

OF TECHNOLOGY, YEATS AND AUTOMATIC WRITING: MANAGING CULTURAL IDENTITIES IN THE AGE OF AI ETHICS AND BEYOND

Martin Štefl

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14712/2571452X.2025.70.12>

Abstract: Pondering about the esoteric system of *A Vision*, the result of countless revisions of a suspicious, yet irresistibly seductive automatic text, Yeats, half despairing, half enthralled, finally concludes that the whole experience affirms “that all the gains of man come from conflict with the opposite of his true being.” The opaqueness and black-box-like quality of automatic writing, eerily akin to the experience of eliciting a meaningful AI-generated answer, reminds today’s readers of the importance of a question-answer/prompt-response dialectic, so often neglected (especially by students) when faced with the seeming flawlessness and artifice of an AI-generated text. The responsibility to creatively engage with an otherwise ossified text further points towards a similar line of criticism aimed at various reifications and reductions of culture, which, in effect, mask the dynamic, performative character of cultural identities, e.g., by bracketing out an individual’s creativity and responsibility when applying a positivistic, data-based cultural model. Departing from Yeats, a poet of multiple cultural allegiances, AI ethics, and philosophy of technology, this article aims to explore the mutually overlapping yet ever-conflicting ways in which cultural identities are produced in current intercultural theories, hoping to deconstruct currently dominant static models of culture in favour of a dynamic, critical approach to (re-)presenting cultures.

Keywords: intercultural communicative competence, culture, AI ethics, philosophy of technology, W.B. Yeats

“Remember we will deceive you if we can.”¹

W.B. Yeats, *A Vision*

The System

Automatic writing, also referred to as “spirit writing, passive writing, or psychography,”² is typically “produced involuntarily when the subject’s attention is ostensibly directed elsewhere, [... either] in an alert waking state or in a hypnotic trance,”³ and produces texts or visual imagery ranging from “unrelated words, fragments of poetry, epithets, puns, obscenities, or well-organized fantasies.”⁴ As such, automatic writing can be approached from various disciplinary perspectives, including literary and aesthetic theory, history of literature, creative writing, astronomy, and, of course, medical science, psychology, psychiatry, and neuroscience. Yeats started experimenting with automatic writing shortly after his marriage with Georgiana Hyde Lees in late October 1917, eventually conducting approximately 450 sessions of automatic writing during which Georgie’s consciousness seems to have been captured by unknown spiritual entities, ghosts, or – as Yeats himself called them – Communicators. The practice of automatic writing continued at least until the middle of 1921, only to be replaced by other forms of occult communication – e.g., sleep talking, hypnosis, dream visions – with Georgie assuming the role of the medium; these continued until 21 March 1924.⁵ By 1917, Yeats had become well-versed in various occult arts, and it did not take him long to realize the aesthetic potential of the communications: during the seven years of regular seances with assorted spectres and spirits, Yeats recorded well over fifty notebooks of automatic writing.⁶ Most of the recorded material consisted of Yeats’ questions and responses that the spiritual advisors would provide through complacent

¹ William Butler Yeats, *A Vision* (London: Macmillan, 1993), 13. Henceforth quoted in-text as *AV*.

² Jack Rooney, “Words of Healing: The Literature of Automatic Writing as Treatment and Prescription in the Victorian Age,” *Literature and Medicine* 39, no. 1 (2001): 110.

³ The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica, “automatic writing,” *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 20 July 1998, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/automatic-writing>.

⁴ Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica, “automatic writing.”

⁵ See Neil Mann, “A Vision: The Automatic Script,” *The System of W.B. Yeats’s A Vision*, <http://www.yeatsvision.com/AS.html>; George Mills Harper, *The Making of Yeats’s A Vision: A Study of the Automatic Script Vol. 2* (Carbondale and Edwardsville, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1987), 1.

⁶ Yeats’s *A Vision* notebooks and the rest of the script and records are available in George Mills Harper, *Yeats’s Vision Papers Vol. 1-4* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1992-2001).

Georgie. *A Vision* duly records instances of the spiritual communicators announcing themselves through strange acoustic – e.g., the case of a “whistling ghost” (AV 15) and/or olfactory phenomena – “smells [...] that] would form themselves in my pocket or even in the palms of my hands” (AV 15) and regularly complains about their fragmentary, confusing, or even contradictory nature.

Yeats consulted his spiritual guides on any topic, ranging from poetry, philosophy, history, occult matters, but also regarding his private life, and received responses that drew on Yeats’s own poetry and essays, for example, when the “unknown writer took his theme at first from [...] *Per Arnica Silentia Lunae*.” (AV 8) The eerie conversations that, thanks to their customization, remind us of algorithmic recommendation engines, known, e.g., from Netflix or Spotify, that “automatically and mathematically predict, [...] rank, and present your top preferences [...] to] better inform and improve human choice;”⁷ would eventually materialize in what later became known as “the System” of the two editions of Yeats’ arcane magnum opus: *A Vision* (1926 and 1937).

Some one hundred years later, in June 2017, a group of researchers working at Google published a landmark research paper entitled “Attention Is All You Need”⁸ that forever changed the history of AI by introducing the so-called “transformer architecture,” revolutionising “natural language processing and laying the foundation for modern generative AI. The architecture has become the backbone of models such as GPT, BERT, and their successors.”⁹ By February 2023, Chat GPT reached 100,000 users and showed no signs of slowing down,¹⁰ with other large language models (LLMs) such as Claude, Bard (Gemini), Copilot, Grok, or DeepSeek, soon to follow. Besides the omnipresent LLM technologies, AI has become the driving force behind yet another digital technology: the so-called recommendation engines, whose development dramatically accelerated in the aftermath of the 2006 Netflix Prize, which was announced to boost recommender algorithm research. In 2016, Steve Levy published in *Wired* his article “How Google Is Remaking Itself as a ‘Machine Learning First’ Company” that reported on the already ongoing revolution in recommender systems, arguing that at least “since

⁷ Michael Schrage, *Recommendation Engines* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2020), 109.

⁸ Ashish Vaswani et al., “Attention Is All You Need,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.03762 v7* (revised 2 August 2023), <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1706.03762>.

⁹ Ashish Vaswani et al., “Attention Is All You Need: The Paper That Changed AI,” *Hidden Layer*, 6 May 2025, <https://hiddenlayer.tech/papers/attention-is-all-you-need/>.

