Review of: "Cultural and Regional Influences on Global AI Apprehension"

Eugene Kelly[1]

1 New York Institute of Technology, United States

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Review of "Cultural and Regional Influences on Global AI Apprehension"

The value of this paper consists in its collection and analysis of papers discussing AI in various parts of the world. It seeks to provide readers concerned with the implementation of AI with materials from other cultures and nations. The author wants to fill a gap in the literature about the possibilities and dangers endemic to this relatively new technology, for he believes that the literature on it is overwhelmingly Western in its perspectives. That is, I would think, inevitable, insofar as the greater amount of research has been done until recently in the Western world. No doubt if Western lands are developing AI, they will develop it for the culture of which they are a part. If they wish to sell AI to foreign cultures, they will do market research to determine what AI functions are desired by the culture that they are delivering it to, and those cultures may demand AI functions that are best suited to them. The difficulty in such transcultural exchanges is, of course, the barriers that are erected by language. This paper contains a bibliography of many papers published in the English language that are written by members of the foreign cultures who may desire the implementation of AI at home and wish to make known what needs and constraints are posed by the governance policies in their culture. Failure to consider those differences may cost AI producers some customers,

A few questions for the author:

On the second page (counting from the Introduction), in the first full paragraph, the author writes that Tjilen et al. claim that "in regions with limited digital literacy and access to technology there tends to be more fear and doubt surrounding AI." Can you tell how that fear and doubt was measured and what forms it took in distinct cultures? Is there a correlation between digital literacy and the fears and doubts about AI, and, if so, what is its nature?

Same paragraph: "AI governance strategies should take into consideration cultural variations and local contexts." Who is conducting the governance in various nations/cultures? Do they have more power over governance than the native governments that may be implementing AI?

Page 3, at the top of the page: "… algorithmic systems can encode and reinforce biases in the data used …" This seems to be a problem in the Western world and most likely in the foreign cultures that develop their own AI systems. What is the source of this problem, and what can be done about it?

Page 3, in the section titled Methodology: The paper could begin here, for this section describes the real value of that

which follows it: the bibliography of papers on AI in diverse cultures. It could begin with an opening statement that establishes the point and force of what is to follow: AI should be developed and implemented only with knowledge of the needs and beliefs of the cultural entities it will serve, and that such knowledge is available in the articles cited, even if only in part.

Page 3, in the Conclusion. I am left wondering about the institutional and political forms to be taken by the "worldwide conversation on artificial intelligence." No doubt the implementation and governance of AI in different nations and cultures will be conducted by the members of those nations and cultures and not by a transcultural entity dominated by the West. It is nonetheless imperative for each of those entities to be aware of how AI is governed and implemented, and to what ends, within and beyond its own borders. This transcultural concern is where the strength of this paper lies.