

GENERATIVE AI IN CENTRAL ASIAN HIGHER EDUCATION: INSIGHTS FROM CHATGPT

S. Kamenova 

University of Melbourne, Australia, Melbourne

*e-mail: saltanat.kamenova@gmail.com

Abstract. *The rapid emergence and development of generative artificial intelligence (AI), particularly large language models such as ChatGPT, is reshaping higher education globally. However, the impact of generative AI varies across countries and regions. This paper presents a study that adopts a thing ethnography approach, as used in earlier studies of generative AI tools, to understand the challenges and opportunities AI tools present for higher education in Central Asia. Focusing on the region's contextual specifics, this paper offers a spatial perspective on the impact of generative AI on the higher education system in Central Asia. It draws on an interview with a generative AI system to explore its own framing of the potential benefits and limitations of ChatGPT in educational contexts. This approach offers distinctive insights into how AI systems themselves articulate their role in higher education, and how such perceptions may inform future trajectories of AI use in the sector. In doing so, the paper raises important questions about how AI technologies interact with existing educational systems, potentially reinforcing uneven development between and within higher education systems in the Global North and Global South.*

Keywords: *Generative AI, ChatGPT, Higher Education, Central Asia, challenges, barriers, opportunities.*

Introduction

ChatGPT, a generative artificial intelligence (AI) language model, is nothing new to most users today. Since its first release in November 2022, OpenAI's ChatGPT has spurred increased interest in its use across various areas, including higher education [1, 2]. The platform reached one million users within five days of its launch and grew to 100 million users within three months, representing an unprecedented pace of adoption in the technology sector [2]. According to OpenAI data, in 2026, ChatGPT had 900 million weekly active users. The rapid development of generative AI models, such as ChatGPT, has drawn increased scholarly attention to the impact of these technologies on teaching and learning in higher education systems, particularly in Global North countries. Various studies have examined the potential challenges and opportunities that generative AI technologies pose for the development of Higher Education. Initial studies considered the role of AI in completing assignment tasks, the potential risks of plagiarism [3] and the possible benefits of generative AI [4]. More recent works engage with the experiences of students using generative AI tools for their educational purposes [1].

However, most of the research on generative AI and its impact on learning and teaching in higher education has emerged from countries in the Global North. While influential for our understanding of generative AI tools and their impact, these findings are limited to specific geographical contexts, leaving gaps in understanding how these technologies are adopted, interpreted, and embedded in transitional higher education systems, particularly in regions like Central Asia.

This paper aims to bridge this gap by exploring the implications of generative AI for teaching and learning in Central Asian higher education. The region presents a distinctive context shaped by Soviet educational legacies, ongoing institutional and technological transformation, multilingual environments (including Russian, national languages, and English), and uneven digital infrastructure.

Rather than treating AI as a neutral technological tool, this paper conceptualises generative AI as a sociotechnical actor embedded within global knowledge hierarchies. It asks: What perspectives does ChatGPT offer on the potential impact of generative AI on opportunities, inequalities, and knowledge production in Central Asian higher education systems? Drawing on a qualitative, semi-structured interview with ChatGPT, the paper argues that while generative AI expands access to educational resources, it might also risk reinforcing linguistic hierarchies, epistemic dependence, and institutional inequalities.

Materials and methods

Following Michel-Villarreal et al. [5] and Jarrahi [6] I applied a qualitative approach, particularly thing ethnography, to explore AI perspectives on the specifics of its use and the impact on teaching and learning in Central Asia. Giaccardi argues that a thing perspective gained through thing ethnography can offer unique insights into the complex relationship between objects and humans, presenting “new ways of framing and solving problems collaboratively with things, which have different skills and purposes than humans” (p. 2). Whilst challenging the anthropocentric assumption about the world, thing ethnography opens up new possibilities to understanding people and practices [7]. Thing ethnography requires anthropological engagement with things, ‘working together with’ them rather than ‘on them’, reframing things as subjects rather than objects of the research [5]. This ontological reworking is especially relevant with the rise of AI language models, which, since their recent introduction, have become a crucial part of human experiences as co-constructors and co-designers of new relationships, meanings and values.