¹⁰ Shelley Walsh, “History of ChatGPT: A Timeline of Generative AI Chatbots,” *Search Engine Journal*, 11 September 2025, <https://www.searchenginejournal.com/history-of-chatgpt-timeline/488370/>.

2010, machine learning and artificial intelligence algorithms have successfully insinuated themselves as foundational technologies for search and recommendation."¹¹

The communion of the technological and the occult is not new. Arcane stories and myths feature an assortment of golems, mechanical animals, artificial human beings, and other wondrous machines. Exploiting this tradition of techno-occult coupling, I propose to approach automatic writing, as found in Yeats's *A Vision*, as a specific case study in the use of persuasive technology, a "recommendation engine," and to use it as an exploratory framework for discussing the effect of technologies and technological interfaces in the age of Gen-AI.¹²

By interpreting *A Vision* and the emergence of Gen-AI (including AI-powered recommendation engines) as two analogical stages of "sociotechnological evolutions of prophecy, prediction, and advice,"¹³ I aim to explore key topics in philosophy of technology and AI ethics, which are relevant for the ways culture is currently (mis-)presented through Gen-AI and technology in general. On a practical level, this juxtaposition highlights the importance of developing critical awareness of both the product and the process in teaching culture and intercultural communication through Gen-AI (and digital technologies), for instance in the pragmatically oriented fields of business and management studies, which tend to approach culture as a readymade product of static models of culture without reflecting on its technologically mediated origin. By creatively exploiting Yeats as a point of departure,¹⁴ the article will examine the marriage of Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC), as represented by the work of influential practitioners, such as Geert Hofstede and Michael Minkov, whose dimensions-

¹¹ Schrage, *Recommendation Engines*, 109.

¹² For the purpose of this article, I adopt a broad understanding of AI as "the diverse set of technologies that extend not just our capacities to act in the world but also our powers of thought and decision-making. AI may refer to the software involved or to the various hardware devices in which it is embedded [...] often as a component of a larger system;" Paula Boddington, *AI Ethics* (London: Springer, 2023), 3. By the term "Generative AI" (gen-AI) I understand, in this article: "an advanced technological approach that enables the creation of content including text, images, and videos. By analyzing and discerning patterns within extensive training datasets, generative AI can autonomously construct material that shares comparable characteristics to its training input. This capability stems from the AI's understanding of data patterns and its ability to replicate or innovate based on these patterns." "Generative AI," *MIT Sloan Teaching and Learning Technologies*, https://mitsloanedtech.mit.edu/ai/basics/glossary/#Generative_AI.

¹³ Schrage, *Recommendation Engines*, xv.

¹⁴ Despite the similarities, it is beyond the scope of this article to present a detailed new interpretation of *A Vision* and Yeats's poetry in general through the perspective of AI. For more on *A Vision* in its entire context, see <https://www.yeatsvision.com/>.

based models of culture represent the mainstream of teaching ICC in business and management settings. Arguably, these models of culture, along with similar modes proposed, e.g., by Deardorff or Trompenaars, carry, especially when technologically mediated, the risk of both perpetuating a distorted, essentialized, and static vision of both culture and technology, as well as of disburdening the students of culture of any need for meaningful interaction with the intercultural Other. Yeats's critical self-distancing from his own hard-won system in *A Vision* will suggest an alternative to these overly self-assertive models of culture.

Why Start with Yeats?

The link between Yeats's occult communication and today's popular Gen-AI interfaces, such as the ubiquitous Chat GPT, is both obvious and opaque. Besides the rather apparent surface similarities between the process of interpreting an automatic script while prompting a (human) medium on the one hand, and prompting a Gen-AI chatbot on the other, both Yeats's automatic writing and Gen-AI epitomize a specific form of a technologically mediated process. The journey from *A Vision* to Gen-AI can thus be read as stages of "the ongoing multimillennial transition from 'deity-driven' to 'data-driven' recommender systems,"¹⁵ whose purpose is to "transform human choice," promote "confident curiosity," and – not unproblematically – endorse "individual agency."¹⁶ Rather than offering a detailed new reading of *A Vision*, the point of contrasting Yeats's journey of doubt and fascination in this work and the appeal of Gen-AI is to argue that Yeats's constant creative questioning and thematizing of the origin of the opaque or transcendental sources of knowledge characteristic of *A Vision* should be, at least partially, adopted by users of the currently dominant, technologically mediated models of culture. Of relevance will be both Yeats's lifelong belief that "all the gains of man come from conflict with the opposite of his true being" (*AV* 13), but, perhaps more importantly, his constant thematizing of the process of composition of *A Vision* and the process of automatic writing in general. Rather than focusing on a detailed exposition of Yeats's system of *A Vision*, the overall argument of this paper is based precisely on this juxtaposition: Yeats's ultimate critical distance from the hard-won system of *A Vision* ("this moment was to reward me for all my toil;" *AV* 301) is contrasted with the mercurial ease of cognitive offloading and disburdening of Gen-AI, which provides ready-made knowledge while "concealing itself"¹⁷ by its

¹⁵ Schrage, *Recommendation Engines*, 40.

¹⁶ Schrage, *Recommendation Engines*, 8.

¹⁷ Martin Heidegger, *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, trans. William Lovitt (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1977), 22.

origin and the way it was produced.¹⁸ Last but not least, Yeats's own life as an Irish/English poet of "violent ambivalences"¹⁹ and transcultural appropriations will serve as an implicit critique of the current dimension and big data-based models of culture which operate almost exclusively with the idea of national culture.²⁰ The argument will return to Yeats in the concluding section of the article, once the concepts of Intercultural Communicative Competence and its models have been introduced.

Culture in Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC)

The field of ICC combines insights and approaches from disciplines such as anthropology, psychology, linguistics, ethics, and international management. Taking into account various overlapping definitions of both culture and communication, definitions of intercultural communicative competence (ICC) vary from "a combination of one's personal abilities [...] as well as relevant contextual variables"²¹ to "an individual's overall capacity to engage in behaviours and activities that foster cooperative relationships in all types of social and cultural contexts in which culturally or ethnically dissimilar others interface."²² Perhaps the most famous definition of ICC comes from Michael Byram, who defines it simply as "the ability to interact with people from another

¹⁸ See Peter Luba, "Dreams of Language in the Age of AI: On Neganthropoc Linguistic Pragmatism with Emerson, Nietzsche and Stiegler," *Hradec Králové Journal of Anglophone Studies* 11, no. 1-2 (2024): 14-22.

