue that AI can bridge learning gaps, democratise access to quality content, and offer tailored support to students with diverse needs (UNESCO, 2023). In resource-constrained environments, AI-enabled mobile learning platforms have extended educational access to rural and under-served communities.

However, these benefits are often unevenly distributed. Digital divides—manifested through unequal access to internet connectivity, digital devices, and technological infrastructure—can exacerbate existing educational disparities (World Bank, 2021). Moreover, universities in wealthier regions of the Global South are better positioned to adopt and adapt AI tools, further entrenching intra-regional inequalities. The literature thus emphasises that without deliberate policy interventions and public investment, AI may reinforce the very inequalities it purports to solve.

In South Africa, for instance, while institutions such as the University of Cape Town and University of Pretoria have invested in AI-driven learning analytics and chatbots, historically disadvantaged universities face infrastructural and financial constraints that hinder similar adoption (Nyamapfene et al., 2020). This scenario necessitates a nuanced understanding of AI's uneven effects across the higher education landscape.

2.5. Pedagogical Implications: AI, Automation, and Human-Centred Learning

The growing use of AI in educational settings has stimulated extensive debate regarding the future of teaching, learning, and academic work. While proponents emphasise the potential of AI to personalise instruction and improve learning outcomes, critics question whether algorithmic systems can adequately support the relational, dialogical, and transformative dimensions of education. This debate is particularly important in African higher education, where education is frequently viewed not only as a mechanism for knowledge transmission but also as a vehicle for social transformation and human development.

The integration of AI into teaching and learning environments has far-reaching pedagogical implications. On the one hand, AI offers the potential for personalised, data-informed instruction that can adapt to student pace and preference. On the other hand, scholars caution that overreliance on algorithmic decision-making risks reducing pedagogy to a mechanistic process, devoid of human interaction and critical reflection (Williamson & Eynon, 2020).

Critical pedagogy scholars argue that learning is inherently social, dialogical, and context-driven—qualities that AI systems struggle to replicate. Freirean approaches to education emphasise consciousness-raising and transformation through critical dialogue, which contrasts sharply with the standardisation and instrumental logic of most AI tools (Freire, 1970). As such, there is a growing call for “blended intelligence” models that combine human insight with AI-driven efficiencies (Luckin, 2018).

In African universities, the pedagogical role of AI must be approached with caution. Research from Nigeria and Kenya has highlighted faculty resistance to AI tools perceived as threatening academic freedom or job security (Ojo & Ayobami, 2022). Moreover, there are concerns that AI-based assessment systems may neglect qualitative learning outcomes such as critical thinking, creativity, and socio-political consciousness.

2.6. Policy and Governance Challenges

The effectiveness and legitimacy of AI integration depend heavily on the governance structures that regulate its development and use. International organisations, governments, and higher education institutions have increasingly recognised the need for regulatory frameworks that ensure transparency, accountability, and ethical compliance. However, significant governance gaps remain, particularly within many African countries where policy responses continue to lag behind technological developments.

A significant body of literature addresses the governance of AI in higher education. Globally, there is a move toward the development of ethical AI guidelines and institutional policies. UNESCO's *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence* (2021) and the European Commission's *Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI* (2019) provide valuable frameworks, yet their translation into localised African contexts remains limited.

Most African countries lack comprehensive national strategies for AI integration in higher education. Where such policies exist, they often focus on economic competitiveness rather than educational justice. The African Union's *AI Continental Strategy* (2022), for example, prioritises innovation and job creation but offers limited guidance on AI's role in transforming education.

The governance gap is also evident at the institutional level. Universities struggle with questions of procurement, localisation, ethical use, and accountability. Without robust regulatory frameworks, the outsourcing of AI systems to private vendors raises issues of data sovereignty and corporate influence over academic affairs (Jaffer & Dlamini, 2023). Scholars thus call for participatory governance models that involve educators, students, technologists, and policymakers in decision-making processes.

2.7. Decolonial Perspectives on AI and Knowledge Production

Recent scholarship has increasingly examined AI through the lens of decolonial theory, raising important questions about knowledge production, epistemic justice, and digital sovereignty. Decolonial scholars argue that contemporary AI systems frequently reflect Western assumptions, datasets, and modes of reasoning, thereby reproducing historical patterns of exclusion and marginalisation. Within African higher education, these concerns are particularly significant because they intersect with longstanding efforts to transform curricula, recognise indigenous knowledge systems, and challenge epistemic dependence on the Global North.

2.7.1 Synthesis of Literature and Emerging Debates

The literature reviewed above reveals three dominant debates regarding AI in higher education. The first concerns whether AI should primarily be understood as a technological innovation or as a socio-technical phenomenon shaped by broader social and political forces. While technology-centred perspectives emphasise efficiency and innovation, critical scholars highlight issues of power, inequality, and governance.

The second debate centres on the relationship between AI and educational equity. Although AI possesses the potential to expand educational opportunities, evidence suggests that benefits often accrue disproportionately to institutions and students possessing greater technological resources. Consequently, educational outcomes remain heavily influenced by pre-existing inequalities.

