

Decolonizing the digital page: Algorithmic hegemony and the erasure of local perspectives in postcolonial literature

Fitriya Dessi Wulandari

Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Indonesia

 fitriyadessi@gmail.com

Abstract: This article explores the tension between decolonial literary aesthetics and the rapid integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English literature education. While postcolonial writers such as Chinua Achebe, Arundhati Roy, Laksmi Pamuntjak, and Intan Paramaditha have successfully reclaimed English to voice non-Western ontologies, the emergence of Large Language Models (LLMs) and Natural Language Processing (NLP) tools poses a new threat of “Digital Epistemicide.” Using Walter Mignolo’s decoloniality framework, this study analyzes how AI algorithms function as modern “linguistic police,” standardizing local metaphors and circular syntaxes into linear Western norms. The results indicate that AI interventions often erase a text’s “cultural soul” in the name of grammatical efficiency. The implications for English Language Teaching (ELT) are profound; the reliance on AI-driven classroom feedback risks reinforcing Linguistic Imperialism 2.0. This research argues for a transformative decolonial pedagogy in ELT that shifts the focus from mere grammatical correctness to algorithmic critical literacy. By encouraging students to negotiate AI suggestions critically, educators can empower them to make meaningful errors as a vital act of resistance.

Keywords: AI algorithms, decoloniality, digital page, ELT, linguistic imperialism, postcolonial literature

Submitted 22 January 2025 | Accepted 30 January 2026

INTRODUCTION

The colonial history of the English language continues to haunt us. Colonialism’s legacy has evolved, as Walter Mignolo suggests, into a fully functioning coloniality, a power that shapes knowledge, culture, and language long after the colonial state has waned. Mignolo’s claim has found resonance in various academic works that seek to explain the multiple functions of English, especially its use as an epistemic tool that marginalizes local voices and elevates the dominant voices of the West, particularly the Eurocentric ones (Brown et al., 2020). In literature, authors from the Global South have used English as a vehicle to resist colonial influence, describing this as a process of linguistic decoloniza-

tion. In “The Empire Writes Back,” Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin observe that postcolonial authors, through the use of the language of a dominating system, attempt to redefine their identity and, most of the time, use the technique of appropriation and abrogation as a means of postcolonial literature (Brown et al., 2020). Most of the literary works that used these techniques were produced in the second half of the 20th century, when English was viewed as a dominant language. However, in the 21st century, with the emergence of artificial intelligence (AI) tools that replicate Global North standards and, consequently, their biases, the challenge persists (Blodgett et al., 2020).

The widespread use of AI tools, including chatbots and automated language correction programs, makes the study of language in postcolonial contexts increasingly complex. Such tools, while fostering enhanced interactivity, also carry the same biases of the Western-centric data that informs their construction (Bose, 1998; Tiffin, 2007). Timnit Gebru and Emily Bender have described the impacts of *stochastic parrots*, in which AI programs overlook and misclassify linguistic variation in English and its various dialects, which in fact represent different forms of equally valid linguistic systems (Blodgett et al., 2020). Such postcolonial constructs have a direct bearing on the decentring of the Western canon in contemporary literature and require evaluation and adjustments to proposed technologies to meet the ideals of inclusivity. The critical literature on bias in natural language processing makes the cultural bias in algorithmic construction apparent. AI working within a statistical mean is referred to as a ‘silo-busting’ technique, but it gives rise to the very entity it seeks to eliminate (Hockly, 2023). Because of this, the AI researcher and literary scholar must find the balance between contemporary technologies and language and culture to create a space that recognizes the diversity of English as equally valid and avoids the imposition of a single norm.

Though there has been rapid growth in both postcolonial literary studies and AI ethics, the gap between the two fields has not narrowed. Literary studies still focus on print and the humanistic. In contrast, AI studies still seem to focus parasitically on sociology and engineering, passing over the complexities of decolonial, out-of-the-box, linguistically, and structurally nonstandard texts. Such a disconnect is alarming, as it fails to address the very real possibility that AI algorithms ‘smoothing’ or, in other words, eliminate the subversive and resistant writing style of authors from the Global South when their texts are treated digitally. The danger of AI acting as ‘digital cops’ and wiping out nonstandard vernaculars in the name of efficiency and compliance with Western norms in a corpus is a real one. When AI is employed to standardize language, it is likely to work with a patchwork of culturally distinct syntaxes, creole expressions, metaphorical vernacular, and culturally specific elements in the texts and wipe

them out completely. Addressing this concern is vital to combating ‘digital colonialism’ in which the voicelessness and the rich diversity of human language are homogenized and silenced by the perverse-but-neutral logic of algorithms (Kwet, 2019; Veracini & Weaver-Hightower, 2023). Such concerns are especially salient in the age of Large Language Models (LLMs) in Education and Literary editing.