¹⁹ Jahan Ramazani, *A Transnational Poetics* (Chicago, IL, and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2001), 32.

²⁰ One line of criticism of the discussed models focuses on their over-reliance on the national-culture model. Yeats himself was creatively interested in cultures and cultural appropriations – see his cross-cultural poems such as "Lapis Lazuli," the Byzantium poems, or perhaps "An Irish Airman Foresees His Death" – and, given his Anglo-Irish allegiances, he would probably not fit the discussed national models of culture that do not account for cultural hybridity. See Jahan Ramazani, *A Transnational Poetics*, x–xi. See also Ramazani's intercultural reading of Yeats's "Lapis Lazuli" as a "self-interrupting, self-thematizing" poem of cultural appropriation in *Transnational Poetics*, 112.

²¹ Lily Arasaratnam, "Intercultural Competence," *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication*, 3 February 2016, <https://oxfordre.com/communication/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228613-e-68>.

²² Young Yun Kim, "The Identity Factor in Intercultural Competence," in *The SAGE Handbook of Intercultural Competence*, ed. Darla K. Deardorff (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 2009), 62.

country and culture in a foreign language.”²³ The following discussion focuses on one of the existing approaches to ICC that relies heavily on dimensions-based models of culture that gained prominence in business and management studies, a field of professional interest of the author of this paper, and that have been ostensibly criticized both before and after the advent of Gen-AI in early 2023.²⁴

Characteristically, the dimensions-based approach to ICC relies on the “common practice” of extracting “measures of culture from self-reported values, beliefs, ideologies, and self-construals. These measures, called ‘dimensions’, come with country scores.”²⁵ A typical feature of the dimension-based models of culture of theorists such as Michael Byram, Geert Hofstede, Fons Trompenaars, Darla Deardorff, or Michael Minkov, is the tendency to distil culture into a set of relatively stable categories referred to as “cultural dimensions.” As Michael Minkov, currently one of the most militant proponents of this approach to culture, claims: “Fortunately – at least for those who believe in scientific methods – there are many measurable phenomena that can be associated with the notion of culture and measured across human populations: religiousness, educational achievement, suicide rates, or death tolls, to name just a few.”²⁶ These cultural dimensions are in turn used to “explain important differences between modern nations related to business and management practices, political and economic systems, and other societal differences.”²⁷ Consistently with this, Geert Hofstede, whose seminal work includes *Cultures and Organisations* (2010, co-authored with Michael Minkov) and *Culture’s Consequences* (1980, 2001) theorizes culture as “the totality

²³ Michael Byram, *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communication Competence* (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1997), 71.

²⁴ See, e.g., Giulliana Ferri, “Ethical Communication and Intercultural Responsibility: A Philosophical Perspective,” *Language and Intercultural Communication* 14, no. 1 (2014): 7-23; Hild E. Hoff, “A Critical Discussion of Byram’s Model of Intercultural Communicative Competence in the Light of Bildung Theories,” *Intercultural Education* 25, no. 6 (2014): 508-17; Catherine Matsuo, “A Critique of Michael Byram’s Intercultural Communicative Competence Model from the Perspective of Model Type and Conceptualization of Culture,” *Fukuoka University Review of Literature & Humanities* 44 (2012): 347-80; Brendan McSweeney, “A Triumph of Faith – A Failure of Analysis: Hofstede’s Model of National Cultural Differences and Their Consequences,” *Human Relations* 55 (2002): 89-118; Brendan McSweeney, “Dynamic Diversity: Variety and Variation Within Countries,” *Organization Studies* 30 (2009): 933-57.

²⁵ Michael Minkov, “Do Dimensions of Culture Exist Objectively? A Validation of Hofstede’s Model,” *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 53, no. 5 (2022), <https://doi.org/10.1177/00220221221100461>.

²⁶ Michael Minkov, *Cultural Differences in a Globalizing World* (Bingley: Emerald, 2011), 5.

²⁷ Minkov, “Do Dimensions of Culture Exist Objectively?”

of cultures, within a nation,"²⁸ defining it as a "collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from others."²⁹

The narrative that accompanies Hofstede's model of culture represents a case in point as it emerged in the 1970s out of "a large survey database about values and related sentiments of people in over 50 countries around the world" that contained "more than 100,000 questionnaires" filled in by IBM workers." Analysing the data, Hofstede was able to discover "correlations between mean scores of survey items at the level of countries."³⁰ His 6D model of culture, which emerged as a result of ongoing revisions and expansions of the original dataset, consequently allows its users to localize "the relative positions of 76 countries on the six dimensions [...] expressed in a score on a 0-100 point scale."³¹

Although the dimensions of individual authors vary and are subject to occasional revisions and reinterpretations, Hofstede's currently include: the Power Distance Index, Individualism versus Collectivism, Masculinity Versus Femininity, Uncertainty Avoidance Index, Long Term Orientation versus Short Term Normative Orientation, and Indulgence versus Restraint.³² The Trompenaars – Hampden-Turner 7D model, for example, features "five dimensions [that] refer to human relationships (Universalism vs Particularism, Individualism vs Communitarianism, Specific vs Diffuse, Neutral vs Affective, Achievement vs Ascription) augmented by the culture's relationship with time and environment."³³

Of further interest is that although Hofstede in his work theorizes his cultural dimensions as mere constructs and conventions,³⁴ his protégé Michael Minkov has, in a recent article with the self-explanatory title "Do Dimensions of Culture Exist Objectively? A Validation of the Revised Minkov-Hofstede Model of Culture with World Values Survey Items and Scores for 102 Countries," published in the influential *Journal of Intercultural Management* claimed "that the cultural continuum has a structure underpinned by some objectively existing reality."³⁵

²⁸ Geert Hofstede, *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2001), 2.

²⁹ Hofstede, *Consequences*, 3.

³⁰ Geert Hofstede, "Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context," *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture* 2, no. 1 (2011), <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014>.

³¹ "National Culture," *Hofstede Insights*, <https://hi.hofstede-insights.com/national-culture>.

³² "What Is the Hofstede Model of National Culture?" *Hofstede Insights*, 30 April 2022, <https://www.theculturefactor.com/intercultural-management#whatisthehofstedemodelofnationalculture>.