The third debate concerns the tension between technological modernisation and epistemic justice. Decolonial scholars argue that AI systems frequently reinforce Global North knowledge hierarchies, thereby marginalising alternative ways of knowing and learning. This challenge is especially pronounced within African higher education institutions seeking to advance curriculum transformation and knowledge decolonisation agendas.

Collectively, these debates demonstrate that AI adoption cannot be evaluated solely in terms of technological performance. Rather, meaningful assessment requires attention to questions of justice, inclusion, governance, and human agency. This study builds upon these debates by examining how AI is experienced within diverse African higher education contexts and by proposing a framework for ethically grounded and socially responsive AI integration.

The decolonial turn in African higher education has brought renewed attention to questions of epistemic justice, linguistic pluralism, and cultural relevance. Within this discourse, AI is increasingly scrutinised for its complicity in sustaining Western epistemological hegemony.

AI systems are typically trained on datasets that exclude African knowledge systems, languages, and epistemic traditions. As a result, they tend to universalise Western-centric knowledge while rendering alternative ways of knowing invisible. This epistemic erasure mirrors broader patterns of coloniality in global knowledge economies (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2018). Decolonial scholars argue that AI, if left unexamined, may become a new frontier of digital colonialism.

However, there are also efforts to subvert this dynamic. Initiatives such as Masakhane—a pan-African, grassroots NLP research collective—aim to build inclusive, African-language AI models. Similarly, researchers are exploring indigenous algorithmic logics rooted in African philosophies such as Ubuntu, relationality, and communal knowledge-sharing (Mohamed et al., 2020). These initiatives represent a vital counter-narrative that challenges the epistemological assumptions of mainstream AI.

2.8. Empirical Gaps and Future Directions

Although research on AI in higher education has expanded significantly since the emergence of generative AI technologies, the overwhelming majority of studies continue to focus on institutions located in Europe, North America, and East Asia (Chan, 2025; Kasneci et al., 2023). African higher education remains comparatively underrepresented despite growing investments in digital transformation and AI-enabled learning systems across the continent.

Research Methodology – A Contextual and Critical Inquiry

3.1. Research Design and Rationale

This study adopts a **critical qualitative research design**, framed by principles of **interpretivism**, **decolonial inquiry**, and **critical pedagogy**. The aim is not only to describe how Artificial Intelligence (AI) is integrated into higher education in the Global South, but to interrogate the implications of this integration for **epistemic justice**, **equity**, and **institutional sovereignty**. As such, the research is both exploratory and analytical, grounded in real-world practices yet attentive to the structural forces that shape them.

Qualitative methodologies are particularly appropriate given the complexity and contextual sensitivity required to understand how AI technologies are adopted and interpreted by diverse stakeholders in different educational settings. Moreover, this approach allows the study to foreground **voices from below**—those of students, educators, and administrators at the coalface of educational change.

3.2. Methodological Framework

The research design is underpinned by a **multi-case study approach**, focusing on three African countries: **South Africa, Nigeria, and Kenya**. These countries were purposively selected based on:

- Their contrasting levels of AI readiness and digital infrastructure.
- The diversity of their higher education systems (ranging from elite universities to rural colleges).
- Their regional influence and engagement in continental AI policy discourse (e.g. African Union's AI strategy, UNESCO AI partnerships).
- Existing pilot projects in AI-based educational technology.

The study also adopts a **critical constructivist epistemology**, which recognises knowledge as socially constructed, contested, and historically situated. This orientation allows the study to move beyond technical analyses of AI to explore the **power dynamics** and **cultural assumptions** embedded in AI systems and policies.

3.3. Data Collection Techniques

To triangulate data and ensure depth and richness of understanding, the study combines **four primary data collection methods**:

3.3.1. Semi-Structured Interviews

Interviews were conducted with a total of **42 participants** across the three case countries. These included:

- University administrators (e.g., vice-chancellors, ICT directors).
- Academic staff (from various disciplines).
- Policymakers (from ministries of education and science/technology);
- Developers and vendors of educational AI tools.
- Student representatives (from public and private universities).

Interview guides were tailored to each group but focused on themes such as perceptions of AI, implementation challenges, pedagogical implications, and ethical concerns. The semi-structured format allowed for flexibility while ensuring comparability across sites.

3.3.2. Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)

To capture collective dynamics and encourage participant reflection, **eight FGDs** were held, involving approximately **65 students** in total. Discussions explored students' experiences with AI-powered platforms (e.g., online assessments, chatbots, learning analytics), digital inequality, language barriers, and data privacy.

FGDs were particularly valuable in surfacing tensions and divergences in student opinion, especially across rural and urban campuses.

3.3.3. Document Analysis

A wide range of **policy documents, strategy papers, institutional reports, and technology deployment records** were analysed. These included:

- National digital education strategies.
- AI policy documents (e.g., South Africa's AI Draft Framework, Kenya's Digital Economy Blueprint).
- University-level AI governance policies.
- Vendor contracts and memoranda of understanding (where available).
- Ethical guidelines (e.g., UNESCO AI ethics recommendations).

