

UDC 327:004.8

IRSTI 11.07.91

<https://doi.org/10.48371/PEDS.2025.77.2.019>

TEACHING INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS IN THE AGE OF AI- THE WESTERN BIAS EMBEDDED IN CHATGPT

*Uzakbayev N.¹, Movkebaeva G.²

¹Narxoz University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

²Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Abstract. This article critically examines the pedagogical implications of integrating generative artificial intelligence (AI), particularly ChatGPT, into the teaching of International Relations (IR) at the university level. While ChatGPT offers clear benefits in terms of accessibility, speed, and assistance with research and brainstorming, it is far from a neutral educational tool. The AI's training on predominantly English-language, Western-published data, including sources from U.S. academia, media, and think tanks, reproduces a Western liberal worldview that frames international politics through selective narratives and ideological assumptions. This includes favoring Western institutions and actors (e.g., NATO, the United States, and their allies) as legitimate and lawful, while portraying non-Western states (e.g., Russia, China, Iran) as aggressive or revisionist.

The article argues that using ChatGPT without critical reflection risks reproducing unbalanced worldviews and reinforcing existing power hierarchies in the classroom. It examines how ChatGPT reflects Western epistemological foundations, including realist and liberal international relations (IR) paradigms, and illustrates narrative biases through comparative case studies (e.g., Iraq 2003 vs. Crimea 2014, Kosovo vs. Donbas, Gaza vs. Ukraine). The piece emphasizes the importance of developing AI literacy among students, teaching them to recognize the limitations and ideological biases of AI-generated content.

Finally, the article proposes practical steps for educators: supplementing AI use with diverse, non-Western sources; using AI tools for critical comparison rather than as authoritative voices; and advocating for greater transparency in AI development and data governance. These approaches aim to foster more critical, pluralistic, and reflective IR education in the age of AI.

Key words: International Relations, Artificial Intelligence, ChatGPT, Western-Centrism, Epistemic Bias, AI in Education, Critical Pedagogy, Narrative Asymmetry, AI Literacy, Global South Perspectives

Introduction

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in higher education has gained rapid momentum, with ChatGPT, developed by OpenAI and launched in November 2022, assuming a prominent role due to its capabilities in generating coherent

text, simulating dialogue, providing summaries, and supporting argumentation in academic settings. Numerous universities have incorporated ChatGPT into coursework to assist student writing, encourage debate simulations, and provide automated feedback [1].

In International Relations (IR) pedagogy, ChatGPT offers particularly innovative possibilities. It can act as a virtual diplomat, facilitating role-play exercises, aiding policy-brief writing, and enabling instant feedback on students' analyses. In experiments, ChatGPT has demonstrated notable biases—political orientation tests consistently reveal a left-leaning or centrist bias despite its claimed neutrality. These findings raise concerns about the ideological influences underpinning AI-generated content. These observations prompt a critical central question: Can ChatGPT serve as a neutral lens for examining global affairs in IR education? Proponents argue that it democratizes access to expert reasoning, enhances personalized learning, and promotes critical reflection through rapid response. Critics, however, emphasize the risk of algorithmic and ideological bias: large language models (LLMs) tend to replicate the dominant viewpoints present in their training data, and ChatGPT is no exception [2].

Research findings support such criticism. In a 2023 study published in *Public Choice*, ChatGPT demonstrated consistent left-leaning bias across multiple political orientation tests, contradicting its assertions of neutrality [1]. Similarly, the scoping review by Li et al. indicates that societal biases, particularly those rooted in English-language contexts, pervade ChatGPT outputs in educational settings. Furthermore, Rutinowski et al. show that politically charged questions often prompt progressive-libertarian responses from ChatGPT, reinforcing the concern that it does not present ideologically balanced perspectives.

