ISSN: 2583-7354

International Journal of Emerging Knowledge Studies

Publisher's Home Page: https://www.ijeks.com/

Fully Open Access Research Paper

Pedagogy in the Data Economy: A Discursive Study of AI and Myopic Memories

Elham Hossain[1*]

Associate Professor of English, Green University of Bangladesh, Bangladesh.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.70333/ijeks-05-02-025

*Corresponding Author: elhamhossaindcc@gmail.com

Article Info: - Received : 08 February 2026 **Accepted** : 25 March 2026 **Published** : 30 March 2026

Abstract

Mode of economy is capable of shifting the paradigm of the teaching-learning process, and it keeps changing continuously since the inception of human civilization, and it receives unprecedented speed and impetus with the advent of industrialization. To ensure and invigorate its widespread hegemony and competitive survival, not through coercion, but through consensus, it assumes neoliberal disposition under the pretext of democratization of economy and equal distribution of resources. With the wake of data technology in the first few decades of the 21st century, economy has been ramified into gig economy or data economy which is surely a progeny of neoliberal economic thoroughfares, of the same content but a different container, In the same vein, AI turns into a paradox and assumes a dubious role in the space between whether it is good or bad; a dangerously potential binary, as creating a post-world, detached from past, present and future in terms of its capacity to construct challenging human agency. This paper will seek to show, on the basis of textual data, how data economy in disguise of neoliberalism promotes myopia in historicity and generates a specific kind of discourse which challenges human agency and subjectivity by stereotyping pedagogy. It will borrow theoretical framework from Jean Baudrillard, a French sociologist, philosopher and theorist, and a few other recent-day thinkers in this field to pursue the research objective.

Keywords: *AI, pedagogy, historical myopia, paradox, data economy.*

1. Introduction

If watched through praxiologist lens, it is found that humans are intertwined with nonhumans, and thus creates a posthuman or more specifically transhuman world conspicuously challenging ethico-onto-epistemological conditions which usually define humans to a great extent. With the formidable advent of AI, overall endeavor to define humans becomes rhizomatic, and it is, by degree, becoming increasingly difficult to have control over "educated subject and educational process, which means the experiences and events will always be different from what was planned beforehand" **(Sousa and Pessoa, 2023, p. 198)**. Autonomy, under such circumstances, of both the parties, that

is, teachers and learners, is melting down to a complex condition which provoke a pressing question: What does it mean to be human? Paradigm shift of economy, consequential outcome of historical myopia in association with humans' increasing dependence on AI brings this question to our sight more than ever, as many assume AI as a tool of neo colonizing or imperializing the Global South.

True, mode of economy gives shapes to not only ethical issues, but also political, academic, ethnographic and even aesthetic issues. In the present days, data turns into such a powerful resource as it is able to transform the learners into data subjects, closely affecting learning management system, their behavioral and cognitive processes. Academic writing, curriculum designing and even policy analysis are, to a great extent, done by AI tools. Use of AI tools in pedagogy seems to be unavoidable for the learners' inescapable dependence on algorithmic contents of pedagogy. But, on the other side, it challenges the learners' efficiency, personalization, autonomy, privacy, and critical thinking, and finally threatens agency. The most crucial aspect of data is that it customizes pedagogy and confines the whole learning process within a limited framework, and by doing so, it creates myopia, a mental tendency to focus narrowly on short-term, immediate, or surface-level information. It hinders reasoning process, long-term consequences, broader context, or systemic effects. Under such circumstances, it is apprehended by the researcher that data economy assumes an innovative mode of neo-liberal economic framework which is, under the subterfuge of promoting open market policy creating sheer compartmentalization among the learners, and though universalizing to a large extent, it is, to a great extent, too, creating economic blocks with unequal amount of amenities, and thus diving the world into two unequal halves with lots of varied units with varied degree of econimic and social dynamics. In this way, it is ensuring the status of the First World countries as manufacturer and the Third World countries as consumer. This paper will pursue the research question- how is data economy, by creating historic myopia and customizing pedagogy, challenging human agency and what should humans do on the face of such threat?