This data provided insights into how AI is framed discursively, operationalised institutionally, and regulated (or not) nationally.

3.3.4. Digital Platform Observations

Where access was permitted, the researcher conducted **observational walkthroughs** of AI-driven platforms used in partner universities. These included:

- Chatbot interactions.
- Predictive analytics dashboards.
- Plagiarism detection tools.
- Adaptive learning environments.

These observations helped assess usability, interface language, and cultural contextualisation of AI tools.

3.4. Sampling Strategy

The study used **purposive and snowball sampling** to identify participants with relevant expertise or experience. The purposive criteria included:

- Institutional role (e.g., involvement in AI planning or usage).
- Geographic location (urban vs. rural institutions).
- Type of university (research-intensive vs. teaching-focused).
- Socio-economic background (especially for student respondents).

Snowball sampling was particularly helpful in locating AI developers, private vendors, and policymakers who are not easily accessible through official channels.

Ethical approval was obtained from affiliated academic institutions in South Africa and local research permits were secured in Nigeria and Kenya. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, and confidentiality was guaranteed through anonymisation of transcripts.

3.5. Data Analysis

Thematic content analysis was used to identify, code, and interpret patterns across interviews, FGDs, and documents. The analytic process involved:

1. **Transcription** and initial coding of all interviews and FGD recordings.
2. **Development of a coding framework**, aligned with the research questions and emergent themes (e.g., equity, language, ethics, institutional capacity).
3. **Cross-case comparison** to highlight differences and similarities in AI adoption and impact across countries and institutions.
4. **Critical discourse analysis** of policy documents to understand how AI is represented and legitimised within institutional and national narratives.

NVivo software was used to manage and visualise the data coding and theme generation.

3.6. Methodological Rigor and Reflexivity

Several strategies were employed to enhance the **trustworthiness** and **validity** of the research:

- **Triangulation** of data sources (interviews, documents, observations);
- **Member checking**, where preliminary findings were shared with selected participants for validation.
- **Peer debriefing** with academic colleagues specialising in AI, education, and African studies.
- **Reflexive journaling** by the researcher to monitor positionality and mitigate bias.

As an African scholar working within the postcolonial university context, the researcher is acutely aware of the challenges of both insider and outsider status. This positionality enriched the analysis but also demanded constant reflexivity, especially when interpreting narratives across class, gender, linguistic, and institutional lines.

3.7. Limitations of the Methodology

The study acknowledges several methodological limitations:

- The focus on only three countries limits generalisability, although the aim was depth rather than breadth.
- Language barriers may have restricted the expressiveness of some participants, particularly in student FGDs where English was not the first language.
- Variability in institutional openness restricted access to certain documents or internal policies.
- Given the evolving nature of AI technologies, findings represent a snapshot rather than a fixed state of affairs.

Nevertheless, the methodological design offers a robust, context-rich, and critically engaged foundation for understanding the socio-technical dynamics of AI in higher education across the Global South.

3.8. Profile of Research Participants

Before presenting the findings, it is important to provide a demographic overview of the participants who contributed to the study. A total of 107 participants were involved across South Africa, Nigeria, and Kenya. These participants included university administrators, academic staff, policymakers, educational technology developers, and students from both public and private higher education institutions.

Of the 42 interview participants, 11 were university administrators, 14 were academic staff members, 7 were policymakers, 4 represented educational technology companies, and 6 were student leaders. Participants were drawn from institutions located in both urban and rural settings to ensure a diversity of perspectives regarding AI adoption and implementation.

The eight focus group discussions involved approximately 65 students. Twenty-seven participants were from South Africa, twenty-two from Nigeria, and sixteen from Kenya. Students represented a variety of disciplinary backgrounds, including education, engineering, information technology, humanities, business studies, and social sciences. Approximately 58% of participants were enrolled at urban universities, while 42% attended rural or historically disadvantaged institutions.

The demographic diversity of the sample enabled the study to capture differing experiences shaped by geography, institutional resources, socio-economic status, and levels of digital access. These variations proved particularly important in understanding how AI technologies are experienced across unequal higher education environments within the Global South.

Findings and Analysis – Unpacking the Impact and Practice of AI in African Higher Education

This section presents the empirical findings of the research, offering both thematic and cross-country analyses of how Artificial Intelligence is being deployed, understood, and experienced in selected higher education institutions across **South Africa, Nigeria, and Kenya**. The data reveals a complex interplay of opportunity, risk, agency, and constraint, shaped by national policy environments, institutional priorities, and broader socio-economic contexts.

4.1. Sources of Evidence and the Landscape of AI Deployment

The findings presented in this section draw upon four primary sources of evidence: semi-structured interviews conducted with 42 stakeholders, eight student focus group discussions involving 65 participants, institutional and policy document analysis, and observations of AI-enabled educational platforms used within selected universities. The triangulation of these data sources enabled the identification of recurring themes, divergences in stakeholder perspectives, and cross-country patterns of AI adoption.