³³ "The 7 Dimensions of Culture," *Trompenaars Hampden-Turner Connecting Viewpoints, Hofstede Insights*, 30 April 2022, <https://thtconsulting.com/models/7-dimensions-of-culture/>.

³⁴ See, e.g., Geert Hofstede, "Dimensions Do Not Exist: A Reply to Brendan McSweeney," *Human Relations* 55, no. 11 (2002): 5.

³⁵ Minkov, "Do Dimensions of Culture Exist Objectively?"

In yet another article from 2016, entitled “A Genetic Component to National Differences in Happiness,” Minkov goes so far as to conclude, albeit tentatively, that “national differences in happiness, defined as the hedonic component of SWB [Subjective Well-Being] or positive affect, have a genetic component.”³⁶

The Marriage of ICC and Gen-AI

Naturally, the whole field of ICC, including dimensions-based models of culture, had to respond to the dissemination of Gen-AI models. Unsurprisingly, the marriage of ICC and Gen-AI has been heavily criticized, among others, for highlighting some of the already existing problems in dimensions-based models of culture. Critics pointed out that the use of “culture machines,” such Gen-AI, “trained on massive collections of cultural artefacts and designed to produce probabilistic representations of culture based on [...] training data [...] will always be prone to stereotyping and oversimplification because of the mathematical models that underpin their operations.”³⁷ Prompting Gen AI to generate new content or, let alone (re-)present another culture – the so-called “persona prompting” – will thus most likely “produce and reproduce essentialized artefacts of culture [...], shape] the understanding of culture,”³⁸ transform “culture into a noun,” and serve “the interests of our current crop of xenophobic politicians, ‘personalised’ marketers and other scions of the ‘culture industry.’”³⁹ The general biasedness of Gen-AI models typically resides in the algorithm’s designer, the algorithm itself (algorithmic discrimination), or in the historical data used to train the model. Literature on the topic abounds with stories of various AI-based tools perpetuating or even magnifying “gender and other biases present in [...] data,”⁴⁰ as was the case with Amazon’s sexist AI⁴¹ or the COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions) algorithm.⁴² The problem is

³⁶ Michael Minkov and M.H. Bond, “A Genetic Component to National Differences in Happiness,” *Journal of Happiness Studies* 18 (2017): 321-40.

³⁷ Rodney H. Jones, “Culture Machines,” *Applied Linguistics Review* 16, no. 2 (2025): 753.

³⁸ David Wei Dai and Zhu Hua, “When AI Meets Intercultural Communication: New Frontiers, New Agendas,” *Applied Linguistics Review* 16, no. 2 (2025): 748.

³⁹ Jones, “Culture Machines,” 753.

⁴⁰ UNESCO, “Women for Ethical AI: Outlook Study on Artificial Intelligence and Gender,” 29, <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000391719>.

⁴¹ Jeffrey Dastin, “Amazon Scraps Secret AI Recruiting Tool That Showed Bias against Women,” *Reuters*, 11 October 2018, <https://www.reuters.com/article/world/insight-amazon-scraps-secret-ai-recruiting-tool-that-showed-bias-against-women-idUSKCN1MK0AG/>.

⁴² Boddington, *AI Ethics*, 51.

exacerbated by the fact that Gen-AI can, on the one hand, “produce outputs that appear to be humanly generated and therefore ‘authentic,’”⁴³ while, on the other hand, appearing to use and produce a “‘neutral’ and true picture of the world.”⁴⁴

To Bias, or Not to Bias

Albeit far from inconsequential, the problem of AI bias, whether data or algorithmic, intentional or unintentional, highlights a larger, fundamental concern within AI ethics and philosophy of technology in general, that is, the problem of technological neutrality. Forgetting that “we are delivered to technology in the worst possible way when we regard it as something neutral,”⁴⁵ the very idea of AI bias seems to miss out on what might be called a default bias that is the politics of the technological. The call to combat AI bias – being it calls for curating the data, managing the datasets, guarantying excessive transparency – in this sense fails to realize that both cultural models and the technologies that carry and enable them will always exist as embedded in epistemic, political, and cultural frames, and that “the attainment of knowledge is *only partially* located within the human knower.”⁴⁶ Arguably, this issue comes into play both in cases of a bias that results from unintended consequences of the technological design as well as a result of “intentional design”⁴⁷ elements (nudges, manipulations) added by the designer.

Given the “transparency of the interface,”⁴⁸ both technological and methodological, the failure to take a critical stance towards technologically (re-) presented models and to realize that the bias is a feature and not a bug has serious epistemological consequences. When AI technologies (e.g., translation tools, chatbots, intercultural training platforms, AI personas) reproduce or magnify essentialized and reified images of culture or introduce “bias,” the dominant ethical reaction is to “debias” (debug) the technology – as if the goal was to reach a neutral, consensual, and universal interculturality; as if the very (re-)presentation of culture in the model, technology, Gen-AI, could be considered or made “objective.”

⁴³ John O’Regan, Giulliana Ferri, “Artificial Intelligence and Depth Ontology: Implications for Intercultural Ethics,” *Applied Linguistics Review* 16, no. 2 (2025): 2.

⁴⁴ Boddington, *AI Ethics*, 50.

⁴⁵ Martin Heidegger, *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, trans. William Lovitt (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1977), 4.

⁴⁶ Branden Hookway, *Interface* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2014), 64.

⁴⁷ Peter-Paul, Verbeek, “Don Ihde: The Technological Lifeworld,” in *American Philosophy of Technology: The Empirical Turn*, ed. by H.J. Achterhuis (Bloomington, IN, and London: Indiana University Press, 2001), 136.

⁴⁸ Hookway, *Interface*, 65.

Amusingly, the question how to navigate this default technological untrustworthiness is an ever-present concern for Yeats, who constantly battles the subversive spirits known as Frustrators, who ingeniously and cruelly disrupt the automatic script:

Was he [the Frustrator] constrained by a drama which was part of conditions that made communication possible, was that drama itself part of the communication? [...] It was part of their purpose to affirm that all the gains of man come from conflict with the opposite of his true being. Was communication itself such a conflict?