Prominent authors such as Chinua Achebe and Arundhati Roy have documented their individual and collective cultural, historical, and sociopolitical experiences in the Western world while subverting its grammatical systems (Foulcher & Day, 2002). Contemporary authors such as Laksmi Pamuntjak and Intan Paramaditha also focus on Indonesian narratives and offer diverse perspectives on historical trauma and feminism. These writers use the English language as a tool but control and refine it to express their sociopolitical realities and, in doing so, confront the traditional structures of Artificial Intelligence (Bose, 1998; Tiffin, 2007). Clearly, the tensions between subversive literary texts and AI’s rigid structures pose a certain problem. When integrated into the literary world, automated literary editing services operate on the assumption that a single, homogeneous literary style, or in this case, a monoculture literary style, will replace the diverse literary styles. There is a considerable body of literature on the evils of automation in literary editing. For example, the impact on an individual or society as a whole is complex, but, as scholars such as Mittelstadt et al. (2016) suggest, the social impact of such interventions could trigger a form of sociological dystopia. Cultural homogenization and its impacts are real threats, and perhaps this is why language is the primary focus of so many critiques on Artificial Intelligence.

The research claims that, to consider the digital age’s decolonizing perspectives, critical awareness is needed to engage in delinking from AI standardization regimes. The use of local metaphors and “nonstandard” syntax in literature goes beyond stylistic considerations, becoming a political act of consenting to local identities that counter global machinery. This position aligns with Silova et al.’s view that, to produce knowledge, coloniality must be interrupted and that the recognition and articulation of other epistemes are important (Silova et al., 2017). With the advent of AI in education and literary editing, the stakes are that algorithmic technologies might treat as “anomalies” texts that contain creole and other hybrids, nonstandard syntax, and culturally-bound metaphors. This risk could usher in a form of “digital colonialism” that de-historicizes and homogenizes diverse and complex expressions of humanity (Staines, 2022). Thus, authors from Nigeria, India, and Indonesia are important not only for their choice of language but also for actively transgressing linguistic boundaries by embedding historical consciousness and local identities in their texts.

This study examines how the dominance of AI algorithms runs counter to decolonial thinking in the writing of Chinua Achebe, Arundhati Roy, Laksmi Pamuntjak, and Intan Paramaditha. A gap exists between postcolonial literary studies and the ethics of artificial Intelligence. Literary studies centre on the printed word and the human dimension, while scholarly work on AI focuses on the social and technical, rarely engaging with the complexities of intentionally nonstandard, subversive, decolonial language. This study contributes to the discourse of English Language Teaching (ELT) by urging educators to view linguistic variations in the works of Achebe, Roy, Pamuntjak, and Paramaditha not as linguistic barriers, but as rich pedagogical resources for teaching critical literacy. Practically, this research offers a framework for writing instruction that moves beyond a sole reliance on Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE) and instead celebrates decolonial creativity. By exploring the tension between algorithms and local aesthetics, this study encourages ELT practitioners to adopt a more inclusive Global English approach, wherein students are invited to recognize that linguistic authority is no longer singular. This contribution is vital in preventing the “character assassination” of the linguistic identities of Global South students, who are frequently coerced into conforming to monolithic AI standardization.

Theoretical framework

This research establishes a multidimensional theoretical framework situated at the intersection of Postcolonial Linguistics, Algorithmic Coloniality, and Global Englishes Pedagogy. The foundational layer of this study draws upon the “Writing Back” paradigm established by Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin (1989), focusing specifically on the twin processes of *abrogation* and *appropriation*. While abrogation involves the systematic rejection of the aesthetic and linguistic categories of the imperial centre, denying the myth of a “Standard English”, appropriation describes the process by which language is seized and reconstructed to convey incommunicable local experiences. In the context of this study, these concepts are expanded into the 21st century. At the same time, 20th-century abrogation targeted the colonial schoolroom; this research argues that contemporary resistance must target the algorithmic “black box.” The linguistic “irregularities” found in the works of Achebe, Roy, Pamuntjak, and Paramaditha are thus analyzed as deliberate ontological anchors that refuse to be subsumed by the “corrective” logic of Western-centric grammars.