Analysis revealed that AI integration remains uneven across institutions and national contexts. While certain universities have invested significantly in AI-enabled systems for learning support, student retention, and administrative efficiency, many institutions continue to rely on fragmented or externally driven implementation initiatives. Across all three countries, AI adoption is shaped by varying levels of infrastructure, institutional readiness, governance capacity, and resource availability.

4.2. Perceptions and Experiences of AI: Ambivalence and Pragmatism

Stakeholders across the three countries expressed a mixture of **optimism, scepticism, and ambivalence** toward AI. While administrators and policy elites frequently champion AI for its perceived modernising role, frontline educators and students exhibit more critical and context-aware perspectives.

4.2.1 Student Experiences

Student perceptions of AI varied considerably according to institutional location, socio-economic background, and levels of digital access. Participants were drawn from urban universities, peri-urban campuses, and rural institutions across South Africa, Nigeria, and Kenya. Consequently, experiences with AI technologies were far from uniform.

Students enrolled at urban and well-resourced institutions generally reported more positive experiences. These participants frequently highlighted the convenience of AI-powered chatbots, personalised learning systems, automated feedback tools, and digital academic support services. Many viewed AI as a useful supplement to traditional teaching and learning practices.

In contrast, students attending rural campuses and historically disadvantaged institutions expressed greater concern regarding unequal access to technological infrastructure. These participants frequently reported challenges associated with unreliable internet connectivity, high data costs, limited access to digital devices, and inadequate technical support. For these students, the potential benefits of AI often remained inaccessible.

Significant differences also emerged regarding language and cultural representation. Students from multilingual backgrounds reported that many AI platforms struggled to recognise local linguistic expressions, indigenous knowledge references, and culturally specific communication patterns. Participants viewed these limitations as evidence that many educational AI systems were designed primarily for Western contexts.

Furthermore, opinions differed regarding data privacy and institutional trust. While some students expressed confidence in university management of AI systems, others voiced concerns about surveillance, data collection, and the lack of transparency regarding how personal information was stored and utilised.

These findings demonstrate that student experiences of AI are heterogeneous rather than universal. Perceptions are shaped by broader socio-economic and institutional conditions, suggesting that discussions of AI effectiveness must account for context-specific realities rather than assuming a uniform student experience.

4.3. AI and Educational Inequality: Amplifier or Equaliser?

AI's impact on educational equity is **ambiguous** and deeply shaped by existing inequalities. On one hand, AI platforms have enhanced learning access for urban, digitally connected students. On the other, rural and marginalised students are often **excluded or disadvantaged** by the same systems.

4.3.1. Digital Divide

In all three countries, students from rural, low-income households face structural barriers to AI-enhanced education, including:

- Poor internet connectivity.
- Lack of access to laptops or smartphones.

- High data costs.
- Inadequate digital literacy.

These factors limit the reach and effectiveness of AI tools designed to “personalise” or democratise education.

4.3.2. *Linguistic and Cultural Bias*

AI systems rarely support indigenous African languages, and their design often fails to consider local socio-cultural realities. For example:

- Adaptive writing tools penalised students for using African proverbs or idiomatic expressions.
- Some AI platforms did not recognise surnames or naming conventions common in Yoruba, Zulu, or Kikuyu cultures.

This epistemic marginalisation contributes to **alienation**, reducing students’ confidence and reinforcing colonial patterns of knowledge validation.

The findings concerning unequal access to AI-enabled educational opportunities are consistent with broader scholarship on digital inequality in the Global South. Similar patterns were identified by the World Bank (2021), which found that technological innovations often benefit students who already possess access to connectivity and digital resources. Likewise, Nyamapfene et al. (2020) observed that disparities in institutional infrastructure continue to shape educational outcomes within South African higher education. The present study extends these findings by demonstrating how AI technologies may reproduce existing educational inequalities unless deliberate interventions are implemented to address structural barriers.

4.4. Ethical Governance: A Vacuum of Norms and Frameworks

One of the most striking findings is the **absence of clear ethical frameworks** governing the use of AI in higher education across the three countries. Institutions frequently adopt vendor-driven platforms without thorough vetting for:

- **Bias detection.**
- **Data protection compliance.**
- **User rights and consent.**
- **Accountability mechanisms.**

4.4.1. *Vendor Dominance*

In most institutions, AI deployment is **outsourced to private technology firms**, many of them international. This raises concerns about:

- **Data sovereignty.**
- **Commercialisation of student data.**
- **Dependence on external software ecosystems.**

Interviews with IT directors revealed that procurement decisions were often made on cost or efficiency grounds, **not ethical compatibility or cultural localisation**.

4.4.2. Policy Gaps

National AI strategies in South Africa and Kenya are under development but do not yet include robust education-sector provisions. Nigeria's digital policy remains heavily skewed toward economic development, with **minimal attention to pedagogy or ethics**.