2. Literature Review

Human civilization continues to go ahead as long as it continues generating new ideas and thoughts, and it is true that "To create new thinking we need new methods" **(Daigle, 2023, p. 233)**. The complexities generated by man-AI collaboration in the pedagogy which possesses the capacity to transform the world are unavoidably creating a posthuman world. In this connection, Jean Baudrillard rightly identifies the present world in the following words: When I speak of time, it is not yet / When I speak of place,/it has disappeared./When I speak of a man,/he's already dead./When I speak of time/is already no more. (2009. p. 9)

The world of 21st century is a world where humanity and all other relevant ingredients that construct and control life are defined and re-defined in a different way. Actually, data-centric technologies that dominate the field are fundamentally narrow (excelling at particular tasks), not general (in the manner of human intelligence). Data-centric technologies are creating a world lacking sentience, emotion, sympathy and even empathy. Even imagination and common sense turn secondary, and only problem-solving skills are targeted to be developed. Technology sharpens knowledge but knowledge about truth is feeble. Postmodern situation in association with technological outburst has split up it and argues that truth is a chameleon-like concept and it keeps changing with the change of context, environment and time. That is, truth is both spatial and temporal, not universal. Roland Barthes declares the death of the author in his seminal essay "The Death of the Author". He argues "... the birth of the reader must be ransomed by the death of the Author" **(Barthes, 1967, p. 148)**. French philosopher Paul Virilio reveals with anxiety in the first decade of this century that we all are assaulted but the attacker is invisible; he is always behind the curtain. In his words:

> *The anonymity of those who initiated the attack merely signals for everyone, the rise of a global covert state of the unknown quantity of a private criminality- that beyond Good and Evil which has for centuries been the dream of the high priests of an iconoclastic progress* **(Ground Zero: Verso, London, p. 82)**.

Tapadhir Bhattacharya, Ex-Vice Chancellor of Asam University, in his essay, "Kritrim Buddhimotta: Protisondorbher Prostabona (Artificial Intelligence: A Proposal for Counter-thesis)" argues that in the era of AI, human beings are living in the world of 'life in death' as all the traditional values and ethical issues are undergoing a disastrous experience about which the world was never prepared before. Bhattacharya questions, "Are we heading towards prosperity or making arrangement to destroy our own 'self'? At present human beings are the inhabitants of the counter-society, counter-world and they are living not with truth, but counter-truth; not reality but counter reality. The tapestry of such counter-world is so complicated that humans cannot see even if they have eyes; they cannot hear even if they have ears; they cannot think even if they have mind. The wonder that is raised among the viewers by the aesthetic oeuvre of Michel Angelo, Vinci, Rafael is brutally dissected and made fastidious by the AI. Virtual reality has taken the place of the physical reality. Slavoj Zizek, a Marxist and Lacanian thinker writes that virtual reality "provides reality itself deprived of its substances" **(1996, p. 290)**. This reality is based on speed, and speed disrupts the thought process. Jean Baudrillard, in this connection, argues:

> *... speed is the triumph of the effect over cause, the triumph of instantaneity over time as depth, the triumph of the surface and pure objectivity over the profundity of desire. Speed creates a space of initiation, which may be lethal, its only rule is to leave no trace behind. Triumph of forgetting over memory, an uncultivated, amnesic intoxication.* **(1988, p. 6)**

In the present world where AI is also taking up the role of an apparatus of economically and intellectually imperializing the world, which is enough now in the age of cyber technology, even fiction, poetry, rhymes, science fictions turn into a lullaby of hibernation, though only two decades ago they were widely revered as a potent repository of the memories of a nation or community of people.

It is reported that Stephen A. Schwarzman, a multibillionaire and ally of Donald Trump has funded research center at MIT and Oxford University that purport to ensure that AI will complement rather than replace human beings. Thus, it is exemplified that even the First world is anxious about the unbridled proliferation of AI, which has the potential to lead humans to an unpremeditated world. But the question which haunts the present world is– can AI really render educated human beings superfluous? The answer to this question is not plain but it may be assumed that AI can unpredictably foment inequality, concentrate power, or harm biological life. But the concern is about those whose interests are served when our conversations endanger technological determinism and the dynamics of the future. True, the world today requires "an educated citizenry; ready to advance racial justice, develop green technologies, enforce anti-trust legislation, enact collective bargaining rights, regulate the gig economy, monitor global supply chains, and enable individuals to control the use of their data" **(*Forum*, 2024, p. 317).**

Even in the case of sociological, aesthetics and literary compositions, it is thought that AI will very soon be able to write screen plays deemed better than human writing. But then what will be the role of human screenplay writer? Will he be turned into a 'Stochastic parrot'? It is, in this connection, a metaphorical term coined by linguist Emily M. Bender and her colleagues to describe large Language Models (LLMs) that usually generate text based on statistical patterns from vast data sets. This term highlights the concern that these models may produce fluent but nonsensical, biased, or harmful outputs because they lack conceptual consistency. AI has the capacity to produce huge number of texts on the basis of quintillions of data in its store but it does not have any concern about the meaning. Hence, dependence on AI in producing creative work like fiction, drama or other literary genres, can transform its user into a stochastic parrot, a man whose vast quantity of work lacking the comprehensibility of the meanings and implications of it. In such situations it creates environmental and ethical biases.