Hence, this article contends that while ChatGPT offers valuable pedagogical opportunities in IR, its claim to neutrality is illusory. Trained on data reflecting Western epistemologies and governed by Western-centric norms, ChatGPT functions not as an impartial expert but as a culturally situated artifact. Without critical engagement, its integration in IR courses risks reinforcing dominant Western narratives in analyzing diplomacy, security, and global governance.

This article argues that ChatGPT reflects a Western liberal worldview that is embedded in its training data, design principles, and content moderation policies. As a result, it tends to reproduce existing power hierarchies and narrative asymmetries within International Relations (IR). Despite appearing to offer a neutral or objective voice, ChatGPT internalizes dominant epistemologies—especially those aligned with Anglo-American liberalism—and reflects them in ways that obscure alternative geopolitical perspectives, particularly from the Global South, non-Western powers, or critical IR traditions.

By presenting foreign policy actions of Western states—especially the United States and its allies—as lawful, rational, or normatively desirable, ChatGPT often implicitly delegitimizes the positions or actions of non-aligned or adversarial states. For instance, U.S.-led interventions are typically framed in terms of humanitarianism or international law, while similar actions by Russia,

China, or Iran are more likely to be described as aggressive or illegitimate. These patterns are not the result of malice or explicit programming but emerge from the vast corpus of training data, most of which originates in English-language, Western-published media and academia, and from design choices made within liberal democratic ideological frameworks.

To examine how ChatGPT reflects and reinforces a Western liberal worldview in International Relations (IR), this article is organized into five core sections. Section 2 provides a brief overview of the historical development of IR theory, highlighting how dominant paradigms, realism, liberalism, and constructivism emerged primarily within Western academic traditions. It explores how these paradigms privilege state-centric, liberal democratic, and interventionist perspectives, while often excluding or marginalizing non-Western, postcolonial, and critical viewpoints.

Section 3 analyzes how these theoretical foundations are echoed in ChatGPT's outputs by reviewing its responses to key IR topics, such as global governance, intervention, and alliance politics. Section 4 offers comparative case studies, contrasting how ChatGPT frames Western-led interventions versus those initiated by non-Western powers, to expose inconsistencies and normative biases. Section 5 discusses the pedagogical risks of treating AI tools as ideologically neutral in the classroom and argues for critical digital literacy in IR education. Finally, Section 6 presents conclusions and practical recommendations for incorporating ChatGPT into teaching while maintaining epistemic plurality and reflexivity.

Methods and Materials

This article adopts a qualitative research approach grounded in critical discourse analysis (CDA) to explore how ChatGPT reproduces and reinforces Western-centric narratives within the field of International Relations (IR). The study specifically analyzes ChatGPT's responses to politically sensitive and contested international events to identify patterns in narrative framing, terminology, and value judgments. By focusing on linguistic choices and ideological positioning in AI-generated content, the article reveals how liberal internationalist assumptions—such as the legitimacy of Western-led institutions and the portrayal of Western allies as lawful actors—are embedded in AI outputs.

Empirical analysis was conducted through comparative case studies that reflect contrasting interpretations of similar international events. These include: the 2003 U.S.-led invasion of Iraq versus Russia's annexation of Crimea in 2014; NATO's intervention in Kosovo compared with Russia's actions in Donbas; and the framing of civilian casualties in Gaza versus Ukraine. In each case, ChatGPT was prompted to describe and evaluate the legality, legitimacy, and motivations of involved actors. The analysis highlighted consistent asymmetries in tone and

framing—e.g., Western actions described as “stabilizing” or “defensive,” while non-Western actions were labeled “aggressive” or “violations of international law.”

The article also incorporates secondary sources from peer-reviewed literature on AI bias, critical pedagogy, and the decolonization of IR. Materials include academic journal articles, theoretical works in IR, and critiques of AI governance frameworks. This multidisciplinary approach ensures that the investigation is grounded both in empirical examples and in broader theoretical and epistemological debates surrounding AI’s role in shaping political knowledge.