A growing body of scholarship highlights the importance of studying AI systems not merely as technical constructs, but as agentic systems with distinct behavioural patterns that emerge within use contexts beyond their training phases [6]. Moreover, the rise of chatbots such as ChatGPT creates new possibilities for direct interaction with AI systems through text-based exchange [8], enabling ethnographers to engage with, interrogate, and critically examine ‘things’ perspective in situ.

While there is a growing interest in chatbots such as ChatGPT and their potential in conducting qualitative research as interviewers [4, 8, 9], there is very limited engagement with AI as a potential participant in qualitative research methods. Existing studies suggest that AI language models can function as interviewers with a reasonable degree of viability, offering efficiencies in data collection and processing, as well as a degree of consistency in responses [8]. However, their use as research participants remains underexplored. This paper builds on emerging work [4-6] to address this gap by adopting thing ethnography and treating AI as a research subject. Specifically, it demonstrates how generative AI models can be engaged as participants through written, conversational exchange, leveraging their capacity to produce contextually situated textual responses.

In line with the practice of thing ethnography, I adopted semi-structured interviews to interrogate ChatGPT’s perspective on the potential challenges and opportunities posed by AI models for higher education systems in Central Asia. Semi-structured interviews facilitate the collection of rich, nuanced data and are widely used in studies that seek to understand participants’ perspectives, interpretations, and meaning-making processes, while allowing flexibility to explore emergent themes and meanings. This approach is particularly suited to interpretivist and constructivist methodologies, where the aim is to understand how meanings are produced, articulated, and negotiated through interaction. In this research, I interviewed ChatGPT as a large language model (LLM). The interaction took place on 5 May 2026 using ChatGPT powered by GPT-5.5 Instant, released by OpenAI as the default ChatGPT model that day. The following themes were designed to guide the interview.

1. Discussion of barriers and challenges of using AI in learning and teaching in Higher Education.
2. Perception of differences in the adoption of AI language models and their impact on Higher Education in Central Asia.
3. Perception of differences in the opportunities offered by AI language models between Global North and Central Asia.

The interview with ChatGPT was uploaded from the ChatGPT response window, transferred to a Word document and transcribed. Drawing on feminist geographers’ approach, thematic analysis was chosen as the primary method of data analysis because of its flexibility and theoretical freedom [10]. During the data analysis, I followed the key steps of thematic analysis outlined by Brawn and Clark (10), first engaging in deep transcript familiarisation, followed by the development of initial/‘candidate’ codes based on a more systematic analysis of the transcripts that produced initial codes. These codes were then organised into meaningful groups such as

“language barriers”, “infrastructural barriers”, “uneven access to LLM” and others. This stage was followed by theme development (“barriers”, “opportunities”, “strategies”) and a review process. In the final stage, some codes and themes were restructured and/or redefined to ensure the data were captured cohesively and the overall research questions were addressed (10). NVivo 14 software was used for the sorting, coding, and tagging processes.

Reflections on conducting an interview with AI

Any ethnographic research requires a certain degree of reflexivity, allowing for the awareness of the role of subjectivity in the research process [11]. Qualitative research is not simply a process of objective data collection; rather, it is an inherently subjective and co-constructed process of knowledge production. Reflexivity becomes particularly crucial when engaging with AI language models, which, while autonomous to a certain degree, “do not act outside of their relations with humans (notably, the researcher in this case).” Jarrahi [6] argues that, similar to the way ethnographers acknowledge their influence on fieldwork, AI researchers must recognise how their positionality, personal contexts, perceptions, and distinctive interaction styles shape the observations and responses generated through their questions and prompts.

