Recognizing the Pluriversal Indigenous Ontologies for the Adoption of Gen AI in Glocal EFL Education: A Theoretical Reflection

Md. Saiful Alam[1*], Adelina Asmawi[2]

[1] *World University of Bangladesh, Dhaka 1230, Bangladesh*
[2] *Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, 50603, Malaysia*

Corresponding Email: saifnottingham@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	Since the emergence of generative artificial intelligence (hence, Gen AI), a newly created discursive wave has been pushing for the integration of the novel, non-human tool as both an inevitable and universally desirable ontology of technology-integrated language education. However, noticeably, this superficial celebratory narrative often overlooks locally valued pedagogical ontologies where Gen AI may appear as culturally foreign, pedagogically misaligned, and technologically impractical. Positing it within this ontological potential, the present paper takes a critical view on the universalist assumption of Gen AI-driven EFL teaching. By applying the method of theoretical reflections, the paper then argues for a "pluriversal" perspective that acknowledges localized epistemologies, classical pedagogies, and human-centered teaching traditions. In doing so, the paper draws on the key concepts, including glocalism, digital divides, technological foreignness, the value of pluriversality, contextualism and cultural-philosophical relativism. By highlighting these concepts, the paper contends that there are some legitimate antecedents for which some global South contexts may resist or remain unprepared or reluctant about the integration of GenAI in EFL practices. The discussion in this paper underscores that GenAI cannot be a one-size-fits-all solution. Otherwise, GenAI tooling of EFL education in indigenous lands may be positioned as a conflicting paradigm threatening the classical, humanist, unique pedagogical rhythm. Therefore, the paper calls for a localized theorization of Gen AI-integrated EFL education. .

1. INTRODUCTION

The evolution of education as a whole passes down essentially differing and distinct ages or epochs meaning a compounding and constituting historical trajectory specificities of which are continually explored by scholarly excavation and narrowed focuses [1], [2], [3]. As it is often beyond a general necessity and essential capacity of delving deep into the historicity of educational evolution, almost always the "current tip" of educational evolution turns out to be what scholars and educators engage with. To put it otherwise, there is always a seeming "presentism" when it comes to the discourse of educational evolution and changes. Thus, narrowly though, the predominance that characterizes an educational age is often (un)consciously celebrated pervasively across the globe. Following this traditional view of educational evolution, Generative Artificial Intelligence (Gen AI) has taken over the defining character of the current age of education in general [4], [5], [6]. Precisely, now it is the age of education shaped by Gen AI [7]. In this age, the dominant discourse centers round the integration of AI in education, and it is deemed to be timely and inevitable [8]. A common suggestion is that failing to join the integration hypes and hopes means lagging behind or remaining beyond the current of technologization of education. However, materializing the integration of technology in

education is not as simple and straightforward as that. Indeed, for a variety of reasons, the hype of techno-educational reality may sound overambitious and too general because the feasibility of celebrating and embracing Gen AI in education is not equally feasible across glocal contexts, which are diverse in multiple respects, as implicated in the growing literature [9], [10]. These contextual gaps and diversities necessitate viewing Gen AI in education from the perspectives of contextual distances and divergences. Just as this argument is applicable to education as a "whole," so it is fitting to language education in "part." Considering this significant tenet of the technology-integrated language teaching in the age of Gen AI, the present paper proposes localized realities to be taken into account as part of the growing discourse from some viable perspectives, including digital divides, local orthodox pedagogies, pluriversality, and (post)humanism. This is a perspective paper gesturing for a theoretical departure that seeks to set principles for indigenous particularities when it comes to adoption of Gen AI in EFL teaching.

2. METHOD

As stated previously, this is a perspective. It is developed following the scholarly process of theoretical reflections, which are often used by scholars for revisiting available theories and signaling at future theoretical extensions, and revisions [11], [12]. In the flow of the reflections, the authors present a coherent argumentative logic. Theoretical positions have been maintained in two rhetorical methods: aligning and departing with theories that have been cited as references. In constructing these two theoretical stances, the authors chose critical, conceptual synthesis and logical, experiential, and perceptual contingencies and presuppositions.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Technological Foreignness in Local EFL Contexts:
Essentially, the world is diverse and constituted of distinctions and uniqueness. The uniqueness is largely representative of "natural distributions" of colors, languages, religions, etc., which signify "strengths" rather than weaknesses or inferiority. Due to this vigor and value of uniqueness, peoples feel enthusiastic to come closer to each other, with an epistemic thrust and inquest of discovering and admiring whatever seems foreign to them. Seeking a unity within the existing, vast diversities [13] is inherently sensible for imagining a "global togetherness," however, not at the cost of negating cultural identities and peculiarities that exist around the contexts and cultures of the globe. Likewise, the uniqueness of local educational practices is not reconcilable either.