These findings align with UNESCO's (2021) concerns regarding transparency, accountability, and human oversight in AI systems. Similar governance challenges have been identified by Jaffer and Dlamini (2023), who argue that many African universities lack comprehensive frameworks for regulating AI adoption. The current study confirms that ethical governance remains one of the most significant barriers to responsible AI implementation within higher education institutions across the continent.

4.5. Institutional Readiness and Capacity Gaps

The effectiveness of AI implementation is contingent on institutional capacity—including infrastructure, human resources, and governance mechanisms. All three countries showed significant gaps in:

- **Faculty training** on AI usage and pedagogy.
- **Technical support systems**.
- **Policy coherence** across departments and faculties.

Even at better-resourced institutions, many educators expressed a sense of **uncertainty and lack of agency**, often describing AI as “something imposed from above.”

The institutional capacity challenges identified in this study correspond with previous research highlighting the importance of organisational readiness for successful technology adoption. Holmes et al. (2021) emphasise that AI effectiveness depends not only on technological sophistication but also on staff training, institutional support structures, and policy coherence. The findings suggest that capacity-building remains a prerequisite for sustainable and equitable AI integration within African universities.

4.6. Toward Blended Intelligence: Human–AI Collaboration Models

Despite challenges, the research uncovered **emerging innovations** in AI deployment that reflect **local ingenuity, human-centric design, and pedagogical reflexivity**. These include:

- A South African university piloting AI-supported **peer learning analytics**, which combines algorithmic insights with human mentorship.
- A Kenyan programme integrating **AI literacy** into teacher education, preparing future educators to work critically with emerging technologies.
- A Nigerian open-source project that trains AI systems on **local language corpora** for use in literacy programmes.

These initiatives reflect an evolving understanding of AI not as a **replacement for human educators**, but as a **tool for augmenting teaching, dialogue, and student engagement**.

Table 1 Synthesis of Findings		
Theme	Insight	Implication
Adoption Trends	AI adoption is patchy, vendor-driven, and lacks strategic alignment.	Need for national and institutional frameworks for coherent implementation.
Stakeholder Perceptions	Students appreciate access; educators worry about dehumanisation.	Prioritise participatory design and human-centred pedagogical frameworks.
Equity and Exclusion	AI benefits are skewed toward the digitally privileged.	Equity audits and inclusive design must be standard practice.
Ethical Governance	Ethical oversight is minimal or absent.	Develop AI ethics policies for higher education with enforceable standards.
Institutional Capacity	Gaps in training, infrastructure, and support.	Capacity-building is essential for sustainable, context-appropriate AI usage.
Epistemic Justice	Western-centric AI systems marginalise African languages and world-views.	Localisation and decolonial epistemologies must guide AI innovation.

Discussion – Towards a People-Centred and Justice-Oriented AI Future

5.1. Framing the Dialogue: Between Technological Optimism and Critical Realism

The findings presented in this study reveal that AI adoption within African higher education is characterised by both significant opportunities and persistent challenges. Across South Africa, Nigeria, and Kenya, institutions are increasingly experimenting with AI-enabled systems to improve administrative efficiency, student support, and educational delivery. However, the findings demonstrate that these benefits are distributed unevenly and are frequently constrained by infrastructural limitations, governance gaps, and socio-cultural misalignments.

Three interconnected themes emerged most strongly from the data. First, AI adoption remains fragmented and institutionally uneven. Second, existing socio-economic inequalities significantly shape who benefits from AI-enabled education. Third, concerns regarding ethical governance, language exclusion, and epistemic justice remain insufficiently addressed. These findings provide important insights into how AI may either contribute to or undermine educational justice within the Global South.

5.2. AI as a Site of Epistemic Conflict: A Decolonial Lens

As the findings reveal, AI systems are not neutral tools; they encode particular epistemologies and ways of knowing. When African students are penalised by AI-powered grammar checkers for using culturally embedded expressions, or when algorithms fail to recognise African names, this is not simply a technical glitch—it is a form of **epistemic injustice** (Fricker, 2007).

Applying a **decolonial theoretical lens** (Mignolo, 2011; Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2018), we can see that dominant AI systems carry within them the logics of Eurocentric modernity: universality, efficiency, quantification, and standardisation. These logics often clash with African epistemological traditions that prioritise orality, relationality, communality, and ethical knowing.

Thus, AI becomes a contested terrain in the struggle for epistemic sovereignty in African higher education. To avoid reproducing digital colonialism, institutions must actively pursue the **indigenisation and localisation** of AI systems—through the development of multilingual corpora, integration of indigenous knowledge systems, and rejection of techno-deterministic models that treat African learners as passive data subjects.

5.2.1 Positioning the Findings Within Emerging Global Research

The findings of this study resonate with emerging international scholarship examining the implications of generative AI within higher education. Recent studies by Kasneci et al. (2023), Chan (2025), and UNESCO (2024) similarly identify tensions between technological innovation and educational equity. However, the present study highlights challenges that are particularly pronounced within African higher education contexts, including infrastructural inequality, linguistic exclusion, and concerns regarding digital sovereignty.