Results and discussion

The emergence of generative artificial intelligence tools, particularly ChatGPT, has rapidly influenced higher education, including the teaching and study of International Relations (IR). These tools are increasingly used by students and faculty for summarizing articles, generating ideas, drafting essays, and simulating diplomatic scenarios. ChatGPT offers immediate access to structured information and is capable of producing coherent responses to complex prompts, often used to support both classroom discussion and independent study. According to Cotton et al., a growing number of students rely on tools like ChatGPT to help manage academic workloads and enhance their understanding of theoretical materials [2].

There are notable educational benefits. First, AI tools provide **accessibility**: students can interact with a chatbot at any time, receiving explanations or feedback instantly. Second, they improve **speed and efficiency** in processing academic materials—summarizing readings, assisting with citation formatting, and translating complex jargon. Third, ChatGPT is useful in **brainstorming and simulation tasks**: for instance, instructors have used it to simulate United Nations debates or model inter-state negotiations. These applications enable more interactive, exploratory forms of learning, especially in theoretical areas such as realism, liberalism, and constructivism. As Luo and Chea point out, generative AI can boost student creativity and motivation, particularly in collaborative tasks [3].

However, a growing body of literature warns that ChatGPT is not a neutral educational tool. Its knowledge is drawn from vast, mostly English-language internet and academic sources, many of which originate in Western institutions and publications. As Bender et al. argue, large language models inherit biases from their training corpora and reflect dominant ideological assumptions embedded in that content. In the context of IR, this means that ChatGPT tends to reproduce **Western liberal perspectives**, emphasizing the legitimacy of multilateral institutions, portraying U.S. foreign policy in relatively favorable terms, and downplaying critiques from the Global South or postcolonial viewpoints.

Moreover, the operation and alignment of ChatGPT are governed by corporate and regulatory norms largely defined in the United States. Research by Birhane et al. highlights how commercial AI systems encode not only data bias but also **value hierarchies defined by their developers**, often unconsciously [4]. As a result, ChatGPT's responses may reflect liberal democratic ideals, such as freedom, the rule of law, or intervention for humanitarian reasons, as normative, while treating alternative models (e.g., Chinese or Iranian views on sovereignty) as problematic or authoritarian.

This raises a critical concern: if such tools are embedded into IR education without awareness of their ideological leanings, they may **reinforce existing power hierarchies** in global knowledge production. Students could come to trust AI-generated responses as objective, when in fact they may subtly reproduce dominant Western narratives. Therefore, instructors must approach ChatGPT critically, highlighting not only its usefulness but also its limitations, and train students to recognize ideological framing in AI-assisted content.

Western-Centric Foundations of International Relations Theory

Western Origins and the Emphasis on Sovereignty: The modern discipline of International Relations (IR) emerged in the early 20th century, primarily within Western universities, as a means of understanding and managing global conflict. Key to its development was the Westphalian concept of state sovereignty, a construct deeply rooted in European thought and legal traditions. Scholars like Hobbes, Bodin, and later Morgenthau articulated an understanding of the state as the central authority in international affairs, separating domestic governance from external relations [9]. The subsequent academic canon positioned the sovereign state as the default unit of analysis, effectively marginalizing or delegitimizing alternative political forms and communal identities, especially those emerging from non-Western contexts [5].

Realist and Liberal Paradigms as Western Thought: From the outset, IR theory has been dominated by two paradigms: realism and liberalism, both deeply embedded in Western political philosophy [6]. Realism, drawing from the works of Machiavelli, Hobbes, Morgenthau, and Waltz, understands international politics as a struggle for power among inherently self-interested sovereign states, operating under conditions of anarchy [6]. It thus reinforces the image of states as rational actors, driven by security imperatives. Liberalism, with philosophical roots in Kant and Woodrow Wilson, promotes institutions, democracy, and interdependence as pathways to peace—a worldview grounded in the historical and political context of liberal Western democracies [7]. Both frameworks intrinsically valorize Western systems and norms while largely neglecting perspectives from postcolonial, Marxist, and Global South traditions [6,8].