Complementing this linguistic foundation, the study adopts the lens of Digital Coloniality (Kwet, 2019) and the critique of Stochastic Parrots (Bender et al., 2021) to address the technological dimension. This framework posits that AI infrastructures are not neutral entities but are “extractive” and “homogeniz-

ing” tools that perpetuate the Coloniality of Power (Quijano, 2000). Through the concept of Algorithmic Imperialism, this research examines the systematic imposition of Global North linguistic standards mediated by Natural Language Processing (NLP) and Large Language Models (LLMs). This leads to a form of Epistemic Erasure, wherein AI, operating through statistical means, treats cultural metaphors and nonstandard syntaxes as “outliers” or “noise.” By theorizing these technologies as digital “border guards,” the framework enables a critical examination of how Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE) tools effectively silence the nuanced subversions of Global South writers.

Finally, the study bridges literary analysis with English Language Teaching (ELT) via the Global Englishes (GE) paradigm (Jenkins, 2009; Galloway & Rose, 2015). This framework challenges the pervasive “Native Speaker Ideology” and replaces it with a Pluricentric Model of linguistic authority. Drawing on Mignolo’s (2011) “Delinking,” the research supports a Decolonial Pedagogy that encourages students to perceive “nonstandard” English as a site of agency rather than deficiency. By synthesizing Global Englishes with literary subversion, the study proposes a pedagogical framework for Critical Digital Literacy. In this model, the “irregular” texts of postcolonial authors serve as vital resources for students to resist the monovocal authority of AI tools such as Grammarly and ChatGPT, thereby preventing the homogenization of their linguistic identities in the digital age.

METHOD

This research employs a qualitative, descriptive approach, focusing on the narrative and structural analysis of the given body of literature. Utilizing the latent Content Analysis approach, the research is not solely concerned with the description of visible linguistic characteristics but also seeks to interpret the sociopolitical and technical meanings behind the text. The research is interdisciplinary, integrating postcolonial literary criticism and digital culture studies, to evaluate how the linguistic experimentation of South Global writers functions as a decolonizing tool within the contemporary data ecosystem (Jalilzadeh, 2025; Lin et al., 2022).

The data utilized in the study were collected via a systematic literature review of the selected text corpus. The primary data sources include four significant literary works, namely Chinua Achebe’s *Things Fall Apart*, Arundhati Roy’s *The God of Small Things*, and the other two works. Furthermore, secondary data are derived from the scholarly literature on postcolonial theory and the principles of Natural Language Processing (NLP) that impact content analysis (Ngema et al., 2024; Jordan et al., 2024). All data were collected using documentation and text-coding techniques to filter quotations that represent the linguistic strategies identified in this study.

Data analysis is carried out using the Thematic Analysis technique, which is constructive and enables the researcher to identify, analyze, and report the meaningful structures of the data. The process starts with the researcher immersing her/himself in the analysis by reading the corpus in depth, to know the specific sub-cultural nuances she/he is dealing with. The researcher then proceeds to initial coding, which is the process of marking particular linguistic units that are subversive, such as local metafiction and elements of gothic horror (Ngema et al., 2024; Tiong et al., 2025). Then, these codes are collated into several superordinate themes such as Conceptual Transliteration, Memory & Phonetic Dialect, Mythological Epistemology, and Gothic Subversion. Each of these themes is further interrogated through the lens of the digital framework to map its relevance to the Digital “Page” structure, particularly its impact on Named Entity Recognition (NER) systems and on cultural dataset enrichment (Xie et al., 2025; Dohale et al., 2022). This analysis concludes with a comprehensive definition of each theme to prepare an academic report that connects the unique stylistic elements of literature with its technical contributions to resisting global information hegemony (Gedara et al., 2021; Wanniarachchi et al., 2022). The contribution of this research, through a systematic and interdisciplinary approach, has enabled an understanding of how narratives and language in literature function not only as a form of cultural expression but also as a means of decolonizing data in today’s digital literature.