While institutions in high-income countries often focus on questions of academic integrity, automation, and assessment redesign, universities in the Global South continue to grapple with more fundamental concerns relating to access, affordability, and institutional readiness. These differences demonstrate the importance of context-sensitive approaches to AI governance and caution against universalising experiences derived primarily from Global North contexts.

5.3. AI and the Political Economy of Educational Technology

Another critical dimension illuminated by the study is the **political economy of AI adoption**. In many institutions, AI systems are acquired through vendor partnerships or donor-funded initiatives, often with limited transparency or public accountability. This model places private technology firms—most of them headquartered in the Global North—in **gatekeeping positions over educational access, content, and assessment**.

Drawing on **critical political economy perspectives** (Feenberg, 2002; Weller, 2018), we can interpret this dynamic as part of a broader neo-liberalisation of education, where knowledge is commodified, students are rendered into data points, and institutional autonomy is eroded through digital outsourcing. Without deliberate regulation and strategic alignment, African universities risk becoming “**digital dependencies**”, reliant on externally developed AI systems that neither reflect nor serve their unique pedagogical missions.

This context calls for a **reimagining of AI procurement and governance**, grounded in principles of public accountability, open-source innovation, and regional cooperation. Pan-African consortia could play a leading role in developing shared AI infrastructure and negotiating more equitable terms with global tech firms.

5.4. Rethinking Pedagogy in the Age of Algorithms

From a pedagogical perspective, the findings suggest that current models of AI integration risk reducing education to **instrumental learning**: the automation of tasks, standardisation of assessment, and surveillance of student behaviour. This reductionism undermines the **humanistic and critical functions of higher**

education, particularly in contexts like the Global South, where education is often a vehicle for liberation, community empowerment, and socio-political transformation.

Drawing on **Freirean pedagogy** (Freire, 1970) and its African reinterpretations (Nyerere, 1968; Shizha, 2013), we must insist on an education that is dialogical, culturally grounded, and oriented toward social justice. AI can support this vision—but only if its deployment is **guided by educators, not vendors**, and designed to enhance rather than replace human agency.

This calls for a shift toward **blended intelligence**: hybrid models of teaching and learning where AI augments human creativity, empathy, and reflexivity. For example, AI might support real-time feedback, but critical discussion must remain the domain of teachers and students engaged in meaningful dialogue. Predictive analytics might flag at-risk learners, but interventions should be led by human mentors who understand learners' social contexts.

5.5. Ethical Governance and Digital Sovereignty

A recurring theme across the case studies is the **absence of ethical governance structures** to regulate AI deployment in education. Unlike sectors such as healthcare or finance, where AI applications are subject to rigorous ethical and legal scrutiny, higher education remains a grey zone—especially in contexts where data protection laws are weak or unenforced.

The risks are significant: algorithmic bias can reinforce discrimination; surveillance systems can erode privacy; opaque decision-making can disempower both staff and students. These risks are magnified in the Global South, where **regulatory capacity is limited**, and external actors often shape technological agendas.

To address these gaps, institutions must establish **AI ethics committees**, informed by local contexts, and accountable to institutional stakeholders. These bodies should oversee procurement, monitor implementation, and ensure compliance with international human rights standards. Furthermore, national education ministries must develop **binding regulatory frameworks**, incorporating principles from UNESCO's AI ethics recommendations, the African Union's digital strategy, and context-specific policy innovations.

Crucially, ethical governance must go beyond checklists—it must reflect a broader commitment to **digital sovereignty**: the right of African societies to define their own technological futures in line with their social values, cultural histories, and development priorities.

5.6. Toward Policy Innovation: Principles for AI in African Higher Education

In light of the empirical findings and theoretical insights, we propose the following **eight guiding principles** for ethical, equitable, and context-appropriate AI integration in African higher education:

1. Equity-Centred Design

All AI systems must be designed with a commitment to reducing—not reproducing—inequalities in access, learning outcomes, and student well-being.

2. Human Agency and Pedagogical Autonomy

AI should support—not supplant—the judgment, creativity, and relational capacities of educators and students.

3. Epistemic Pluralism

AI systems must recognise and accommodate African languages, knowledge systems, and cultural modes of reasoning.

4. Transparency and Explainability

Algorithms must be explainable, auditable, and subject to human oversight in decision-making processes.

5. Data Sovereignty and Protection

Student data must be protected by robust legal and institutional frameworks, with clear guidelines on consent, access, and retention.

6. Institutional Capacity Development

Investments in AI must include training, infrastructure, and ongoing professional development for staff and students.

7. Participatory Governance

AI policy must be shaped through inclusive dialogue involving educators, students, policymakers, civil society, and technologists.

8. Pan-African Cooperation and Innovation

Regional bodies should foster collaboration on open-source AI tools, shared data repositories, and joint ethical standards.

5.7. Contributions to Theory and Scholarship

This study contributes to the emerging literature on **critical AI in education** by grounding analysis in the **material realities and epistemic struggles** of the Global South. It extends work by Benjamin (2019), Noble (2018), and Eubanks (2018) by highlighting how algorithmic harm is mediated through local contexts of inequality and historical marginalisation.