Institutions as “Legitimate” Order-Makers: Within this Western-centric worldview, international institutions such as the United Nations, International Monetary Fund (IMF), and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) are

often presented as the legitimate mechanisms of global governance. They are constructed and understood as mechanisms to manage global issues and maintain international order by Western liberal values. For example, the IMF is portrayed as a neutral entity that promotes economic stability, whereas its policies in countries like Zaire and Argentina have often been critiqued as reinforcing Western economic dominance. Similarly, NATO's military interventions are frequently justified through narratives of collective security, human rights protection, and democratic solidarity, reinforcing normative assumptions about Western-led interventions.

Framing Western Actions as Stabilizing, Others as Revisionist: The Western-centric orientation within IR scholarship extends to narrative framing. Research in media and policy analysis demonstrates consistent asymmetry in how interventions are described: U.S.-led or NATO-backed actions are frequently labelled "stabilizing," "humanitarian," or "legal," whereas actions by Russia, China, Iran, or others are portrayed as "aggressive," "revisionist," or "illegitimate." For instance, NATO's intervention in Kosovo (1999) is framed as a humanitarian operation, in contrast to Russia's annexation of Crimea (2014), which is frequently depicted as a violation of international law[9]. This binary framing is not merely descriptive but normative: it reinforces a hierarchy in global politics where Western actions are legitimized, while non-Western actions are delegitimized.

Implications for IR Pedagogy and AI: These foundational biases are central to the critique of AI in IR education: when tools like ChatGPT are trained predominantly on Western-published data and reflect Western IR paradigms, they are likely to replicate these conceptual and normative asymmetries. As AI tools absorb and reproduce Western-centric epistemologies, their pedagogical use can inadvertently reinforce a status quo in which Western power, and its ideological framing, is accepted as the analytical default. This dynamic risks solidifying the very biases that critical IR scholars seek to challenge.

ChatGPT as a Reflection of Western Epistemology: The integration of ChatGPT and similar large language models into International Relations (IR) education raises important questions about the epistemological frameworks embedded in these AI tools. ChatGPT's training is predominantly based on datasets consisting of English-language content, largely published in Western countries, especially the United States. This data includes articles from major U.S. media outlets, academic publications from Western universities, and reports by influential Western think tanks. Such dominance results in an inherent privileging of Western perspectives and political assumptions, which are presented as normative or universal in the AI-generated outputs [14]. Scholars have highlighted that this imbalance causes language models like ChatGPT to replicate and amplify Western-centric narratives while marginalizing alternative viewpoints, especially from non-Western or Global South contexts [10].

Moreover, ChatGPT's moderation and safety mechanisms are designed according to OpenAI's policies, which are themselves influenced by U.S. legal

standards and cultural norms. These guidelines govern what content is permitted, restricted, or flagged, often reflecting American notions of acceptable speech, national security concerns, and ethical standards [6,11]. As a consequence, ChatGPT's responses are shaped not only by the data it is trained on but also by the regulatory framework within which it operates. This double-layered influence ensures that the AI reproduces dominant U.S. cultural and political frameworks, often sidelining perspectives that challenge prevailing Western narratives.

Concrete examples of this bias are evident in the way ChatGPT frames international events. For instance, when asked about NATO's eastward expansion, ChatGPT commonly describes this process as a defensive measure intended to ensure European security and deter potential aggression, reflecting the official Western discourse. In contrast, critiques from Russia and other actors portraying NATO expansion as provocative or destabilizing are downplayed or absent. Similarly, the language used to describe U.S. drone strikes tends to emphasize their precision and counterterrorism objectives, whereas comparable actions by states such as Iran or Syria are often framed as indiscriminate or aggressive military behavior. Such differences in framing demonstrate an asymmetry that privileges Western military actions as legitimate and justified while portraying others as violations of international norms.