If considered from the perspectives of power dynamics, then AI is capable of serving democracy, inclusion of diversity, and environmental sustainability. But in the capitalist and corporate economic framework, democratization of AI means encouraging businesses and consumer-oriented market to adopt new products in exchange for data and fees. Open AI is not sufficiently open as it has now commercialized GPT3 through an exclusive license

with Microsoft. During the recent Covid 19 pandemic, tech companies and investors might dream of replacing schools, colleges and even universities with CD-ROMS, MOOCs, google meet, microsoft teams and zoom. If all these means of technology succeed, it is apprehended that it will create a generation of superfluous human beings, a generation of stochastic parrots, devoid of deep knowledge and problem solving capacity through Socratean argumentations. If it really happens, it will be so not because of technology, but because of the failure of democracy, a political policy of distributing resources among all equally. Compartmentalization as well as segmentation of economy does not conspicuously guaranty democratic environment for all. True, data-economy is a recent but all-pervading phenomenon which is working now and facilitating only a specific chunk of people who can afford to buy data, while the majority living in the rural backdrop does not have as much access into the store of data as the chosen few, and thus, it creates compartmentalizing the society.

Actually, vulnerability of democracy emanates from the implementation of neo-liberal politics, and it is true that "The political policies of neo-liberalism have reduced the capacity of individuals and groups to reflect on and change the social world, meanwhile applications of AI and algorithmic technologies, rooted in the profit-seeking objectives of global capitalism, deepen this deficit" **(Pilkington, 2024, p. 1).** Neo-liberal policies re-structure the society on the basis of being an individual consumer, and consequently, it leaves little time, space and institutional capacity for the citizens to reflect on their impact, or challenge their dominance. AI and algorithmic technologies are shaping human engagement with society along the line of individualism and thus, reducing man's potential and rendering it myopic, a kind of short-sighted historicity fragile enough to define the users in terms of the millennium old past and the far reaching future leading to symmetrical outputs.

In the same vein, humans use AI for creating dialectical reasoning, argumentative memories and understanding. To AI humans are shere data and not more than that, not flesh and blood with decision-making capacity. On the other hand, humans also use AI tool to solve their problem algorithmically. This superficially reciprocal exchange process creates a memory loop and, in this loop, both components are conditioned by the capitalist framework of economy. This spiral loop alienates humans farther from their own memory, a repository of his own history and heritage that define his identity. AI which ostensibly seems to be all-seeing, all knowing, conspicuously inspires us to solve the problem only, not to think of the problem. Many people think and feel satisfied with the assumption that AI's support in solving problem is very relishing as it at best helps solve problem. This kind of assumption is a progeny of the cognitive process shaped by neo-liberal mode of economy which claims open market policy though instigates discrimination by leading the society with diverse communities with diverse finacial capacities to unequal competition. It is just like a helpless enunciation while surrendering agency to the scarcity of the potential of extensive exploration of the axiomatic though paradoxical paradigm, that something is better than nothing. It can be understood as a myopic memory. It happens "where the scope for agency in our lives is supplanted by one of a utility that is often technocratic and highly politicized **(Pilkingtom, 2024, p. 2).**

Obviously, it is an age of data commodity and both individual and collective memory is constructed as well as reconstructed by neo-liberal policies. Data community is constructed algorithmically and it is accepted, rather than mediated. Capitalism put limitations on human agency to ask and to pronounce why and how questions. It tends to distort how humans see themselves and their surrounding world, and thus alienates them from their legacy and thus, dehumanizes them. Many in the field of AI apprehend that "with the hypothetical risk of a 'super intelligent' AI going rogue and threatening humanity" **(Pilkington, 2024, p. 4).** It is apprehended because neoliberal memory is mostly fragmented and individual and such state is congenial to the alienation of the world community.