Anyhow, the world is divided into two most common categories, which are the "Global North" and "Global South" [14]. These categories are otherwise synonymous with the other two most familiar global economic categories, which are the "developed" and the "(less)developing." Furthermore, politically speaking, these divides are represented as "the colonialist" and "the colonized." Whatever, the things of the global north are pragmatically "foreign" to the global south and vice versa. Generally, accepting or embracing foreign things 130 tis times difficult, inappropriate, unacceptable, and impossible. Often, it amounts to a huge "compromise" to cultural pride and identities. Not all the features of the educational systems, for example, of the West can be forced upon the East. If so is attempted, it may result in anarchy, or often it may be counterproductive. Similarly, Gen AI may be "foreign" to many educators and learners of many educational contexts where "human-centricity" in educational activities is traditionally adorned, valued, and culturally appropriate. In such "human-centered educational spaces," 130 tis No. surprise that the nature and the practices of language education may be inherently unique and diverging. 130 tis noteworthy that this contextual uniqueness may signify several characteristics that can make an EFL context stand out. Firstly, this may mean a feature of "orthodox," practice which may not be essentially intentional to "pace" up with the fast-track "western hypes" of GenAI in language education. Secondly, it may also mean "unreadiness" for the integration of Gen AI in language education [15]. In the same breath, it may also mean "reluctance" or "skepticism" about the potential "good" that is allegedly promised to be brought forth by Gen AI EFL practices independent of contexts. Thirdly, it may further mean a kind of local "resistance" to the promised prospects of Gen AI as a new, non-human actor. This super-hyped

techno actor may be opposed by the local sanctity, comfort, and structured teaching philosophy that govern the unique EFL practices of the indigenous. Briefly, in some less technologized societies, GenAI that is basically imported from the markets of the scientific West may be pushed back as "foreign disruption" in the traditional, native pedagogy of the less developed contexts. Precisely, this paper advocate for the conceptualization of GenAI integration in EFL instruction as a "glocal" framework [16] that bridges the global and local and explores and evaluates glocal learning contexts before making any wholesale adoption of AI tools.

Local Classical Pedagogies in Unique EFL Contexts:
To put it metaphorically, just as stomachs cannot digest new food that they are not habituated to accommodate, so it is that educational systems of one culture may not be appropriate for the diverging educational practices of a different culture. It is, therefore, suggested that educational practices are not essentially something that should be blindly copied and generalizable for every context. Similarly, as far as "tooling" or technologizing of education is concerned, the outcomes of unwise mimicking or indiscriminate adoption of the most advanced tools to cultivate in an indigenous space may not be that comfortable or highly beneficial. As a matter of fact, educational practices are something to be locally developed, keeping in mind the local realities and conditions. Practically, cultivation of paddy is not possible in Arba deserts. Just like that, the sudden switching on of the adoption of technology in unique cultures that have developed their "local classic" systems of education may turn out to be an illusion. In addition, it may be considered part of patriotism to save the local classic pedagogy from the illusional hypes of technology that are being celebrated as good in the technology-intensive societies. Thus, unwarranted temptation to technology in local EFL education may tremendously fail rather than act as the magic lamp of Aladdin to cause a revolution. Apart from that, "humanistic nutrition" is often derived from the classical pedagogy of a local people, which helps provide them with what scholars call "whole person" education for holistic development [17], [18], [19]. This is why adoption and integration of Gen AI tools in the local classic EFL pedagogies may superficially fill the stomach but may not provide the nutrition that shapes the local natives' identities and indigenous convictions. Hence, before jumping at the hyped campaign of Gen AI integration in EFL education, looking into the comparative value of the "local classical pedagogies" and foreign tools may be a critical consideration. To accommodate this theoretical "open-endedness", the act of adoption of GenAI should be seen from the philosophical lens of epistemological concept of "contextualism" [20]. Contextualism can justify that adoption of Gen AI in EFL education is not a universally practical idea, rather it is relative to contexts which are heterogenous.

Pluriversalsim Challenging Gen AI Adoption in Local Settings:
Generally accepted, education at its core is universal. However, besides this universal assumption, it is, at the same time, important to take into account that the states and societies in which education is received and imparted are not universal; it is rather genuinely "pluriversal", according to a wider view of scholars [21], [22], [23]. On this strong account, recognizing the pluriversals is critical while integrating Gen AI in EFL teaching. It should be borne in mind that coercive acceptance or sudden excitement-induced, prompt embrace of Gen AI may cause a sudden "chaos" and disruption in the normal momentum in local language education. The pluriversal view considers that pluriversal contexts develop and acculturate "plural pedagogies", as and when appropriate, which counteract the "hegemony" of universal pedagogy that is often uncritically exported from the West. This challenging view of pluriversalism serves a decolonial denial to the agenda of imagining the whole world as a "universal West" which is expected to be copied by "the Rest" of the globe. Borrowing or copying the so-called notion of universalism of technologization of EFL education is the process of creating an "indiscriminate contingency" that blocks the generative avenue of "pedagogical pluriversalism" in indigenous EFL education. Precisely, the contexts that advocate for pluriversal localized pedagogies may be unaffected by the Gen AI hypes. This theoretical departure can be realized by aligning the phenomenon of Gen AI adoption in glocal contexts with "culturally responsive pedagogy" [24] which may help the determinism of the feasibility of Gen AI adoption, by considering diversity in educational settings.