RESULTS

The contemporary literary landscape is defined by influential voices that systematically challenge the hegemony of Western narratives, most notably through the works of Arundhati Roy and Chinua Achebe. Roy, an Indian novelist celebrated for *The God of Small Things*, employs a poetic yet searing prose to investigate India’s rigid “Love Laws.” Her narrative dissects how social norms prescribe the boundaries of affection and dismantle individual lives, a theme she extends into her political essays regarding the destructive impacts of globalization and environmental crises. Conversely, Chinua Achebe, revered as the “Father of Modern African Literature,” used his masterpiece *Things Fall Apart* as a tool of resistance against colonial stigmatization. By integrating a straightforward writing style with the rich texture of Igbo proverbs, Achebe brilliantly depicted the tragic cultural collision occurring when local African traditions confronted British colonial penetration.

This decolonial phenomenon is further bolstered by Indonesian authors who choose to write in English to “translate” local cultural complexities for a global audience. Laksmi Pamuntjak, in her epic novel *Amba (The Question of Red)*, demonstrates profound scholarly depth by intertwining Mahabharata-

ta mythology with the dark history of Indonesia’s 1965 upheaval. Her elegant prose provides an intellectual context for international readers to grasp the nation’s collective trauma. Meanwhile, Intan Paramaditha adopts a distinct trajectory through the Gothic and horror genres in works such as *The Wandering* and *Apple and Knife*. Utilizing a sharp feminist lens, Paramaditha deconstructs traditional folklore and myths to address gender politics and sexuality, creating a discursive space that challenges patriarchal structures through a provocative aesthetic.

Comparative framework of postcolonial authors

The following table synthesizes the linguistic strategies and thematic contributions of these four authors within the context of the digital page.

Author	Keyword	Linguistic Style & Technique	Decolonial Focus	Contribution to the “Digital Page”
Chinua Achebe (Nigeria)	Things Fall Apart	Integration of Igbo proverbs into straightforward English structures.	Dismantling colonial stigmas that depicted Africa as “primitive” or pre-linguistic.	Provides cultural data augmentation to counter colonial algorithmic bias.
Arundhati Roy (India)	The God of Small Things	Nonstandard capitalization, Malayalam phonetics, and fragmentary syntax	Deconstructing traditional “Love Laws” and critiquing globalization/ecology.	Subversion of Named Entity Recognition (NER) and linear NLP standards.
Laksmi Pamuntjak (Indonesia)	Amba (The Question of Red)	Epic, elegant prose grounded in rigorous historical research.	Reconstructing the history of 1965 through the lens of the Mahabharata mythology.	Constructing alternative historical narratives in the global digital space
Intan Paramaditha (Indonesia)	The Wandering / Apple and Knife	Gothic/horror genre and the deconstruction of traditional fairy tales.	Feminist critique of gender politics, sexuality, and patriarchal structures.	Challenging digital homogeneity through meaningful “irregularity” and subversion.

Linguistic style and technique

Chinua Achebe: Things Fall Apart (1958)

In his seminal work *Things Fall Apart* (1958), Chinua Achebe employs the technique of conceptual transliteration, effectively embedding the internal logic of the Igbo language within the syntactic structures of English. Through the iconic aphorism,

“Proverbs are the palm oil with which words are eaten” (p. 7),

Achebe engages in semantic experimentation by preserving specific local material references, namely “palm-oil”, as a substitute for Western linguistic abstractions. The application of the verb “eaten” to the object “words” signifies a

deliberate semantic deviation designed to safeguard cultural integrity. From a linguistic perspective, while the sentence adheres to a straightforward \$S-V-O\$ (Subject-Verb-Object) grammatical structure, its metaphorical density compels the English language to submit to an African cognitive schema. This practice asserts linguistic sovereignty against colonial hegemony.

The resilience of local identity in Achebe's narrative is further fortified by the use of proverbs as sociological instruments. This is exemplified in the passage:

“Looking at a king’s mouth, one would think he never sucked at his mother’s breast” (p. 26).

Rather than adopting Western sociological terminology to explain vertical mobility or power hierarchies, Achebe utilizes a sharp Local Context-Awareness expressed through grounded biological metaphors. This technique demonstrates that communicative efficacy in Achebe's text does not rely on adherence to standard English lexical norms. Instead, it flourishes through the successful transfer of traditional values into a global medium, ensuring that the cultural essence remains intact during the process of linguistic transition.