(AV 13)

Such reflections and problematizations of both the process and product are an essential part of *A Vision*. As Catherine E. Paul and Margaret Mills Harper point out in their introduction to the 1925 edition, the text is composed of “both explanation and instruction, argument and agreement.”⁴⁹ Importantly, Yeats’s ambition to present an objective system of “hard symbolic bones under the skin” (AV 207) and his fascination by what the System offers is from the outset accompanied by reflection, thematization of the tedious and opaque process, and eventual critical distancing. Especially in the second edition, the originary myth of the System thus cannot be separated from the System itself. Importantly, this fundamental conflict – a mindset of questioning both the process and product – is something that we lack in both the dimensions-based models of culture and their AI-mediated representations. The drive to de-bias AI is one of its most prominent symptoms. Setting aside for a while the threat of intentional bias, the de-biasing approach seems to imply that there exists some transcendental, universally valid, objective, non-political vantage point from which culture can be (re)presented safely, without underlying bias: that means, without the need to reflect on the process and product brought forth by AI. Paula Boddington in this sense correctly shows that “the ethical question of bias in algorithms is often portrayed as being concerned with how to remove bias in data sets, modelling, and the use of algorithms,” while at the same time presuming that “it is at least theoretically possible to have an unbiased use of algorithms, and hence that we may, via data, capture what the world is ‘truly’ like, what its fundamental ontology is.”⁵⁰

⁴⁹ W.B. Yeats, *A Vision: The Original 1925 Edition*, ed. Catherine E. Paul and Margaret Mills Harper (New York, London, Toronto and Sydney: Scribner, 2008), xxiii.

⁵⁰ Boddington, *AI Ethics*, 310.

As “addressing bias in a system [...] may be including a way of seeing the world that contains its own injustices,”⁵¹ the desired primacy of the ethical in the form of a *de*-biased relation itself can be interpreted as an instance of political concealing. Interestingly, this apparently ethical move reminds us of Deleuze’s critique of Levinas’s transcendental move to think about the relation to the Other through “Face” (a call to prioritize ethics before “an ontology” built on a reductive and forceful “comprehension of being”⁵²) as “dependent on a prior political decision regarding the system of signification used to conceptualise and describe ethical relation.”⁵³

Discussions of the way culture is (re-)presented through Gen-AI, therefore, should not be reduced to the problem of AI bias. Instead of debugging (i.e., debiasing) technology, it seems more productive for educators in the field of ICC to encourage a critical discussion of the “unintended consequences” of technologies, including technologies that mediate the understanding of the world for their users. One way of doing that – besides reading Yeats – is to think of technologies that underpin cultural dimensions in terms of Don Ihde’s “hermeneutic technologies” that foster relations schematized as “I → (technology-world).”⁵⁴ According to Ihde, a hermeneutic technology – for example, a thermometer – “provides a representation of reality, which implies that the design of such a technology predetermines which aspect of reality is to be made perceptible by it and in which ways.”⁵⁵ Similarly, a digital, data-driven model of culture, such as the 7D model of Fons Trompenaars, Charles Hampden-Turner and Peter Woolliams or the country comparison tool available on dedicated webpages are a case in point and are in a sense not different from the said thermometer: useful, yet, in its ready availability, always prone to commodify and reify the cultural other, easily “disburdening.”⁵⁶

Further, the fundamental difference between a thermometer and a data-driven model of culture is in the degree of “explainability.”⁵⁷ If we read dimensions-based

⁵¹ Albert Borgmann, *Technology and the Character of Contemporary Life* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 51.

⁵² Emmanuel Levinas, *Totality and Infinity I*, trans. Alphonso Lingis (Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 2007), 43.

⁵³ Gavin Rae, “The Political Significance of the Face: Deleuze’s Critique of Levinas,” *Critical Horizons* 17, no. 3-4 (2016): 291.

⁵⁴ Verbeek, “Don Ihde,” 126.

⁵⁵ Verbeek, “Don Ihde,” 129.

⁵⁶ Borgmann, *Technology and the Character of Contemporary Life*, 59.

⁵⁷ Mark Coeckelbergh, *AI Ethics* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2020), 204.

models of culture as probabilistic “predictions about individuals,”⁵⁸ which promise to “be useful to students of culture for particular purposes,”⁵⁹ i.e., as “recommenders [that] digitally nudge, advise, [...] invite more informed decision”⁶⁰ and “virtually educate and train their users,”⁶¹ we must not forget to ask about the origin of the choice architecture these models represent, and question the ways in which they operate affecting their users and their expectations.

Similarly to the promise of Yeats’s communicators to build an incomprehensible, yet “elaborate classification of men [...] supported by [...] a series of geometrical symbols” allowing its users to prophesize “the birth of a Napoleon or a Christ” (AV 9), this cultural choice architecture is a double black box: that of the statistical model of culture (ungraspable for an average user), and that of the illusion of de-biased technological/scientific objectivity. The inability (or unwillingness) of the user to understand the calculations behind the ostensibly opaque cultural model, paired up with their inability to understand how Gen-AI or other technologies (re-)present culture (through this model), can be interpreted as an example of a “device,” whose function it is to “disburden”⁶² by making its products “carefree”⁶³ and nudge its users towards framing intercultural encounters as a commodity “available and to be enjoyed in consumption”⁶⁴ without “the encumbrance of or the engagement with a context.”⁶⁵ The contrast to Yeats’s ambivalent approach in *A Vision* is quite instructive: instead of scrutinizing both the process and product while remaining fascinated, the origin and character of the device is not systematically thematized and pointed out but subjected to multiple concealing.

The dimensions-based models of culture, regardless of whether AI-generated or not, thus come into existence by means of “modelling of a thing or process” which “often takes place as a kind of mimicry” that, “while potentially leading to deeper and more sophisticated methods of control, [...] also carries an epistemological danger of mistaking the model as a form of knowledge with a knowing of the thing or process itself.”⁶⁶ This is especially true in the case of the discussed models, in which “available means of measurement often determine what is to be measured.”⁶⁷

⁵⁸ Minkov, *Intercultural Differences*, 17.

⁵⁹ Minkov, *Intercultural Differences*, 225.

⁶⁰ Schrage, *Recommendation Engines*, 9.

⁶¹ Schrage, *Recommendation Engines*, 16.

⁶² Borgman, *Technology*, 42.

⁶³ Borgman, *Technology*, 47.

⁶⁴ Borgman, *Technology*, 48.

⁶⁵ Borgman, *Technology*, 47.

⁶⁶ Hookway, *Interface*, 64.

⁶⁷ Borgman, *Technology*, 60.