(Post)Humanist Persistence Discouraging Gen AI in EFL Education:
It would not be an accident that there may be some contexts where educational philosophy is not that liberal to what is called "posthumanism" [25], [26], which welcomes and accommodates non-human actors (such as, GenAI tools besides human agents) in educational activities. These contexts may not believe in "tooling education," which happens to overshadow or, in some cases, may replace human actors from the scene of educational activities. Such contexts directed by the philosophy of humanist delivery of education may be less likely to embrace GenAI actors in EFL practices because they may fear that it can reduce humanist practices to "tooled activities." Thus, EFL educators who take a humanistic approach to education—meaning education for "humans, of humans, and by humans" may avoid GenAI as foreign and as something dwarfing human abilities in language education and putting aside humanness from educational actions and accomplishments. Precisely, a strong view may hold that the absence of a posthuman view of EFL education in local contexts may look upon Gen AI as a disruptor rather than a facilitator. Otherwise, the "unitarian" approach to EFL education education as human-only activities—may dismiss the trinitarianism in EFL education accommodated in the philosophy of posthumanism: "(1) human teacher + (2) Gen AI + (3) human students (posthumanist trinity)." That is to say, contexts that are reluctant to the "reduced humanism" in EFL education may seem less likely to step into the post-human era, which embraces Gen AI as a "new normal" in EFL education. Otherwise, Gen AI adoption should be made subjected to not just "cultural relativism" [27] but also conditional or "revised posthumanism" that keeps an obvious, active manifestation of humanism in the posthuman acknowledgement of Gen AI tools as actors in EFL teaching

4. CONCLUSION

Although GenAI in EFL education is being widely celebrated, contextual sensitivity should be considered when it comes to the adoption of this novel non-human tool in locally appropriate, traditional pedagogies. It may come as foreign and therefore be unwelcome and ignored in indigenous peculiarities. For various factors, Gen AI-integrated EFL education may not be absolute theorization, and the tool may not be universally embraced globally. Indigenous reluctance and resistance inspired by contextual uniqueness, the value of pluriversal EFL educational practices, and humanist mindset may demonstrate an unwelcome attitude towards the emerging Gen AI tools. In the pluriversal ontology of EFL education, Gen AI may represent a technological "new rhythm" that may threaten the "old tune" of local practices and pedagogies. Given that, the localized ontology begs a new theorization of Gen AI-integrated EFL education that acknowledges the foreignness of the continuous emergence of Gen AI artifacts. This paper recommends that further empirical studies be directed towards the expansion of the theorization of Gen AI-assisted EFL pedagogy by a compelling revisit to the available theories of glocalism, contextualism, posthumanism, and culturally-responsive pedagogy, and cultural relativism.

REFERENCES

[1] W. Humes, "Evolution and Educational Theory in the Nineteenth Century," in *The Wider Domain of Evolutionary Thought*, Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer, 1983, pp. 27–56.
[2] J. T. DeCuir-Gunby and P. A. Schutz, "The Evolution of Race-Focused and Race-Reimagined Approaches in Educational Psychology: Future Directions for the Field," *Educ Psychol Rev*, vol. 36, no. 1, p. 30, 2024, doi: 10.1007/s10648-024-09873-2.
[3] Y. Xie, J. Smith, and M. Davies, "The Evolution of Critical Thinking in the Chinese Education Context: Policy and Curriculum Perspectives," *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, pp. 1–24, 2025, doi: 10.1080/09620214.2025.2462967.
[4] Z. Bahroun, C. Anane, V. Ahmed, and A. Zacca, "Transforming Education: A Comprehensive Review of Generative Artificial Intelligence in Educational Settings through Bibliometric and Content Analysis," *Sustainability*, vol. 15, no. 17, p. 12983, 2023, doi: 10.3390/su151712983.
[5] L. Ruiz-Rojas, P. Acosta-Vargas, J. De-Moreta-Llovet, and M. González-Rodr\'\iguez, "Empowering Education with Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools: An Instructional Design Matrix Approach," *Sustainability*, vol. 15, no. 15, p. 11524, 2023, doi: 10.3390/su151511524.