It is also important to note that LLMs such as ChatGPT are engineered to be ‘a helpful assistant’ and are biased toward continuing the conversation, prompting it to offer suggestions such as “Would you like me to...”, “I can also...”, or “Let me know if...”. They often sustain conversations by offering follow-up questions, suggestions, or alternative perspectives that prompt users to continue engaging. This AI feature was also evident during an interview with ChatGPT in this research. It often suggested that I follow up the interview questions with another one, which ChatGPT thought appropriate and most useful in the given context. Sometimes, such suggestions aligned with my interview script, previewing the following question. However, at other times, it attempted to steer the conversation in a different direction. While the suggestions were logical and aligned with the broader aim of the interview, they touched on issues that were not the primary focus of my research.

This built-in feature of generative AI often changes the dynamics of the interview, reversing the interviewer/interviewee roles and actively influencing how the conversation unfolds. Rather than responding passively to questions, ChatGPT frequently directed the flow of discussion by proposing follow-up prompts, alternative lines of inquiry, and additional themes for exploration. For example, after answering my first question about the opportunities for AI use in Higher Education, ChatGPT suggested a few other questions that could be further developed.

“If you’d like, your next question could probe the risks or limitations, or ask me to reflect on how these opportunities differ compared to the Global North” (ChatGPT, 5th of May, 2026).

At times, these suggestions extended beyond simple encouragement, adopting a more directive and assertive tone. In actively shaping the interview, ChatGPT would emphasise particular themes or responses through stylistic and linguistic cues, such as boldfacing text or using evaluative language, including words like “strong” or “very important.” Such interventions demonstrate how generative AI can subtly influence the perceived significance and direction of qualitative inquiry.

“If you want to continue your interview, a very strong next question would be something like: whether localisation risks reinforcing “token inclusion” of local knowledge without changing underlying power structures in AI systems” (ChatGPT, 5th of May, 2026).

Hence, I argue here that reflexivity and positionality are an important part of research involving direct engagement with AI language models. When interviewing AI through structured prompts and analytical frameworks, qualitative researchers should be aware of the possible influence such systems exert on the research process and findings. Rather than functioning as neutral or passive respondents, generative AI models actively co-produce the interaction, influencing both the direction and interpretation of qualitative data. Recognising this co-constitutive relationship is therefore essential for maintaining methodological transparency and critically reflecting on how knowledge is produced within human/AI research encounters.

Results and discussion

Challenges

Consistent with the findings of Michel-Villarreal et al. [5], this research shows ChatGPT's awareness of its shortcomings in performing research-related tasks, particularly regarding the accuracy and reliability of its results. ChatGPT admitted that it can “*sometimes generate incorrect, misleading, or overly confident responses*” (ChatGPT, May 5, 2026), which, as argued by ChatGPT, in turn may affect the research and learning quality and lead to mistrust “*in digital tools more broadly.*” It also mentioned academic integrity and deskilling of students as possible challenges of AI use in higher education in Central Asia.

“Because I can generate essays, summaries, explanations, and even problem solutions, students may rely on me instead of developing independent writing or analytical skills and treat me as an “answer machine” rather than a learning support tool” (ChatGPT, 5th of May, 2026).

However, unlike in the conversation with Michel-Villarreal et al. [5], ChatGPT has not mentioned plagiarism as part of the broader issue of academic integrity. It has also omitted personalised learning and communication/collaboration problems as possible challenges for AI use in Central Asia. This could be explained by AI's understanding of regional differences in education and teaching, or by differences in conversational style, prompts used, etc., during the interview.

Given the particular focus of this research on Central Asia, added to the aforementioned challenges, AI model reflected on challenges that are more specific to the region. According to ChatGPT, the outreach of the AI tools and its accessibility to a broader cohort of students could lead to a potential and, as argued by ChatGPT, “unintentional” digital divide between urban/rural, economically and technically advanced/disadvantaged users in Central Asia.

“Even though I am widely accessible online, my use depends on stable internet connectivity, reliable devices (often smartphones rather than laptops), and sometimes paid subscriptions for advanced features. In parts of Central Asia, these conditions are uneven. This means I can unintentionally reproduce or widen inequalities, where more urban or economically advantaged students benefit more from me than rural or less-resourced peers” (ChatGPT, 5th of May, 2026).