Arundhati Roy: The God of Small Things (1997)

In contrast to Achebe's structural integration of proverbs, Arundhati Roy facilitates decolonization through syntactic deconstruction. Utilizing nonstandard capitalization in phrases such as *“The Orangedrink Lemondrink Man”* or *“The Loss of Sophie Mol,”* Roy constructs an autonomous system of data classification based on the emotional significance of characters rather than formal grammatical protocols. In *The God of Small Things (1997)*, Roy constructs a “dialect of memory” that radically challenges grammatical conventions. Through statements such as:

“It was a time when the Unthinkable became Thinkable...” (p. 31),

Roy assigns ontological weight to emotional entities by transforming adjectives into abstract nouns, thereby granting them a status equal to that of official institutions. From a digital decolonization perspective, this strategy disrupts conventional Natural Language Processing (NLP) systems, which typically categorize capitalization only as “named entities.” By granting visual authority to private trauma, Roy compels the English language to acknowledge a hierarchy of internal experiences often marginalized by state-driven grand narratives. Furthermore, Roy employs deliberate “Linguistic Noise” through phonetic

wordplay to preserve the sensory integrity of her characters. This is exemplified in the phrase:

“Locusts Stand I” (p. 154),

There is an auditory representation of the children’s perception of the term “Local Standby.” Technically, this functions as a resistance against linguistic standardization and the autocorrect mechanisms of modern writing. By prioritizing the rhythms of Malayalam and local perception over lexical precision, Roy rejects total linguistic assimilation. This practice demonstrates that her grammatical deviations are not merely rhetorical flourishes but subversive acts intended to safeguard the integrity of the local “voice” amid the dominance of global English.

Laksmi Pamuntjak: Amba (The Question of Red) (2014)

Distinct from Roy’s radical subversion, Laksmi Pamuntjak employs epic intellectualism as a decolonial strategy. Through intense intertextuality, Pamuntjak integrates the *Mahabharata* into the historical discourse of 1965, bridging traditional mythology and modern political reality. Her elegant, philosophically reflective style challenges the label of “exoticism” often attached to translated literature. Within the framework of Decolonizing the Digital Page, Pamuntjak demonstrates that local historical data, often viewed as “gaps” or “absences” by dominant narratives, can be reconstructed into a solid, authoritative knowledge structure through precise language and rigorous research. In *The Question of Red* (2014), Pamuntjak utilizes epistemological translation, mapping Javanese cosmology onto a sophisticated English framework. Through the protagonist’s self-identification:

“I was Amba, the eldest daughter of the King of Kasi...” (p. 14),

Mythology is used not as a decorative element but as a logical framework that determines identity. She performs a “remapping” of names as complex data entities, forcing English to carry the ontological weight of classical Eastern narratives. This ensures that local identity is not reduced during global circulation but remains an autonomous historical subject. Her use of interrogative structures, such as:

“For what is history but the ordering of the past?” (p. 382),

The sentences reflect high-level intellectual rigor. By blending poetic aesthetics with international discursive standards, Pamuntjak demonstrates that English can serve as an instrument for organizing the “empty spaces” of national history, positioning Indonesian narratives within an equal global intellectual dialogue.

Intan Paramaditha: Apple and Knife (2018) & The Wandering (2020)

Intan Paramaditha completes this decolonial spectrum by utilizing the Gothic genre and the abject body as tools for feminist critique. In *Apple and Knife* (2018), she deconstructs myths that perpetuate female subordination. Her linguistic style is marked by provocative imagery:

“Beauty is a curse, and for years I’ve been trying to vomit it out” (p. 45).

By using the verb “*vomit*,” Paramaditha transforms passive feminine aesthetics into an act of physical rejection, delegitimizing hegemonic Western beauty standards. This grants agency to female characters through the “language of horror,” turning biological experience into a socio-political instrument of resistance. In *The Wandering* (2020), Paramaditha explores border-crossing through spectral metaphors that challenge linear identity. The quote:

“But a ghost is just a story that refuses to die, isn’t it?” (p. 112),

The author utilizes circular metaphors to question the validity of geopolitical and algorithmic boundaries. In the context of global mobility, this functions to deconstruct “boundaries” as fragile narrative constructs. By pairing spatial terms with supernatural elements, Paramaditha creates a discourse on travel that rejects cultural geofencing. Her approach serves as an “aesthetic interruption,” proving that local narratives labeled as “dark” or “taboo” by algorithmic morality are, in fact, crucial spaces of resistance against digital cultural homogenization. These authors demonstrate that the “irregularity” of postcolonial text is a vital defense mechanism against the linear efficiency of AI. While Achebe retools syntax, Roy disrupts digital categorization, Pamuntjak fills historical voids with epistemological precision, and Paramaditha interrupts the aesthetic status quo.