In this sense, the above-described models of culture provide an illusory knowledge of a cultural event and function as a transparent interface, similar to

a computer model of turbulence [that] possesses in itself a statistical complexity that, while it remains essentially different from the turbulence that it models, still passes far beyond what may be grasped as knowledge by unaided human cognition. Here the statistical model itself becomes another form of interface, as between a computer program and its operator, whose combined product is an attempted knowing of the interface at the heart of the turbulent fluid. Regardless of the statistical sophistication and predictive power such modelling might have, the epistemological claim it holds over that which it models bears with it an illusory portion, present both in its claim to bridge the model and the event and in its predicting, determining, or positing of causation with respect to that event. The illusory stands as knowledge of the event, in the gleanings of all that transpires in the model-as-interface and in the distillation of calculations that would otherwise have been incalculable to unaided human reason.⁶⁸

Subjectivation

If it is true “that the complexities of an event as embodied within an interface, if knowable, are essentially only knowable to a *knower* that is also a product of augmentation,”⁶⁹ we must further consider the unintended effects of technological mediation on an unreflecting human knower. As argued above, dimensions-based models of culture represent a particular type of persuasive technology: “a particular tool for achieving behavior change,”⁷⁰ or a choice architecture that, through its technological intentionality, provides “a framework for human actions” and therefore can be argued to have “a certain influence on those actions.”⁷¹ As Peter-Paul Verbeek puts it: “Technologies ‘want’ to do things in particular ways, as it were, they have a certain ‘intention’ and promote this intention among its users.”⁷² The “intentions” of the dimensions-based models of culture invite or nudge their users to a specific stance toward themselves and set expectations of future intercultural encounters.

⁶⁸ Hookway, *Interface*, 65.

⁶⁹ Hookway, *Interface*, 65.

⁷⁰ Robert Münscher, “Choice Architecture Techniques: Developing a Comprehensive Taxonomy to Test Applicability in Business Relationships,” *Management Decision* 62, no. 11 (2024): 3383-403.

⁷¹ Verbeek, “Don Ihde,” 136.

⁷² Verbeek, “Don Ihde,” 136.

By presenting algorithmic “knowledge claims to us [...with the] expectation that the future will be like the past,”⁷³ such models outline specific scenarios, effectively pre-structuring any encounter with the cultural other, either by accentuating specific (measurable) aspects of the given culture or by offering probabilistic predictions of certain behaviours. Such intercultural design, as Carl Mitcham puts it in his discussion of design and Heidegger’s Dasein, “constitute[s] a special prefiguring of the future that sees the future as a freedom open to indefinite manipulation” and suppresses human existence as a “concern-filled destiny”:

And yet all my designed creations to some extent go beyond their design; they always have what are called unintended (undesigned) consequences. Thus there are limits to design to which we must respond – either authentically or inauthentically.⁷⁴

As mediation by artifacts cannot be reduced to a “mediation ‘between’ subject and object,” but rather should be seen as a “mediation of a sort in which both subject and object are constituted,”⁷⁵ the way we use our technologies does not simply shape our understanding of culture, but also who we are in terms of if/how we critically (or uncritically) engage with the world in general: “mediation does not simply take place *between* a subject and an object, but rather *co-shapes subjectivity and objectivity*. Both humans and the world they experience are products of technological mediation.”⁷⁶ Therefore, critical attention paid to the pragmatically minded way culture is (re)presented and taught (especially) in business and management studies is important because it distorts the very notion of culture, but also because it scripts towards either the unproblematic and/or the neutral and welcomes cognitive offloading,⁷⁷ choice delegation, de-skilling, disburdenment, overreliance on quick-fix technological solutions, and other such “ironies of AI”⁷⁸ bypassing the politics of the technological.

⁷³ Boddington, *AI Ethics*, 51.

⁷⁴ Carl Mitcham, “Dasein Versus Design: The Problematics of Turning Making into Thinking,” *International Journal of Technology and Design Education* 11 (2001): 34.

⁷⁵ Verbeek, “Don Ihde,” 131.

⁷⁶ Verbeek, “Don Ihde,” 131.

⁷⁷ See Michael Gerlich, “AI Tools in Society: Impacts on Cognitive Offloading and the Future of Critical Thinking,” *Societies* 15, no. 6 (2025): 1-28.

⁷⁸ Prakash Shukla, Phuong Bui, Sean S. Levy, Max Kowalski, Ali Baigelenov and Paul Parsons, “De-skilling, Cognitive Offloading, and Misplaced Responsibilities: Potential Ironies of AI-Assisted Design,” in *Proceedings of the Extended Abstracts of the CHI*

In this sense, the desire to produce a de-biased and therefore non-problematic (re)presentation of culture not only relies on the assumption that such consensus is desirable – let alone achievable – but also misses on what might be called “the political,” that is, the conflictual dimension of social life and meaning creation, or what Chantal Mouffe in her *On the Political* (2005) refers to as the “ineradicability of the conflictual dimension in social life.”⁷⁹ As “the world is problematic because it makes us think,”⁸⁰ static models of culture, especially when mediated by AI or technologies in general, not only rely on the naïve realism of a representational model of what it means to *know something*, but also undermine, in Patočka’s words, the “problematic nature of all meaningfulness,”⁸¹ and with it the philosophy of history and political life centred on *polemos*.

Digitally and AI-powered dimensions-based models of culture are, in this sense, “but the newest in a long line of technological innovations that promise to help individuals make better choices [...] and unburden us from a laborious and error-prone decision-making process.”⁸² The resulting non-agonistic non-problematic epistemologies and a disburdening ethics of commodity are provided by the invisible machinery of the device that – as Albert Borgman puts it – “makes no demands on our skill, strength, or attention.”⁸³ The result will be, as Plato famously argues in *Phaedrus*, students who “will be hearers of many things and will have learned nothing; they will appear to be omniscient and will generally know nothing; they will be tiresome company, having the show of wisdom without the reality.”⁸⁴ Therefore, it is not knowledge of a cultural model and the position of one’s culture in a “great system” of cultural determinants that is vital, but the *process* of critical entanglement within a context, within a lived world: “questioning certainty as the ultimate aim of thinking, and its replacement with

Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI EA '25) (New York: Association for Computing Machinery, 2025), Article 171, 1-7.

⁷⁹ Chantal Mouffe, *On the Political* (London and New York: Routledge, 2005), 4.