English language ‘supremacy’ and Western models of academic conduct were identified as more specific barriers that institutions and students in Central Asia might encounter when working with AI. ChatGPT admits that since it “*performs best in English*”, it may push students “*toward English-mediated academic thinking*” whilst marginalising “*local epistemologies and ways of expressing knowledge*” (ChatGPT, May 5, 2026). Local languages might be less supported by AI tools, as well as local and contextually sensitive knowledge.

This concern resonates with broader debates on algorithmic bias. Gichoya et al. [12] found that AI bias in healthcare operates across multiple stages of algorithmic development, reflecting broader structural inequalities. Since many AI datasets are predominantly generated from limited geographical and socio-cultural contexts, they often reproduce partial or generalised forms of knowledge. ChatGPT similarly recognised this limitation, noting that it may “*generalise too much, miss local institutional realities and rely on Global North frameworks when interpreting Central Asian contexts*” (ChatGPT, May 5, 2026).

Barriers

Added to these challenges, ChatGPT also reflected on potential barriers to AI adoption in higher education across Central Asia. These included technological inequalities in access to AI tools, language barriers associated with the dominance of English-language models, the absence of rigorous institutional policies governing AI use, and low levels of AI literacy among both students and staff. While some of these barriers have been identified in earlier research [5], others remain underexplored, especially in the context of Central Asia. For instance, ChatGPT suggested that the adoption of AI may encounter resistance within Soviet-style educational traditions and pedagogical practices, which are often characterised by hierarchical structures and more conventional approaches to teaching and learning.

“Many Central Asian higher education systems still retain elements of teacher-centred instruction, memorisation and reproduction-based assessment, hierarchical classroom relations.

My design, however, encourages dialogue, iterative questioning, exploratory learning. This mismatch can lead to uneven pedagogical integration, where I am used in ways that do not fully align with either traditional or “AI-enhanced” learning models” (ChatGPT, 5th of May, 2026).

ChatGPT has also pointed to the uneven access to AI models between urban and rural students, as well as between better-funded universities and peripheral institutions. Since the adoption of AI technologies requires more advanced technological infrastructure and robust connectivity [5], therefore, resource-rich universities can benefit more from the use of AI. This could lead to varying degrees of AI adoption and use in Central Asia, benefiting some while disadvantaging others.

Interestingly, ChatGPT, in this research, has not addressed the issue of ethical use and privacy concerns. Michel-Villarreal et al. [5] found that a wide range of issues, including data privacy, algorithmic bias, and the authenticity of student work, could affect AI adoption in higher education.

Opportunities

Despite the challenges that can arise from using AI in higher education, growing evidence shows that generative AI tools can offer opportunities for both teaching and learning [5, 12–14]. Some studies show that generative AI models such as ChatGPT can assist researchers and teachers in brainstorming ideas [14], facilitating personalised learning [13, 14], enhancing teaching practices [13], and improving the writing and communication of knowledge and information [5, 15].

The findings of this paper are broadly consistent with those of previous studies [5, 13, 14]. In addition, ChatGPT highlighted its role in supporting a multilingual environment, which is characteristic of Central Asia. Central Asia is highly multiethnic and multilingual, featuring many languages along with the titular languages such as Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Tajik, Turkmen and Uzbek [16]. ChatGPT argues that it *“can support multilingual learning environments,”* assisting with *“translation, paraphrasing, and explanation across these languages, helping students engage with global academic content even if their English proficiency is still developing. At the same time, I can help lecturers adapt materials into more accessible linguistic forms”* (ChatGPT, 5th of May, 2026). Similar findings were found in Chan & Hu (1) work, who argue that text-to-text AI generators can provide valuable writing support for students, particularly for those who are non-native English speakers.