Decolonial focus

In this critical review, each author’s work is analyzed through a specialized thematic lens to dissect how English linguistic structures are reconstructed to accommodate non-Western realities. The following analysis explores four pri-

mary pillars of technique: Conceptual Transliteration, Memory & Phonetic Dialects, Mythological Epistemology, and Gothic Subversion. Collectively, these strategies constitute a formidable resistance against the homogenization of global language. Comparative Framework of Decolonial Techniques

The table below outlines the strategic divergence among the four authors in their effort to reclaim the English language:

Author	Primary technique	linguistic objective
Chinua Achebe	Conceptual transliteration	Preserving the internal logic and materiality of local culture.
Arundhati Roy	Memory & phonetic dialects	Resisting linguistic standardization and totalizing assimilation.
Laksmi Pamuntjak	Mythological epistemology	Granting intellectual authority and discursive weight to local history.
Intan Paramaditha	Gothic subversion	Delegitimizing patriarchy and eroding rigid geopolitical boundaries.

The four pillars, Conceptual Transliteration, Memory & Phonetic Dialects, Mythological Epistemology, and Gothic Subversion, form a cohesive front against the encroaching tide of Algorithmic Imperialism. By deliberately embedding local ontologies and “irregular” linguistic markers into their texts, Achebe, Roy, Pamuntjak, and Paramaditha create a literary landscape that resists the flattening effects of modern technology. In addition, the threat of AI-driven standardization lies in its “corrective” nature, which views cultural nuances as noise to be filtered. However, as this research demonstrates, it is precisely within this “noise” that the sovereignty of the Global South is maintained. These authors prove that decolonization in the 21st century is a matter of maintaining the complexity of human history against the reductive logic of the machine.

The analysis in this section focuses on how Achebe facilitates decolonization through the theme of Conceptual Transliteration. This technique transcends mere linguistic transfer; rather, it imposes the cognitive logic and social structures of Igbo society onto English syntax, thereby forging a “new English” rooted in local materiality. Chinua Achebe pioneered conceptual transliteration by embedding the internal logic of the Igbo language within English structures. Through material metaphors, such as “*proverbs are the palm-oil with which words are eaten*”, Achebe rejects Western abstraction and compels the English language to submit to African cognitive schemata. This strategy establishes a form of linguistic sovereignty in which the colonial instrument is forced to serve local sociological concepts without compromising its cultural integrity.

Arundhati Roy’s strategies through the themes of Memory Dialects and Phonetic Subversion. Roy rejects the authority of standardized grammar by documenting childhood sounds and trauma as markers of linguistic identity. The focus of this analysis is how grammatical deviations and phonetic wordplay are

employed to shield the local “voice” from censorship and modern algorithmic standardization. Arundhati Roy pushes this subversion into more experimental realms by constructing a “dialect of memory.” By utilizing nonstandard capitalization for emotive terms (e.g., “*the Unthinkable*”) and phonetic puns (“*Locusts Stand I*”), Roy not only defies grammatical conventions but also disrupts modern digital categorization systems, such as Natural Language Processing (NLP). She prioritizes sensory authenticity and the local rhythms of Malayalam over lexical standardization, ensuring that the individual voice is not reduced by the mechanisms of cultural “autocorrect.”

The following analysis employs the lens of Mythological Epistemology to examine how Laksmi Pamuntjak bridges modern history with classical Eastern philosophy. This narrative demonstrates that her use of sophisticated English is not an act of assimilation but rather an intellectual tool for positioning Javanese mythology as a valid framework of data within global historical discourse. Laksmi Pamuntjak offers a distinct dimension through epistemological translation. She employs highly sophisticated, academic English to remap Indonesia’s dark history through the lens of mythology (notably the character of Amba). This technique demonstrates that narratives from the Global South can operate within the most rigorous international discursive standards. Pamuntjak integrates historical datasets with Javanese cosmology, ensuring that local identity emerges as a complex, autonomous intellectual entity rather than merely an exoticized object of trauma.