⁸⁰ Miroslav Petříček, “Gilles Deleuze: filosofie ve jménu života” [Gilles Deleuze: Philosophizing in the Name of Life], in Gilles Deleuze, *Logika smyslu* (Logique du sens), trans. Miroslav Petříček (Prague: Karolinum, 2021), 366. Translated by the author.

⁸¹ Jan Patočka, *Heretical Essays in the Philosophy of History*, trans. Erazim Kohák (Chicago and La Salle, IL: Open Court Publishing, 1996), 57.

⁸² Malte Dold and Alexa Stanton, “I Choose for Myself, Therefore I Am: The Contours of Existentialist Behavioral Economics,” *Erasmus Journal for Philosophy and Economics* 14, no. 1 (2021): 1-29.

⁸³ Borgman, *Technology*, 42.

⁸⁴ Plato, *Phaedrus*, trans. Benjamin Jowett (The Internet Classics Archive), 274c, accessed 2 September 2025, <https://classics.mit.edu/Plato/phaedrus.html>.

a conditional alternative that makes our thinking from the very beginning more open and entangled with the world.”⁸⁵

In Conclusion

Yeats, after twenty years of engaging with the system hard won through hours of occult communication, realized at the end of the second edition of his *A Vision*:

My imagination was for a time haunted by figures that, muttering “the great systems,” held out to me the sun-dried skeletons of birds, and it seemed to me that this image was meant to turn my thoughts to the living bird. That bird signifies truth when it eats, evacuates, builds its nest, engenders, feeds its young; do not all intelligible truths lie in its passage from egg to dust?

(AV 214)

As “thinking before making yields a decontextualized product,”⁸⁶ decontextualized, seemingly objective representations of culture produce thin descriptions, the “sun-dried skeletons of birds” (AV 214), when any intelligible description is inseparable from its lived contexts: “culture is not a power, something to which social events, behaviours, institutions, or processes can be causally attributed; it is a context, something within which they can be intelligibly – that is thickly – described.”⁸⁷ Fetishist overreliance on decontextualized, static models of culture and an activist drive to de-bias the AI will – in itself – not push us to “think against ourselves.” As Yeats would say, such approach lacks “the Vision of Evil, [as it does] not conceive of the world as a continual conflict” (AV 144). Instead of asking whether “the spirit is a statistical pattern in the data” and questioning the system to learn the best course of action, we need to opt for an experimental practice of what I am capable of doing; to paraphrase with both Deleuze and Yeats once more: “truth is never a product of a prior disposition but the result of a violence in thought. [...] It depends on an encounter with something which forces us to think, and to seek the truth.”⁸⁸ Thus, any use of dimensions-based models of culture comes with what Carl Mitcham calls “a duty *plus respicere* [...], that is, a professional

⁸⁵ Vojtěch Kolman, *Co je dialektika?* [What Is Dialectics?] (Prague: Argo, 2023), 25. Translated by the author.

⁸⁶ Mitcham, “Dasein Versus Design,” 34.

⁸⁷ Clifford Geertz, *Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 14.

⁸⁸ Gilles Deleuze, *Proust and Signs*, trans. Richard Howard (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), 16.

obligation to expand such thinking in order to try to take more aspects of reality into account.”⁸⁹ Because a world that is not problematic does not make us think.

In this sense, it seems further possible to argue that knowledge, or what passes for it, cannot be contextualized if we do not reflect on its origin, on both the process and product. Consequently, the main critique of AI-based models of culture discussed above and the main argument of this article is that these models and their proponents struggle when it comes to encouraging their users to critically reflect on the process and product they offer. Such overtly pragmatic, instrumental or managerial approach to culture endorsed this way is the result of the seeming comprehensibility and availability of the end-product (a culture as expressed through a model) and, perhaps paradoxically, the opaqueness and incomprehensibility of the way this knowledge was produced; equally, it is the result of the way the authors frame their models and indeed themselves as scientific, objective and unproblematic, as seen above.

Yeats’s life-long epistemological quest embodied in his *A Vision* is in this sense instructive: here, the process of acquiring knowledge is made a subject to constant visions and re-visions, self-interruptions and self-thematizations. Facing the deity-driven recommender machine, Yeats prefers creative self-doubt to static self-affirmation of late-positivist scientific triumphalism. The narrative framework Yeats uses to present his System thus can be argued to construct an open reflective space that points towards or at least does not conceal the problematic nature of the product and process it offers. This makes it relevant, although perhaps in a rather unexpected way, to those who, one hundred years later, face the omnipresent allure of data-driven recommendation machines.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arasaratnam, Lily. “Intercultural Competence.” *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication*, 3 February 2016. Accessed 28 September 2025. <https://oxfordre.com/communication/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228613-e-68>.
- Boddington, Paula. *AI Ethics*. London: Springer, 2023.
- Borgmann, Albert. *Technology and the Character of Contemporary Life*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- Byram, Michael. *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communication Competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1997.

⁸⁹ Mitcham, “Dasein Versus Design,” 34.

- Dai, David Wei and Zhu Hua. "When AI Meets Intercultural Communication: New Frontiers, New Agendas." *Applied Linguistics Review* 16, no. 2 (2025): 747-51.
- Deleuze, Gilles. *Proust and Signs*. Translated by Richard Howard. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2000.
- Dold, Malte and Alexa Stanton. "I Choose for Myself, Therefore I Am: The Contours of Existentialist Behavioral Economics." *Erasmus Journal for Philosophy and Economics* 14, no. 1 (2021): 1-29.
- Ferri, Giulliana. "Ethical Communication and Intercultural Responsibility: A Philosophical Perspective." *Language and Intercultural Communication* 14, no. 1 (2014): 7-23.
- Geertz, Clifford. *Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- "Generative AI." *MIT Sloan Teaching and Learning Technologies*. Accessed 2 October 2025. https://mitsloanedtech.mit.edu/ai/basics/glossary/#Generative_AI.
- Gerlich, Michael. "AI Tools in Society: Impacts on Cognitive Offloading and the Future of Critical Thinking." *Societies* 15, no. 6 (2025): 1-28.
- Harper, George Mills. *The Making of Yeats's A Vision: A Study of the Automatic Script Vol. 2*. Carbondale and Edwardsville, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1987.
- Harper, George Mills. *Yeats's Vision Papers Vol. 1-4*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1992-2001.
- Hoff, Hild E. "A Critical Discussion of Byram's Model of Intercultural Communicative Competence in the Light of Bildung Theories." *Intercultural Education* 25, no. 6 (2014): 508-17.
- Hofstede, Geert. *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2001.
- Hofstede, Geert. "Dimensions Do Not Exist: A Reply to Brendan McSweeney." *Human Relations* 55, no. 11 (2002): 1355-60.
- Hofstede, Geert. "Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context." *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture* 2, no. 1 (2011), 5 November 2020. Accessed 2 September 2025. <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014>.
- Hookway, Branden. *Interface*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2014.
- Jones, Rodney H. "Culture Machines." *Applied Linguistics Review* 16, no. 2 (2025): 753-62.
- Kim, Young Yun. "The Identity Factor in Intercultural Competence." In *The SAGE Handbook of Intercultural Competence*, ed. Darla K. Deardorff (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2009), 62.
- Kolman, Vojtěch. *Co je dialektika? [What Is Dialectics?]*. Prague: Argo, 2023.
- Luba, Peter. "Dreams of Language in the Age of AI: On Neganthropoc Linguistic Pragmatism with Emerson, Nietzsche and Stiegler." *Hradec Králové Journal of Anglophone Studies* 11, no. 1-2 (2024): 14-22.