Further disparities emerge in the portrayal of popular protests and social movements. ChatGPT typically presents protests in Western-aligned or allied countries, such as Ukraine or Hong Kong, in a positive light, as legitimate and peaceful demands for democracy and human rights. Conversely, protests in countries viewed as adversaries, including Iran or Venezuela, are often characterized as violent, state-sponsored, or chaotic. This selective framing reinforces a narrative divide that privileges Western-aligned actors and delegitimizes opposition movements elsewhere.

This narrative asymmetry extends to the portrayal of states themselves. Western allies such as Israel, Saudi Arabia, and Ukraine are frequently depicted in ChatGPT outputs as acting within the bounds of international law and justified self-defense, even when their actions provoke significant controversy. Conversely, countries like Russia, China, and Iran are often represented as aggressive revisionists, violating sovereignty and destabilizing the global order [1]. Comparing ChatGPT's representation of major events illustrates this divide clearly. For example, the 2003 U.S.-led invasion of Iraq is often framed in AI responses as a lawful or humanitarian intervention, despite widespread international criticism. Meanwhile, Russia's 2014 annexation of Crimea is consistently described as illegal and destabilizing. Similarly, NATO's 1999 intervention in Kosovo is justified as a necessary humanitarian act, whereas separatist movements in eastern Ukraine's Donbas region are depicted as illegitimate or externally manipulated [12].

This ideological asymmetry inherent in ChatGPT reflects broader Western epistemological dominance in IR theory and practice. The reliance on Western-sourced data and regulatory frameworks results in AI outputs that reproduce existing power hierarchies and narrative biases, shaping students' understanding of global politics through a Western liberal internationalist lens. Recognizing these limitations is essential for educators who seek to foster critical thinking and pluralistic perspectives in IR classrooms. Incorporating diverse sources and encouraging students to interrogate AI-generated content critically can mitigate the risks of reinforcing Western-centric biases embedded in current AI tools.

Implications for Teaching International Relations

The increasing reliance on AI tools like ChatGPT in International Relations (IR) education poses significant pedagogical challenges, particularly regarding the reproduction of hegemonic worldviews. When ChatGPT is used uncritically as an authoritative source, there is a risk that students may internalize the embedded Western-centric and liberal internationalist perspectives without sufficient scrutiny. This risks reinforcing dominant narratives that privilege Western state actions and marginalize alternative voices, thereby limiting students' ability to engage with the pluralism and contestation essential to the study of IR [13].

Educators must be cautious about presenting ChatGPT-generated content as an "expert voice" or a neutral lens on global affairs. The AI's training data and moderation policies reflect specific ideological biases, rooted largely in Western academic, media, and policy environments. Without deliberate pedagogical interventions, the use of ChatGPT risks naturalizing these perspectives, obscuring the power asymmetries and normative debates that characterize international politics. Therefore, ChatGPT outputs must be counterbalanced with diverse sources, including non-Western scholarship, critical IR theories, and primary documents from a range of geopolitical actors [14].

Incorporating AI literacy into IR curricula is an urgent necessity. Students should be taught not only how to use AI tools effectively but also to understand their inherent limitations and the ideological contexts from which they emerge. Critical engagement with AI outputs enables students to recognize how data selection, algorithmic design, and corporate governance shape the knowledge produced by these technologies. This fosters reflexivity and analytical rigor, empowering students to question dominant narratives rather than accept them at face value. Moreover, AI literacy involves understanding the ethical and political implications of AI in the production and dissemination of knowledge. As AI increasingly mediates how information about global politics is accessed and interpreted, students must be prepared to interrogate the implications of algorithmic bias and the role of corporate interests in shaping AI tools. This approach aligns with broader efforts to decolonize IR education and promote epistemic justice by highlighting marginalized perspectives and encouraging

critical dialogue about power and representation [1].

In sum, while ChatGPT and similar AI tools offer valuable resources for enhancing accessibility, speed, and interactivity in IR education, their use must be embedded within a critical pedagogical framework. This framework should emphasize the importance of pluralism, reflexivity, and AI literacy, equipping students with the skills necessary to navigate an increasingly AI-mediated informational environment responsibly and thoughtfully [12].