Within the particular context of Central Asia, where access to the latest technological and research breakthroughs are somehow limited in the titular languages, ChatGPT sees the role of generative AI as a bridging infrastructure, which through access to *“global knowledge system”* can *“expose users to perspectives, terminology, and debates that may not be fully represented in local curricula. This can support the internationalisation of higher education in the region”* (ChatGPT, 5th of May, 2026).

Ways forward

This paper, along with other emerging work on AI use in higher education, shows growing interest in generative AI, spurred by the rapid rise and popularisation of ChatGPT. Some studies raise concerns over the use of generative AI, especially for academic integrity [3, 17], while others see it as a transformative resource with the potential to revolutionise the way education is delivered and experienced [15, 18, 19]. While there is still much to unpack about the impact of generative AI on teaching and learning, one thing is certain: generative AI have come to stay. As such, embracing its possibilities while ensuring its responsible and ethical use in teaching, learning and research becomes critically important. According to ChatGPT, institutions of Higher Education in Central Asia should neither ban generative AI nor blindly accept it. From the generative AI perspective, it is important to create an environment where AI *“becomes a managed part of the learning process rather than an uncontrolled external force”* (ChatGPT, 5th of May, 2026).

'Managing' generative AI in education includes developing and adopting clear AI policies, guidelines, and best practices to ensure the responsible and ethical use of AI [4, 5, 17, 19]. Redesigning the assessment is another way to manage AI models in Higher Education. ChatGPT admits that *"detection tools are unreliable, including ChatGPT"* (ChatGPT, 5th of May, 2026). Thus, instead of focusing on detection, it is worth developing new and innovative ways of assessment which encourage student engagement through in-class assessments or supervised tasks along with tasks that require *"local context, personal reflection, or data interpretation that cannot be easily outsourced"* (ChatGPT, 5th of May, 2026). Increasing AI literacy among students and staff is another way to engage responsibly and ethically with AI. Zhai [19] argues that AI systems, due to their complexity, require significant resources and expertise to develop and maintain, making them challenging for staff and educators. This can be a challenge for universities and educators who may not have the necessary resources or expertise to implement and use AI effectively. Educating staff and students includes, among other things, increasing awareness of AI limitations and critical engagement with generative AI outputs. ChatGPT argues that it is essential that students and staff learn how *"to question AI outputs, compare AI responses with academic resources and identify bias, simplification, or missing context"* (ChatGPT, 5th of May, 2026).

Considering the contextual specificities of Central Asia, ChatGPT further emphasised the importance of contextually tailored approaches, including the *"promotion of multilingual and locally grounded AI practices"* (ChatGPT, May 5, 2026). Such measures involve supporting the use of local and Russian languages, as well as developing historically and contextually sensitive assessment tasks that engage with local knowledge systems and regional realities. Additionally, in the Central Asian region, integrating AI systems requires addressing infrastructural gaps and inequality. According to ChatGPT, AI adoption should include *"ensuring campus access to AI-enabled resources, providing institutional accounts or shared infrastructure where feasible, and avoiding assessment designs that assume constant high-level connectivity"* (ChatGPT, May 5, 2026). Regional cooperation and knowledge sharing are encouraged, argues ChatGPT, since many challenges are shared across Central Asian countries. These include *"development of regional guidelines or frameworks on AI in higher education, shared training programs for faculty development, and collaboration between universities on curriculum adaptation"* (ChatGPT, May 5, 2026).

Conclusion

According to OpenAI, approximately 2.5 billion prompts are submitted daily, while 43% of U.S. knowledge workers report using AI for work-related tasks. These figures are likely to increase further as the capabilities and possibilities of generative AI continue to expand. Considering the growing interest and demand for generative AI in Higher Education across Central Asia, this paper aimed to explore the possibilities and limitations of AI use and adoption in higher education in the region from the perspective of LLM. Engaging in a thing ethnography, it explored ChatGPT's responses on the use of AI and its integration in higher education. ChatGPT's perspectives are generally consistent with some earlier works on AI in higher education with exceptions for some regionally tailored insights. In its responses, ChatGPT framed generative AI as creating opportunities for teaching and learning in Central Asian higher education, while also highlighting the limitations and risks associated with its use. In particular, the responses highlighted the potential implications of English-language dominance and the epistemological influence of the Global North, within which many AI models are developed and trained. As ChatGPT itself mentioned, AI-generated responses may *"default to globally dominant frameworks"* (ChatGPT, May 5, 2026), potentially privileging dominant forms of knowledge over locally and culturally specific educational practices. Further empirical research is necessary to explore how the opportunities, limitations, and challenges identified in ChatGPT's responses are experienced and negotiated in practice across diverse Central Asian higher education settings. Studies involving students, academic staff, and professionals from various universities and institutional contexts could help determine whether the opportunities and restrictions outlined by ChatGPT are reflected in real-world situations, and how these may