- Mann, Neil. "A Vision: The Automatic Script." In *The System of W. B. Yeats's A Vision*. Accessed 5 November 2024, <http://www.yeatsvision.com/AS.html>.
- Matsuo, Catherine. "A Critique of Michael Byram's Intercultural Communicative Competence Model from the Perspective of Model Type and Conceptualization of Culture." *Fukuoka University Review of Literature & Humanities* 44 (2012): 347-80.
- McSweeney, Brendan. "A Triumph of Faith – A Failure of Analysis: Hofstede's Model of National Cultural Differences and Their Consequences." *Human Relations* 55 (2002): 89-118.
- McSweeney, Brendan. "Dynamic Diversity: Variety and Variation within Countries." *Organization Studies* 30 (2009): 933-57.
- Minkov, Michael. *Cultural Differences in a Globalizing World*. Bingley: Emerald, 2011.
- Minkov, Michael. "Do Dimensions of Culture Exist Objectively? A Validation of Hofstede's Model." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 53, no. 5 (2022). Accessed 21 September 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00220221221100461>.
- Minkov, Michael and M.H. Bond. "A Genetic Component to National Differences in Happiness." *Journal of Happiness Studies* 18 (2017): 321-40.
- Mitcham, Carl. "Dasein Versus Design: The Problematics of Turning Making into Thinking." *International Journal of Technology and Design Education* 11 (2001): 27-36.
- Mouffe, Chantal. *On The Political: Thinking in Action*. London and New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Münscher, Robert. "Choice Architecture Techniques: Developing a Comprehensive Taxonomy to Test Applicability in Business Relationships." *Management Decision* 62, no. 11 (2024): 3383-403.
- "National Culture." *Hofstede Insights*. Accessed 30 April 2022. <https://hi.hofstede-insights.com/national-culture>.
- O'Regan, John P. and Giulliana Ferri. "Artificial Intelligence and Depth Ontology: Implications for Intercultural Ethics." *Applied Linguistics Review* 16, no. 2 (2025): 797-807.
- Patočka, Jan. *Heretical Essays in the Philosophy of History*. Translated by Erazim Kohák. Chicago and La Salle, IL: Open Court Publishing, 1996.
- Petříček, Miroslav. "Gilles Deleuze: filosofie ve jménu života" [Gilles Deleuze: Philosophizing in the Name of Life]. In Gilles Deleuze, *Logika smyslu* (Logique du sens). Translated by Miroslav Petříček. Prague: Karolinum, 2021.
- Plato, *Phaedrus*. Translated by Benjamin Jowett. The Internet Classics Archive. Accessed 2 September 2025. <https://classics.mit.edu/Plato/phaedrus.html>.
- Rae, Gavin. "The Political Significance of the Face: Deleuze's Critique of Levinas." *Critical Horizons* 17, no. 3-4 (2016): 279-303.
- Ramazani, Jahan. *A Transnational Poetics*. Chicago, IL, and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2001.

- Rooney, Jack. "Words of Healing: The Literature of Automatic Writing as Treatment and Prescription in the Victorian Age." *Literature and Medicine* 39, no. 1 (2001): 108-32.
- Schrage, Michael. *Recommendation Engines*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2020.
- Shukla, Prakash, et al. "De-skilling, Cognitive Offloading, and Misplaced Responsibilities: Potential Ironies of AI-Assisted Design." In *Proceedings of the Extended Abstracts of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI EA '25)*. New York: Association for Computing Machinery, 2025. Article 171, 1-7.
- "The 7 Dimensions of Culture," *Trompenaars Hampden-Turner Connecting Viewpoints, Hofstede Insights*. Accessed 30 April 2022. <https://tthconsulting.com/models/7-dimensions-of-culture/>.
- The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. "automatic writing." *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 20 July 1998. Accessed 2 September 2025. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/automatic-writing>.
- UNESCO. "Women for Ethical AI: Outlook Study on Artificial Intelligence and Gender." Accessed 15 January 2025. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000391719>.
- Vaswani, Ashish, et al. "Attention Is All You Need," *arXiv* preprint arXiv:1706.03762 v7 (revised 2 August 2023). Accessed 23 October 2025. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1706.03762>.
- Vaswani, Ashish, et al. "Attention Is All You Need: The Paper that Changed AI." *Hidden Layer*, 6 May 2025. Accessed 8 October 2025. <https://hiddenlayer.tech/papers/attention-is-all-you-need/>.
- Verbeek, Peter-Paul. "Don Ihde: The Technological Lifeworld." In *American Philosophy of Technology: The Empirical Turn*. Edited by H.J. Achterhuis. Bloomington, IN and London: Indiana University Press, 2001: 119-46.
- Walsh, Shelley. "History of ChatGPT: A Timeline of Generative AI Chatbots." *Search Engine Journal*, 11 September 2025. Accessed 19 October 2025. <https://www.searchenginejournal.com/history-of-chatgpt-timeline/488370/>.
- "What Is the Hofstede Model of National Culture?," *Hofstede Insights*. Accessed 30 April 2022. <https://www.theculturefactor.com/intercultural-management#whatisthehofstedemodelofnationalculture>.