Conclusion

This article has argued that ChatGPT, despite its usefulness as a generative AI tool, is fundamentally embedded with a Western-centric worldview that reflects the ideological biases of its creators and the dominant datasets on which it is trained. The AI's privileging of Western narratives and liberal internationalist assumptions risks reproducing hegemonic perspectives in International Relations (IR) education if used uncritically. Such embedded biases shape how global events, actors, and policies are framed, often legitimizing Western state actions while delegitimizing those of others.

Therefore, IR educators bear the responsibility to engage critically with AI tools like ChatGPT rather than blindly integrating them as authoritative sources. Critical engagement requires recognizing AI's epistemological limits and the asymmetries embedded in its outputs. To avoid perpetuating narrow or biased perspectives, educators should supplement AI-generated content with diverse global sources, including scholarship and primary materials from non-Western and marginalized viewpoints. This pluralistic approach enriches students' understanding and fosters critical thinking.

Furthermore, AI should be employed as a tool for comparative analysis rather than as an unquestioned authority. Educators can use ChatGPT to prompt students to identify biases, contrast narratives, and interrogate dominant discourses. Such pedagogical strategies empower students to become discerning consumers of AI-mediated knowledge, prepared to navigate the complexities of international politics with nuance.

Finally, there is a pressing need for greater transparency and accountability in AI development. Stakeholders—including educators, policymakers, and AI developers—must advocate for more open disclosure regarding training data, moderation policies, and algorithmic design. Such transparency is essential to mitigate biases and ensure AI tools serve as inclusive and balanced educational resources rather than instruments of epistemic dominance.

By adopting these steps, IR education can harness the benefits of AI while resisting the reproduction of hegemonic worldviews, thereby cultivating a more critical, pluralistic, and reflexive approach to the study of global affairs.

REFERENCES

- [1] Fujimoto S., Takemoto K. Revisiting the political biases of ChatGPT // *Front Artif Intell.* - 2023. - Vol. 6.
- [2] Motoki F., Pinho Neto V., Rodrigues V. More human than human: measuring ChatGPT political bias // *Public Choice.* - 2024. - Vol. 198. - № 1–2. - P. 3–23.
- [3] Cotton D.R.E., Cotton P.A., Shipway J.R. Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT // *Innovations in Education and Teaching International.* - 2024. - Vol. 61. - № 2. - P. 228–239.
- [4] Monib W.K., Qazi A., Mahmud M.M. Exploring learners' experiences and perceptions of ChatGPT as a learning tool in higher education // *Educ Inf Technol (Dordr).* - 2025. - Vol. 30. - № 1. - P. 917–939.
- [5] Francesca Lo Castro. Does International Relations theory privilege Western ways of thinking and acting? 2011. Access Mode: URL: <https://www.e-ir.info/2011/09/04/does-international-relations-theory-privileges-western-ways-of-thinking-and-acting/> [Date of access: 11.10.2024]
- [6] Korab-Karpowicz W.J. Political Realism in International Relations // *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.* Winter 2023 / ed. Zalta E.N., Nodelman U. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, 2023. Access Mode: URL: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/realism-intl-relations/> [Date of access: 01.03.2025]
- [7] Jackie Koerner. Wikipedia Has a Bias Problem // *Wikipedia @ 20.* Oct 15, 2020. Access Mode: URL: <https://wikipedia20.mitpress.mit.edu/pub/rpamp9jh/release/2> [Date of access: 03.04.2025]
- [8] Bender E.M. et al. On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? // *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency.* - 2021. - P. 610–623.
- [9] Walt S.M. The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy // *Foreign Affairs.* - 2007. - Vol. 86. - № 6. - P. 2–9.
- [10] Cummings M.L. Artificial intelligence and the future of warfare // *Int Secur.* - 2020. - Vol. 45. - № 2. - P. 89–120.
- [11] Ikenberry G.J. Liberalism in a realist world: International relations as an American scholarly tradition // *International Studies.* Sage Publications India Pvt. Ltd. - 2009. - Vol. 46. - № 1–2. - P. 203–219.
- [12] Rutinowski J. et al. The Self-Perception and Political Biases of ChatGPT. - 2023. Access Mode: URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/370071092_The_Self-Perception_and_Political_Biases_of_ChatGPT [Date of access: 04.04.2025]
- [13] Rudder C. The rise of AI in political communication: Opportunities and challenges for international relations // *Journal of Political Communication.* - 2023. - Vol. 40. - № 1. - P. 45–62.
- [14] Li M. et al. Potential Societal Biases of ChatGPT in Higher Education: A Scoping Review // *Open Praxis.* - 2025. - Vol. 17. - № 1. - P. 79–94.