In this connection, Chang and Lee very rightly detect that "inherent addiction in adolescents results in a decreased capacity to process semantic memories, encode memories, and plan using the working memory **(2024, p. 1).** These researchers further mention that internet negatively impacts the young people's thought process, memory and meanwhile society continues

to spiral towards myopy, alienating its citizens increasingly farther and farther from meaning, truth, authenticity, and control. Besides, it is unrefusable that neoliberal society is increasingly structured on the basis that algorithms serve a hegemonic world view which hinders the users against the consideration of discrimination between consumer choice and collective control. Even art and literature which commonly throbs in impulses, is drastically embraced by the ambivalence or debates whether AI generated poetry or arts is creative or not. In this connection, **Christopher Norris (2024)** claims "… 'AI' thus becomes the default repository of everything that must, on this view, be regarded as derivative from, or parasitical upon, technologies that embodied a certain kind- and which therefore cannot be termed 'creative' in a more than nugatory sense" (p. 61). Norris argues that AI works as per the instructions of various qualified and gifted human beings, though it works within the trajectory decided by the quintillions of data in its store. If an individual asks AI to compose a ballad or a sonnet for him on the basis of themes previously supplied with some keywords, then it generates the same as per demands or commands. With sufficient details and instructions, it can generate piece of literature which is obviously "a product of all the inputs, resources, database trawling, and directive ingenuity invested in the project by variously qualified and gifted human beings" **(Norris, 2024, p. 62).** In consequence of the evolutionary disposition of AI, it is now a matter of anxiety for the educators at every level of coursework assessment from school to university and beyond. The question which triggers this anxiety is – has an individual actually himself, without AI assistance thought up or written up this piece of poetry or fiction? AI is very responsive and it can receive the instructor's commands along with his experience, and accordingly re-organize it in the algorithmic territory. While searching for authenticity and agency of AI, an ethical question comes to mind that Norris raises, "Did the critic approach those semantic complexities as giving us access to a mind in the process of creation, that is, a poet with all her thoughts, feelings, experiences, mind- states, and (crucially) intensions? (p. 65) The answer to this question goes – AI may already, or might very soon, be within the gates of human intelligence and creativity" **(Norris, 2024, p. 65).** But AI performs a competent job of producing rhymed and metrical verse, and of composing – not creating. It is a formalist job but because of its rapid evolving capabilities and adaptive capacity it will, in course of time, be attuned to poet's mindset and inventiveness. But, as **Norris (2024)** remarks, "At any rate, the thing is here and likely to stay around as long as our civilization lasts, so poets had best start figuring how best to respond" **(p. 75).** Here lies the question of agency which may work collaboratively with AI, not throwing its autonomy to ashtray.

But Andrew **Hoskins (2023)** rightly mentions that AI is a multifaceted battleground for literature as it encompasses ethical challenges around copyright and originality, economic shifts in the publishing industry, chronic debate whether AI accommodates or replaces human creativity. Hoskins also argues that the entanglements between humans and machines both enable and endanger human agency in making, unmaking and remaking of individual and collective memory. **Hoskins (2023)** further mentions, "The Advent of Open AI, ChatGPT, **Chatbot in 2022**, and the recent rapid development and accessibility of AI and related technologies and services, heralds a new battleground between humans and computers in the shaping of reality" **(Hoskins, 2023, p. 1).** True, battle, in some cases is good as it emanates from debate, resistance and counter discourse. Humans can sustain their agency by posing counter discourse and collaborating, not uncritically surrendering their thought process to technology.

True, in consideration of all pervading use of AI almost in all sectors of modern life, man and AI stand face to face, not side by side, especially in the question of `agency'. In comparison, other technologies depend on man's autonomy. A car, for example, does not start working unless and until a human driver starts its engine. Even a computer does not initiate its programme unless and until it receives any command or instruction from a human operator, and remarkably it works within the limit decided by its operator. But AI keeps working autonomously. It is because of the development of machine learning, AI assumes both constructive, though not conspicuously creative, and generative role. In this connection, William Uricchio sounds very relevant when he claims:

> *... developments in machine learning have enabled algorithms to self-optimize and generate their own improvements. They can now self-author and self-create. This greatly complicates notions of authorship, agency and even algorithms' status as tools, which imply an end user.* **(2017, p. 127)**

AI with quintillions of data can work by itself algorithmically and it does not depend on human operator for its generative and transformative activism. Human authorship or agency does have no role in its consistent job of data rearranging and reorganizing. The paradigm of inherent authorship and also categories of authorship is challenged by AI in the traditional assessment system or inherent predictability which usually personalize authorship, being dehumanized by algorithms.