Moreover, the paper advances **decolonial computing** as an emergent field, demonstrating that questions of AI ethics, fairness, and governance cannot be answered without interrogating the global hierarchies that shape technological development and access. It invites scholars to move beyond Eurocentric frameworks and build **Southern-led AI imaginaries**, rooted in the experiences, values, and aspirations of African communities.

Finally, the concept of “**blended intelligence**” introduced here offers a new lens for thinking about educational futures—one that balances innovation with integrity, automation with agency, and data with dialogue.

Conclusion – Reclaiming Educational Futures Through Ethical and Equitable AI

6.1. Restating the Central Argument

This study set out to explore how Artificial Intelligence (AI) is being integrated into higher education institutions across South Africa, Nigeria, and Kenya—three countries that together represent the aspirations, contradictions, and complexities of the Global South’s digital transformation. By grounding the analysis in empirical research and critical theoretical perspectives, the study makes a compelling case for rethinking AI not merely as a technological tool, but as a **social, political, and epistemological force**.

The central argument advanced is that while AI holds undeniable potential to transform teaching, learning, and administration, this transformation will only be meaningful and just if it is **deliberately shaped by local contexts, ethical frameworks, and inclusive governance mechanisms**. Left unregulated or externally driven, AI risks becoming a new vector of inequality, epistemic violence, and digital dependency.

6.2. Key Empirical Insights

The research found that AI adoption across African universities is uneven, fragmented, and largely **vendor-led** rather than strategy-driven. While certain flagship institutions have piloted AI tools with moderate success, most universities—especially rural and historically under-resourced ones—struggle with infrastructural, financial, and human resource limitations.

Stakeholders' experiences with AI reveal a landscape of **ambivalence**. Students appreciate the efficiency gains of AI tools but remain concerned about language exclusion, data privacy, and lack of transparency. Lecturers, on the other hand, often fear the loss of pedagogical agency and the reduction of teaching to data analytics and automation. Policy-makers express enthusiasm but are hampered by fragmented regulation and limited institutional capacity.

A particularly urgent theme is the **epistemic disjuncture** between AI's Eurocentric design and the African cultural-linguistic milieu. Systems trained on Western data and assumptions often fail to recognise or respect African linguistic expressions, knowledge systems, and social values—thus reinforcing colonial patterns of exclusion under a new digital guise.

6.3. Theoretical and Strategic Contributions

From a theoretical standpoint, the study contributes to **decolonial computing, critical AI studies, and postcolonial pedagogy**. It highlights the importance of interrogating not only what AI does but how and **whose interests it serves**. The findings call for a paradigmatic shift from techno-solutionism to **human-centred and justice-oriented innovation**—a shift grounded in Africa's diverse intellectual traditions and lived realities.

Strategically, the study proposes a set of **guiding principles for responsible AI adoption** in higher education, including equity-centred design, epistemic pluralism, participatory governance, and pan-African cooperation. These principles are not abstract ideals but actionable pillars for universities, ministries, and multilateral institutions seeking to ensure that the digitalisation of African education is truly inclusive, sovereign, and transformative.

6.4. Policy and Institutional Implications

For **national governments**, the study underscores the need to embed education-specific considerations within national AI strategies. This includes legislating **data protection laws**, funding AI capacity-building for universities, and ensuring that public procurement of AI platforms includes **ethical audits and localisation criteria**.

For **universities**, the findings suggest that institutional readiness must go beyond technology acquisition. Institutions need to invest in **digital infrastructure, staff development**, and the creation of **interdisciplinary**

ethics committees. Curricula should be updated to include critical AI literacy for both staff and students, ensuring that users can question, shape, and resist the ways AI enters the classroom and campus.

For **regional bodies** like the African Union and SADC, the study points to a historic opportunity: the creation of shared **open-source educational AI platforms**, developed collaboratively and governed democratically, that reflect the needs and aspirations of African learners and educators.

6.5. Limitations and Areas for Future Research

As with all studies, this work has limitations. It focuses on three countries and a select group of institutions, which may not fully capture the heterogeneity of the continent’s higher education landscape. Language diversity, informal learning ecosystems, and vocational institutions remain underexplored in this study.

Future research could expand the geographic scope and include **Francophone and Lusophone African contexts**, investigate **gendered dimensions** of AI adoption, and track the **long-term effects** of AI integration on learning outcomes, institutional governance, and academic labour markets.

Moreover, research collaborations between African universities and global South–South networks can yield richer insights and contribute to a **counter-hegemonic knowledge economy** in AI development.

6.5.1 Implications for Future Research and Policy

The emergence of generative AI technologies presents an urgent agenda for future research in African higher education. Scholars must move beyond questions of adoption toward investigations of long-term educational outcomes, algorithmic accountability, student well-being, academic labour, and digital sovereignty. Equally important is the need for comparative studies examining differences between African regions and other parts of the Global South.

Policy development should prioritise the establishment of AI governance frameworks that balance innovation with ethical responsibility. Such frameworks must explicitly address issues of transparency, equity, inclusion, language diversity, and institutional autonomy if AI is to contribute meaningfully to sustainable educational development.