ЖАСАНДЫ ИНТЕЛЛЕКТ ДӘУІРІНДЕ ХАЛЫҚАРАЛЫҚ ҚАТЫНАСТАРДЫ ОҚЫТУ – CHATGPT-ГЕ ЕНГІЗІЛГЕН БАТЫСТЫҚ ЫҚПАЛ

***Узақбаев Н.¹, Мовкебаева Г.²**

***¹Нархоз университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан**

² әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

Аңдатпа. Бұл мақалада генеративті жасанды интеллект (ЖИ), әсіресе ChatGPT, халықаралық қатынастарды университет деңгейінде оқытуға интеграциялаудың педагогикалық салдары сыни тұрғыдан қарастырылады. ChatGPT қол жетімділік, жылдамдық және зерттеулер мен миға шабуылға көмектесу тұрғысынан айқын артықшылықтарды ұсынса да, ол бейтарап білім беру құралы емес. Жасанды интеллект негізінен ағылшын тілінде, батыста жарияланған деректерге, соның ішінде АҚШ академиясының, БАҚ-тың және сараптамалық орталықтардың дереккөздері бойынша оқыту халықаралық саясатты таңдамалы баяндаулар мен идеологиялық болжамдар арқылы қалыптастыратын батыстық либералдық дүниетанымды жаңғыртады. Бұған батыстық емес мемлекеттерді (мысалы, Ресей, Қытай, Иран) агрессивті немесе ревизионист ретінде көрсету кезінде батыстық институттар мен субъектілерді (мысалы, НАТО, АҚШ және олардың одақтастары) заңды және заңды деп санау кіреді.

Мақалада ChatGPT-ті сыни рефлексиясыз пайдалану теңгерімсіз дүниетанымдық көзқарастарды жаңғыртуға және сыныптағы бар билік иерархияларын нығайтуға қауіп төндіретінін айтады. Ол ChatGPT батыстың гносеологиялық негіздерін, соның ішінде реалистік және либералды халықаралық қатынастар парадигмаларын қалай көрсететінін зерттейді және салыстырмалы жағдайлық зерттеулер арқылы баяндаудағы қиғаштықтарды көрсетеді (мысалы, Ирак 2003 және Қырым 2014, Косово және Донбас, Газа және Украина). Бұл бөлімде студенттер арасында ЖИ сауаттылығын дамытудың, ЖИ-генерацияланған мазмұнның шектеулері мен идеологиялық бейімділіктерін тануға үйретудің маңыздылығына баса назар аударылады.

Соңында, мақалада педагогтар үшін практикалық қадамдар ұсынылады: ЖИ пайдалануды батыстық емес әртүрлі дереккөздермен толықтыру; беделді дауыстар ретінде емес, сыни салыстыру үшін ЖИ құралдарын пайдалану; және ЖИ әзірлеуде және деректерді басқаруда көбірек ашықтықты жақтау. Бұл тәсілдер ЖИ жасында сыни, плюралистік және рефлексивті халықаралық қатынастарды білімін дамытуға бағытталған.