Again, pervasiveness of generative AI in the form of Chatbots is utterly transforming the current and future relationship between humans, technologies, and the past, forging a new AI memory ecology. Chatbot can now respond to human enquiries and engage in conversation, and it is no more a marvel but a reality. Memory is the storehouse of the past which is reconstructed in the present by AI. AI has untethered human past from the present. It encodes that past which never existed before and the future which will never exist. It sounds paradoxical but it is true because AI does not essentially retrieve memory; it rather generates memories, past, present and the future by permutating and combining data already at its store. This construction is a dialogic process and this dialogue goes not eternally between the past and the future, and in this connection, smartphone as "both connective and computational, as both portal and achieves/continuously scaffolds our lives and memories" **(Hoskins, 2024, p. 3).** It can even, through apps and services, enable the living to 'speak' with the dead, including in the creations of a Chatbot of an individual. It can even remake human's memories beyond the grave.

Then, in such a crucial situation, inevitably the question emerges– how should Humans treat AI? True, AI has been symbiotically interwoven with the present world and in academia it has already started working as a very crucial and also inevitable pedagogical tool. Under such circumstances, it is not a timely stance to evade AI. Humans should rather collaborate, not alienate it to assess their relationship with it, and in this interactive process, probably a new literacy is to be developed, which is capable of assessing various data forms and they should put an essential question, how "they are deployed and developed a critical sense of their limits, capacities, implications, and possibilities" **(Uricchio, 2017, p. 137).** It is undenying, as **Noah Harari (2024)** claims that every new technology solves some old problems and at the same time creates some new ones. To fight back all these new problems human agency must be retained by any means, in whatever ways and for whatever purpose humans use AI. Uncritical compliance to AI hegemony may lead humans to neo-imperialized network.

3. Methodology

This research is mostly based on textual data collected from the sources, such as books, articles and interviews of the experts in the relevant field ranging from 1977 to 2024, the researcher's experience, though it has been put into this paper objectively, not subjectively, and as such, it is basically qualitative research aiming at finding out how pedagogy goes through changes in the backdrop of data economy and transforms the generations into subjects without agency if AI is let to exercise its hegemony upon the learners' thought process uncritically. This qualitative research adopts a critical discourse analysis process to examine how AI-mediated pedagogical practices are framed in the data economy-framework. Drawing on critical pedagogy, media theory, and memory studies, this paper analyzes policy and theory texts, institutional narratives, and cultural discourses surrounding the role and usage of AI in the teaching-learning process. The methodology foregrounds discourse as a site where pedagogical values, memory practices, and power relations are negotiated, revealing how data-driven systems promote myopic forms of memory and the cognitive process.

4. Finding and Discussion

AI based pedagogy reinforces epistemic conformity which tells upon the proliferation of creative faculty of the learners. The most apprehensive outcome of AI based pedagogy is that it promotes customized cognition and assessment process. Besides, pedagogy within the data economy thus privileges immediacy, efficiency, and algorithmic foresight over the

cultivation of durable knowledge and intellectual autonomy, and thus, it transforms as well as turns knowledge monolithic and promotes monoculturalism and monolingualism which is conflicting with the existing motto of the education system required for creating more durable, sustainable and productive knowledge. Hosting different disciplines is inevitable for patronizing intellectual discourse among languages and cultures "as ecological diversity is important for healthy plant and animal growth, cultural diversity is important for a healthy and robust social life" **(Thiong'o, 2025, p. 40).** It is true that AI contributes outstandingly to brainstorming and organizing scattered ideas, and thus, reducing the invested time and consequently increasing the mass of intellectual property. But as it works mathematically on algorithms, it has in its store, it tells upon the humanization process of thoughts and ideas it generates.

Actually, AI redefines human memory and epistemic capacity which characterize humans. If viewed philosophically, humans live in memories that they hierarchically inherit from their predecessors. Past guides the present and the past is enlivened by the present. Humans negotiate with both the past and the present, and construct their identity. But the past and the present that AI brings before the users are merely a construction on the basis of quintillions of data it has in its store. As a result, uncritical compliance to AI in the pedagogical process involves a possible apprehension of the distortion of identity and the certain loss of autonomy.