[6] H. E. Al Issa and G. Maheshwari, "Shaping the Future of Education: A Cluster Analysis of Generative AI's Transformative Impact," *Interactive Technology and Smart Education*, 2025, doi: 10.1108/ITSE-01-2025-0013.

[7] P. Shah, *AI and the Future of Education: Teaching in the Age of Artificial Intelligence*. Hoboken, NJ, USA: Wiley, 2023.

[8] Y. Walter, "Embracing the Future of Artificial Intelligence in the Classroom: The Relevance of AI Literacy, Prompt Engineering, and Critical Thinking in Modern Education," *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, vol. 21, no. 1, p. 15, 2024, doi: 10.1186/s41239-024-00448-3.

[9] G. Y. Yingsoon, S. Zhang, N. A. Chua, Y. Chen, and T. Xiaoyao, "Embracing Cultural Dimensions in AI-Enhanced Sustainability Education: Tailoring Pedagogies for a Global Learner Community," in *Rethinking the Pedagogy of Sustainable Development in the AI Era*, Hershey, PA, USA: IGI Global, 2025, pp. 37–60.

[10] M. Nyaaba, "Glocalizing Generative AI in Education for the Global South: The Design Case of 21st-Century Teacher Educator AI for Ghana," *arXiv preprint*, 2025.

[11] G. Vestheim, "Theoretical Reflections," *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 217–236, 2007, doi: 10.1080/10286630701342907.

[12] A. M. Williams and V. Baláž, "Tourism Risk and Uncertainty: Theoretical Reflections," *J Travel Res*, vol. 54, no. 3, pp. 271–287, 2015, doi: 10.1177/0047287514523334.

[13] J. Mariyono, A. N. A. Kamila, and A. N. A. Hidayatullah, "Unity in Diversity: Navigating Global Connections through Cultural Exchange," *Quality Education for All*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 114–137, 2025, doi: 10.1108/QEA-10-2024-0122.

[14] W. Li and others, "Multiple Environmental Inequalities between Global South and Global North in over 10,000 Urban Centers," *npj Urban Sustainability*, vol. 5, 2025, doi: 10.1038/s42949-025-00302-z.

[15] L. Kohnke, B. Moorhouse, and D. Zou, "Exploring Generative Artificial Intelligence Preparedness among University Language Instructors: A Case Study," *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 5, p. 100156, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100156.

[16] M. Tian, "Bridging Global and Local: Exploring Glocal Learning Contexts in an Adult ESL Classroom," *J Multiling Multicult Dev*, pp. 1–27, 2025, doi: 10.1080/01434632.2025.2503419.

[17] J. P. Miller, "Holistic Education: A Brief History," in *International Handbook of Holistic Education*, London, U.K.: Routledge, 2018, pp. 5–16.

[18] J. P. Cruz and others, "Whole-Person Development of Undergraduate Nursing Students: A Multi-University Study," *Nurs Educ Perspect*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. E26–E31, 2022, doi: 10.1097/01.nep.0000000000000938.

[19] V. Sankar, "Holistic Development in Education: Nurturing Well-Rounded Individuals for a Complex World," *Shanlax International Journal of Arts, Science and Humanities*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 103–106, 2025, doi: 10.34293/sijash.v12is2-jan.8884.

[20] K. DeRose, "Contextualism: An Explanation and Defense," in *The Blackwell Guide to Epistemology*, Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell, 2017, pp. 187–205. doi: 10.1002/9781405164863.ch8.

[21] M. Zembylas, "The Quest for Cognitive Justice: Towards a Pluriversal Human Rights Education," *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 397–409, 2017, doi: 10.1080/14767724.2017.1357462.

[22] J. Garcia-Arias, S. Corbetta, and B. Baronnet, "Decolonizing Education in Latin America: Critical Environmental and Intercultural Education as an Indigenous Pluriversal Alternative," *Br J Sociol Educ*, vol. 44, no. 8, pp. 1394–1412, 2023, doi: 10.1080/01425692.2023.2234088.

[23] L.-A. Noel and others, "Pluriversal Futures for Design Education," *She Ji: The Journal of Design, Economics, and Innovation*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 179–196, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.sheji.2023.04.002.

[24] H. V Richards, A. F. Brown, and T. B. Forde, "Addressing Diversity in Schools: Culturally Responsive Pedagogy," *Teach Except Child*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 64–68, 2007.

[25] A. Miah, "A Critical History of Posthumanism," in *Medical Enhancement and Posthumanity*, Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer, 2008, pp. 71–94.

[26]   M. Buchanan-Oliver, "The Spectre of Posthumanism in Technology Consumption: The Death of the Human?," in *Death in a Consumer Culture*, London, U.K.: Routledge, 2015, pp. 300–315.

[27]   M. Warnock, "Cultural Relativism and Education," *Westminster Studies in Education*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 35–44, 1979, doi: 10.1080/0140672790020103.