differ across countries, institutions, disciplines, and modes of education, including face-to-face, distance, and online learning. The analysis of ChatGPT's responses also indicates that the opportunities and challenges associated with AI are highly context-dependent, emphasizing the significance of local institutional realities and regional knowledge systems in discussions about AI in higher education. This paper thus contributes to understanding how a generative AI system captures and portrays the regional particularities of AI in Central Asian higher education, while offering insights that can guide future research, educational practices, and policy development.

This paper is not without its limitations. First, as argued by Montenegro-Rueda et al., a thing ethnography is also subject to limitations inherent to ethnographic research. Similar to Montenegro-Rueda et al., this research has interviewed only ChatGPT, without engaging with other available chatbots. It has also interviewed ChatGPT only once, overlooking the dynamic and evolving nature of generative AI. According to Jarrahi, AI systems may change over time and, as a result, produce different outputs and behaviours at different times. Thus, this paper the findings presented in this paper should be understood as context- and time-specific rather than fixed or universally reproducible. Another limitation of this paper lies in a singular scenario used for the interview. Jarrahi argues that by engaging the AI in different roles for the same questions, researchers might observe how the system adapts its outputs across various contexts.

Future research could address these limitations by adopting a thing ethnography approach across a broader range of generative AI systems. It could also incorporate repeated and longitudinal interactions with chatbots in order to better capture the evolving nature of AI-generated responses and behavioural patterns over time. In addition, future studies might experiment with different interview scenarios by prompting AI systems to respond from particular positionalities, such as those of a student, educator, or policy expert. Such an approach could provide further insight into how AI systems generate context-dependent outputs and adapt their responses according to assigned roles and interactional settings.

REFERENCES:

- 1 Chan C.K.Y., Hu W. (2023). Students' voices on generative AI: Perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, vol. 20, article 43. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8>
- 2 Imran M., Almusharraf N. (2023). Analyzing the role of ChatGPT as a writing assistant at higher education level: A systematic review of the literature. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, vol. 15, no. 4, article ep464. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/13605>
- 3 Dehouche N. (2021). Plagiarism in the age of massive generative pre-trained transformers (GPT-3). *Ethics in Science and Environmental Politics*, vol. 21, pp. 17–23. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3354/esep00195>
- 4 Baidoo-Anu D., Owusu Ansah L. (2023). Education in the Era of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI): Understanding the Potential Benefits of ChatGPT in Promoting Teaching and Learning. *Journal of AI*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 52–62. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.61969/jai.1337500>
- 5 Michel-Villarreal R., Vilalta-Perdomo E., Salinas-Navarro D.E., Thierry-Aguilera R., Gerardou F.S. (2023). Challenges and opportunities of generative AI for higher education as explained by ChatGPT. *Education Sciences*, vol. 13, no. 9, article 856. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13090856>
- 6 Jarrahi M.H. (2025). Interviewing AI: Using qualitative methods to explore and capture machines' characteristics and behaviors. *Big Data & Society*, vol. 12, no. 3, article 20539517251381697. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517251381697>
- 7 Giaccardi E., Speed C., Cila N., Caldwell M. (2016). Things as co-ethnographers: Implications of a thing perspective for design and anthropology. In: Smith R.C., Tang Vangkilde K., Gislev Kjærsgaard M., Otto T., Halse J., Binder T. (eds.). *Design Anthropological Futures*. London: Bloomsbury, pp. 235–248. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781474280617.ch-015>
- 8 Jalali M.S., Akhavan A. (2024). Integrating AI language models in qualitative research: Replicating interview data analysis with ChatGPT. *System Dynamics Review*, vol. 40, no. 3, article e1772. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/sdr.1772>
- 9 Wuttke A., Aßenmacher M., Klamm C., Lang M.M., Würschinger Q., Kreuter F. (2025). AI conversational interviewing: Transforming surveys with LLMs as adaptive interviewers. In: *Proceedings of the 9th Joint SIGHUM Workshop on Computational Linguistics for Cultural Heritage, Social Sciences, Humanities and Literature (LaTeCH-CLfL 2025)*, pp. 179–204. Albuquerque, New Mexico: Association for Computational Linguistics. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2025.latechclfl-1.17>