Further, AI involves a huge network of monetary activities framed in the model of neoliberal economic system which outwardly promotes democratization of economic enterprises by advocating the participation of all and sundry in the economic activities. But the fatal aspect of this system is that it compartmentalizes the society by creating unequal competitive environment and providing the privileged class with more opportunities to exploit the less privileged class of the society in various ways as it is mostly driven by the capitalist impetus of privatizing public institutions and withdrawing government support. In fact, by promoting privatization of the public property, it discourages the government to control market, and thus the capitalists become the beneficiary of the data economy. If viewed closely, then it is found that data economy facilitates a few organizations of the global North, such as Microsoft, Google, Facebook and a few others while the majority are being transformed into mere consumers, and Geoffrey Hinton, popularly called the grandfather of AI, apprehends that AI tool, though personalizes pedagogy and tailors lessons for the convenience of both teachers and learners, will create unemployability in future. If there is truly an apprehension, then it is time a new way of collaboration between human teachers-learners and AI. Unless and until a strong and impartial regulatory body can be formed, the benefit of data economy and AI will not be equally distributed among the people. If ensured, then the pedagogy can generate human resources with problem solving capacity, employability and decision making agency.

5. Conclusion

This paper concludes with some recommendations needed to fight back the pitfalls associated with AI. As AI is mostly used to save time because of its amazing speed in solving problem, sufficient quantity of time should be taken to deploy this tool in problem solving activities. Traditional pedagogy which is mostly remarkable for dialectic dispassion must not be totally annihilated; it should rather be modified and collaboratively used with AI, and in this way AI can play the role of a Socratean partner who creates an argumentative environment. One final thing that cannot be skipped that humans cannot give up changes; they should rather adopt the changes for speed and productivity with accuracy. So, AI must be accommodated in the existing pedagogical process critically, not uncritically with a view to attaining more productivity and speed. But speed has the potential to cause disruption to the thought process. Aligning speed with cognition is a great challenge to the AI users. But humans cannot but keep pace with the present world, because it is undeniable that they are, because of the changing power dynamics and economic realities, local and at the same time global; that is, glocality and internationality embrace humans inescapably, and in such reality AI turns into a symbiotic ingredient of humans, and on the whole, it is undenying that the prospect of AI in pedagogy depends on how potentially it creates employability. Finally, the researcher assumes that this open-ended research will inspire the

successive researchers to delve deeper into the relevant field.

References

Barthes, R. (1977). Image-music-text. Fontana Press.

Baudrillard, J. (1988). America. Verso.

Baudrillard, J. (2009). Why hasn't everything already disappeared? Seagull Books.

Chang, M. L. Y., & Lee, I. O. (2024). Functional connectivity changes in the brain of adolescents with internet addiction: A systematic literature review of imaging studies. *PLOS Mental Health, 1*(1), Article e000022. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmen.0000022

Daigle, C. (2023). Posthumanism and postdisciplinarity: Breaking our old teaching and research habits. In C. Daigle & M. Hayler (Eds.), Posthumanism in practice (pp. 227–240). Bloomsbury Academic.

Forum. (2021). PMLA, 136(3), 317–319. https://doi.org/10.1632/S0030812921000079

Harari, Yuval Noah (2024). Nexus: A Brief History of Information Networks from the Stone Age to AI. Penguin Random House.

Hoskins, A. (2024). AI and memory. Memory, Mind & Media, 3, e18, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1017/mem.2023.18

Norris, C. (2024). Poetry, philosophy and smart AI. SubStance, 53(1), 60–76. https://doi.org/10.1353/sub.2024.a924142

Pilkington, D. (2024). Myopic memory: Capitalism's new continuity in the age of AI. Memory, Mind & Media, 3, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1017/mem.2024.21

Sousa, L. P. de Q., & Pessoa, R. R. (2023). Reflections on a language teacher education praxis from a posthumanist viewpoint. In C. Daigle & M. Hayler (Eds.), Posthumanism in practice (pp. 198–211). Bloomsbury Academic.

Thiong'o, N. w. (2025). Decolonizing language and other revolutionary ideas. The New Press.

Uricchio, W. (2017). The datafied society. Amsterdam University Press.

Žižek, S. (1996). From virtual reality to the virtualization of reality. In T. Druckrey (Ed.), Electronic culture: Technology and visual representation (pp. 290–295). Aperture.

Cite this article as: Elham Hossain., (2026). Pedagogy in the Data Economy: A Discursive Study of AI and Myopic Memories. International Journal of Emerging Knowledge Studies. 5(3), pp. 357–364. https://doi.org/10.70333/ijeks-05-02-025