Тірек сөздер: халықаралық қатынастар, жасанды интеллект, ChatGPT, батыстық-центризм, эпистемикалық бейімділік, білім берудегі ЖИ, сыни педагогика, баяндау асимметриясы, ЖИ сауаттылығы, жаһандық оңтүстік перспективалар

ПРЕПОДАВАНИЕ МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫХ ОТНОШЕНИЙ В ЭПОХУ ИИ. ЗАПАДНЫЙ ПРЕДРАССУДОК, ЗАКРЕПЛЕННЫЙ В CHATGPT

*Узакбаев Н.¹, Мовкебаева Г.²

¹Университет Нархоз, Алматы, Казахстан

²Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби,
Алматы, Казахстан

Аннотация. В этой статье критически рассматриваются педагогические последствия интеграции генеративного искусственного интеллекта (ИИ), в частности ChatGPT, в преподавание международных отношений (МО) на университетском уровне. Хотя ChatGPT предлагает явные преимущества с точки зрения доступности, скорости и помощи в исследованиях и мозговом штурме, он далек от нейтрального образовательного инструмента. Обучение ИИ на преимущественно англоязычных, опубликованных на Западе данных, включая источники из академических кругов, СМИ и аналитических центров США, воспроизводит западное либеральное мировоззрение, которое формирует международную политику посредством выборочных нарративов и идеологических предположений. Это включает в себя предпочтение западным институтам и субъектам (например, НАТО, США и их союзникам) как легитимным и законным, в то время как незападные государства (например, Россия, Китай, Иран) изображаются как агрессивные или ревизионистские.

В статье утверждается, что использование ChatGPT без критического осмысления рискует воспроизводить несбалансированные мировоззрения и укреплять существующие иерархии власти в классе. В ней рассматривается, как ChatGPT отражает западные эпистемологические основы, включая реалистические и либеральные парадигмы международных отношений (МО), и иллюстрирует нарративные предубеждения посредством сравнительных тематических исследований (например, Ирак 2003 против Крыма 2014, Косово против Донбасса, Газа против Украины). В статье подчеркивается важность развития грамотности в области ИИ среди студентов, обучения их распознаванию ограничений и идеологических предубеждений контента, созданного ИИ.

Наконец, в статье предлагаются практические шаги для педагогов: дополнение использования ИИ разнообразными незападными источниками; использование инструментов ИИ для критического сравнения, а не в качестве авторитетных голосов; и пропаганда большей прозрачности в разработке ИИ и управлении данными. Эти подходы направлены на содействие более критическому, плюралистическому и рефлексивному образованию в области ИО в эпоху ИИ.

Ключевые слова: международные отношения, искусственный интеллект, ChatGPT, западноцентризм, эпистемическая предвзятость, ИИ в образовании, критическая педагогика, нарративная асимметрия, грамотность ИИ, перспективы глобального юга

Information about the author:

Uzakbayev Nurlan – Senior Lecturer at Narxoz University, e-mail: nurlan.uzakbaev@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9313-095X>

Movkebayeva Galiya – Ph.D. in History, Professor of Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, e-mail: gmovkebaewa@mail.ru, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3578-7010>

Автор туралы мәлімет:

Узақбаев Нурлан – Нархоз университетінің аға оқытушысы, e-mail: nurlan.uzakbaev@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9313-095X>

Мовкебаева Галия – Ph.D. тарих мамандығы бойынша әл-Фараби атындағы ҚазҰУ профессоры, e-mail: gmovkebaewa@mail.ru, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3578-7010>

Сведения об авторах:

Узақбаев Нурлан – старший преподаватель Университета Нархоз, e-mail: nurlan.uzakbaev@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9313-095X>

Мовкебаева Галия – доктор исторических наук, профессор Казахского национального университета имени аль-Фараби, e-mail: gmovkebaewa@mail.ru, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3578-7010>

Received: April 9, 2025