- 10 Braun V., Clarke V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 77–101. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>
- 11 Palaganas E.C., Sanchez M.C., Molintas M.V.P., Caricativo R.D. (2017). Reflexivity in qualitative research: A journey of learning. *Qualitative Research Journal*.
- 12 Gichoya J.W., Thomas K., Celi L.A., Safdar N., Banerjee I., Banja J.D., Seyyed-Kalantari L., Trivedi H., Purkayastha S. (2023). AI pitfalls and what not to do: Mitigating bias in AI. *The British Journal of Radiology*, vol. 96, no. 1150, article 20230023. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1259/bjr.20230023>
- 13 Farrokhnia M., Banihashem S.K., Noroozi O., Wals A. (2024). A SWOT analysis of ChatGPT: Implications for educational practice and research. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, vol. 61, no. 3, pp. 460–474. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2195846>
- 14 Sok S., Heng K. (2023). ChatGPT for education and research: A review of benefits and risks.
- 15 Lim W.M., Gunasekara A., Pallant J.L., Pallant J.I., Pechenkina E. (2023). Generative AI and the future of education: Ragnarök or reformation? A paradoxical perspective from management educators. *The International Journal of Management Education*, vol. 21, no. 2, article 100790. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100790>
- 16 Bahroy S.A. (2016). Language ecology: Understanding Central Asian multilingualism. In: Ahn E.S., Smagulova J. (eds.). *Language Change in Central Asia*, pp. 11–32. De Gruyter. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781614514534-006>
- 17 Montenegro-Rueda M., Fernández-Cerero J., Fernández-Batanero J.M., López-Meneses E. (2023). Impact of the implementation of ChatGPT in education: A systematic review. *Computers*, vol. 12, no. 8, article 153. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/computers12080153>
- 18 Saaida M.B.E. (2023). AI-driven transformations in higher education: Opportunities and challenges.
- 19 Zhai X. (2022). ChatGPT user experience: Implications for education. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4312418>

ОРТАЛЫҚ АЗИЯДАҒЫ ЖОҒАРЫ БІЛІМ БЕРУДЕГІ ГЕНЕРАТИВТІ ЖАСАНДЫ ИНТЕЛЛЕКТ: CHATGPT НЕГІЗІНДЕГІ ТҰЖЫРЫМДАР.

S. Kamenova

Мельбурн университеті, Австралия, Мельбурн қ.
*e-mail: saltanat.kamenova@gmail.com