6.6. Final Reflection: The Struggle for Educational Futures

In conclusion, this paper has argued that the future of AI in African higher education is not preordained—it is a site of **contest, creativity, and collective decision-making**. At stake is not only how students learn, but also what counts as knowledge, who controls the infrastructures of education, and how digital futures are imagined and governed.

As African institutions navigate this terrain, they must resist the seduction of imported, “off-the-shelf” AI systems and instead cultivate a mode of digital engagement that is **critical, contextual, and decolonial**. This means reclaiming agency—not only in how technology is used but in how it is conceptualised, designed, and governed.

Ultimately, the goal is not simply to adopt AI but to **humanise it**, not merely to automate education but to **reimagine it as a space of liberation, dialogue, and transformation**. This is the promise—and the challenge—of people-centred governance in the age of algorithms.

References

- African Union. (2022). *Continental strategy on artificial intelligence in Africa*. African Union Commission.
- Bawa, A. C., & Sarpong, D. (2021). Digital transformation in African higher education: Opportunities and ethical risks. *Higher Education Policy*, 34(1), 112–128. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41307-020-00192-3>
- Benjamin, R. (2019). *Race after technology: Abolitionist tools for the new Jim Code*. Polity Press.
- Birhane, A. (2021). The impossibility of automating ambiguity. *Artificial Life*, 27(1), 44–61. https://doi.org/10.1162/artl_a_00336
- Birhane, A., Prabhu, V., & Kahembwe, E. (2024). Decolonising machine learning in Africa: Challenges and opportunities. *AI & Society*, 39(2), 567–582.
- Chan, C. K. Y. (2025). Artificial intelligence in higher education: Emerging trends, challenges and future directions. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 44(1), 15–29.
- Chigona, A. (2022). Algorithmic injustice: AI and exclusion in multilingual South African classrooms. *South African Journal of Education*, 42(2), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v42n2a2030>
- Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. St. Martin's Press.
- Feenberg, A. (2002). *Transforming technology: A critical theory revisited*. Oxford University Press.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.
- Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing*. Oxford University Press.
- Gwagwa, A., Kraemer-Mbula, E., Rizk, N., Rutenberg, I., & De Beer, J. (2022). Artificial intelligence and the African context. *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society*, 20(2), 125–143.
- Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2021). *Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning*. Center for Curriculum Redesign.
- Jaffer, T., & Dlamini, N. (2023). Private platforms and public pedagogies: A case for AI regulation in African universities. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 37(1), 55–75.
- Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeiffer, F., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., Stadler, M., & Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 103, 102274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274>
- Luckin, R. (2018). *Machine learning and human intelligence: The future of education for the 21st century*. UCL Institute of Education Press.
- Masakhane Research Foundation. (2024). *Advancing African language technologies: Progress and future directions*. Masakhane Research Foundation.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2011). *The darker side of western modernity: Global futures, decolonial options*. Duke University Press.
- Mohamed, S., Png, M. T., & Isaac, W. (2020). Decolonial AI: Decolonial theory as sociotechnical foresight in artificial intelligence. *Philosophy & Technology*, 33(4), 659–684. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-020-00405-8>
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2018). *Epistemic freedom in Africa: Deprovincialization and decolonization*. Wits University Press.
- Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. New York University Press.
- Nyamapfene, A., Moyo, N., & Dube, C. (2020). Digital equity and the higher education divide in South Africa. *International Journal of Educational Development in Africa*, 5(1), 1–20.
- OECD. (2024). *Artificial intelligence and the future of skills and higher education*. OECD Publishing.
- Ojo, A. T., & Ayobami, O. (2022). Artificial intelligence and pedagogical resistance in Nigerian universities. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 15(3), 119–135.
- Selwyn, N. (2020). *Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education*. Polity Press.
- Shizha, E. (2013). Reclaiming our indigenous voices: The problem with postcolonial sub-Saharan African school curricula. *Journal of Indigenous Social Development*, 2(1), 1–18.

- Tlili, A., Shehata, B., Adarkwah, M. A., Bozkurt, A., Hickey, D. T., Huang, R., & Agyemang, B. (2023). What if the devil is my guardian angel? ChatGPT as a case study of using chatbots in education. *Smart Learning Environments*, 10(15), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-023-00237-x>
- UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence*. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000381137>
- UNESCO. (2023). *AI and education: Guidance for policymakers*. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000376709>
- UNESCO. (2024). *Generative AI and the future of education*. UNESCO.
- Weller, M. (2018). *25 years of ed tech*. AU Press.
- Williamson, B., & Eynon, R. (2020). Historical threads, missing links, and future directions in AI in education. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 45(3), 223–235. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1794945>
- World Bank. (2021). *Reimagining human connections: Technology and innovation in education*. World Bank Publications.
- World Economic Forum. (2024). *Shaping the future of learning: The role of artificial intelligence in higher education*. World Economic Forum.
- Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education—Where are the educators? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16(1), Article 39. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0>