Аңдатпа. Генеративті жасанды интеллекттің (ЖИ), әсіресе ChatGPT сияқты ірі тілдік модельдердің қарқынды пайда болуы мен дамуы бүкіл әлемдегі жоғары білім беру жүйесін өзгертуде. Алайда генеративті ЖИ-дің ықпалы біркелкі емес және әртүрлі аймақтарда әртүрлі көрінеді. Бұл мақалада генеративті ЖИ құралдарын зерттеген алдыңғы еңбектерде қолданылған thing ethnography тәсілі негізінде Орталық Азиядағы жоғары білім беру жүйесі үшін ЖИ ұсынаатын мүмкіндіктер мен қиындықтарды түсінуге бағытталған зерттеу ұсынылады. Аймақтың контекстік ерекшеліктеріне назар аудара отырып, мақала генеративті ЖИ-дің Орталық Азиядағы жоғары білім беру жүйесіне әсерін кеңістіктік тұрғыдан қарастырады. Зерттеу генеративті ЖИ жүйесімен жүргізілген сұхбатқа сүйеніп, ChatGPT-тің білім беру контекстіндегі әлеуетті артықшылықтары мен шектеулерін ЖИ-дің өзі қалай сипаттайтынын талдайды. Бұл тәсіл ЖИ жүйелерінің жоғары білімдегі өз ролін қалай түсіндіретіні және мұндай түсініктердің болашақта білім беру саласындағы ЖИ қолдану бағыттарына қалай әсер етуі мүмкін екендігі туралы ерекше түсініктер береді. Осылайша, мақала ЖИ технологияларының қолданыстағы білім беру жүйелерімен өзара әрекеттесуіне қатысты маңызды сұрақтарды көтеріп, олардың Ғаламдық Солтүстік пен Ғаламдық Оңтүстіктегі жоғары білім беру жүйелері арасындағы және ішіндегі теңсіз дамуды күшейтуі мүмкін екенін көрсетеді.

Кілт сөздер: генеративті ЖИ, ChatGPT, жоғары білім, Орталық Азия, қиындықтар, кедергілер, мүмкіндіктер.

ГЕНЕРАТИВНЫЙ ИСКУССТВЕННЫЙ ИНТЕЛЛЕКТ В ВЫСШЕМ ОБРАЗОВАНИИ ЦЕНТРАЛЬНОЙ АЗИИ: ВЫВОДЫ НА ОСНОВЕ CHATGPT

S. Kamenova

Мельбурнский университет, Австралия, г. Мельбурн

*e-mail: saltanat.kamenova@gmail.com

Аннотация. Стремительное появление и развитие генеративного искусственного интеллекта (ИИ), в частности больших языковых моделей, таких как ChatGPT, трансформирует систему высшего образования во всем мире. Однако влияние генеративного ИИ распределяется неравномерно и варьируется в зависимости от стран и регионов. В данной статье представлено исследование, использующее подход «этнография вещей», применявшийся в предыдущих исследованиях инструментов генеративного ИИ, направленных на исследование вызовов и возможностей, которые ИИ представляет для высшего образования в Центральной Азии. Фокусируясь на региональной специфике, данная статья предлагает пространственный взгляд на влияние генеративного ИИ на систему высшего образования Центральной Азии. Исследование основано на интервью с системой генеративного ИИ и рассматривает то, как сама система описывает потенциальные преимущества и ограничения ChatGPT в образовательном контексте. Такой подход позволяет получить уникальные представления о том, как ИИ-системы сами артикулируют свою роль в высшем образовании и каким образом подобные представления могут влиять на будущую траекторию использования ИИ в образовательном секторе. Тем самым данная статья поднимает важные вопросы о том, как технологии ИИ взаимодействуют с существующими образовательными системами, потенциально усиливая неравномерность развития между и внутри систем высшего образования Глобального Севера и Глобального Юга.

Ключевые слова: генеративный ИИ, ChatGPT, высшее образование, Центральная Азия, вызовы, барьеры, возможности.

Information about author:

Kamenova Saltanat – PhD, University of Melbourne (Australia, Melbourne, e-mail: saltanat.kamenova@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://doi.org/0009-0006-9361-6024>).

Автор турали мәлімет:

Kamenova Saltanat – PhD, Мельбурн университеті (Австралия, Мельбурн қ., e-mail: saltanat.kamenova@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://doi.org/0009-0006-9361-6024>).

Сведения об авторе:

Kamenova Saltanat – PhD, Мельбурнский университет (Мельбурн, г. Австралия, e-mail: saltanat.kamenova@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-9361-6024>).