In conclusion, this analysis highlights Intan Paramaditha’s use of Gothic Subversion. This technique borrows elements of horror and striking aesthetics to dismantle patriarchal narratives and geopolitical boundaries. The primary focus is the deployment of metaphors of the “abject” body as linguistic instruments to reclaim marginalized female agency. Intan Paramaditha utilizes Gothic Subversion and metaphors of the abject body to deconstruct patriarchy. By transforming conventional concepts of beauty into aggressive physical acts (such as “*vomit*”), she empowers women to reject passive aesthetic standards. Through circular metaphors of “ghosts” and border-crossings, Paramaditha further challenges the linearity of identity and geopolitical constraints, offering a perspective that rejects the centre-periphery dichotomy in global mobility.

Contribution to the digital page

This analysis positions Chinua Achebe, Arundhati Roy, Laksmi Pamuntjak, and Intan Paramaditha as agents of decolonization within cyberspace. These authors use various critical techniques to modify the back-end of digital data structures, from enriching cultural datasets to subverting hegemonic natural language processing (NLP) systems.

In *Things Fall Apart*, Chinua Achebe does not simply tell a story; he infuses the internal logic of the Igbo language into the structures of English. Technically, this contribution is a form of Cultural Data Augmentation, vital to the ‘Digital Page’. Colonial algorithms are often trained on homogeneous datasets, which leads to a bias that prevents an understanding of the context that lies outside of the Western tradition. Achebe, by using material metaphors such as ‘proverbs are the palm-oil with which words are eaten’, provides linguistic data that compels search and translation algorithms to recognize a non-Western cognitive framework. This is an attempt to ensure that African cultural representation in the digital space is not reduced to mere raw data, but rather to a valuable cultural knowledge system.

Arundhati Roy’s work, *The God of Small Things*, poses a challenge, both direct and technical, towards the mechanisms of Natural Language Processing (NLP). Roy’s “memory dialect” uses nonstandard capitalization (e.g., “the Unthinkable”) and phonetic transcription (“Locusts Stand I”) to subvert Named Entity Recognition (NER) systems. The conventional NER system is built to recognize important entities, such as locations or organizations, based on capitalization. Roy disrupts this logic by assigning the “institutional” status to the emotions and trauma of her childhood. The contribution to the digital page is to exemplify that human language need not follow a sequence; he compelled AI technology to understand that meaning often lies in grammatical deviations rather than in strict adherence to the global standard of the English language.

Laksmi Pamuntjak integrates mythology and history in *Amba* and makes a case for an alternative history for the digital south. In the global digital landscape, historiographies are primarily from the Global North. Pamuntjak’s command of the English language and choice of history as a medium create an original English-language primary historical digital dataset for the author and researcher. *Digital South* documents history in a way that shows the researcher that Indonesia’s history is not an exotic footnote or a traumatized data dump, but a significant digital contribution. *Digital South* is reclaiming the “Digital Page” for the Global South.

Intan Paramaditha, in *The Wandering and Apple and Knife*, disrupts digital narrative homogeneity and, in so doing, offers us something unique. Digital content algorithms favor a clean, orderly, and linear aesthetic. With the use of Gothic Subversion and her so-called abject body metaphors, and the poetics of a patriarchy she dissects, Paramaditha puts “disorder” into the data flow. The use of horror in the writing, as well as the circular narrative structure of the “ghost” of the dead who refuses to die, is intended to circumvent cultural geofencing. The “Digital Page” is not a sterile, homogeneous space but one that houses complexity, horror, and the agency of women. This is her contribution.

The authors' works are not only fiction but also constitute high-quality data essential for training future AIs. If AI models are trained only on texts that are "grammatically obedient" to Western writing rules, we will end up with a bi-ased artificial intelligence. On the other hand, incorporating Achebe's, Roy's, Pamuntjak's, and Paramaditha's linguistic strategies will enable us to lay the foundations for Digital Decolonization. This cyberspace can understand, appreciate, and replicate the full diversity of human logic.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this research indicate that postcolonial writing practices have, in contemporary times, engaged not only the colonial language hegemony in its physical manifestation, but also a structurally technological determinism. The transformation from classical colonialism to Linguistic Imperialism 2.0 marks a shift from the discipline of the body (through schooling and missionaries) to cognitive disciplining via algorithms. The following analysis examines the linguistic techniques of world writers from Achebe to Paramaditha as sites of resistance to the imposition of digital standards that often engage in the 'ontological erasure' of local identities. In postcolonial writing and the inquiry into the style and linguistic techniques of the writer, there is a dialectic of deep tension between cultural creativity and the constraints of modern technology. If, in classical colonial times, the imposition of language was carried out through education and missionaries, now, in the digital era, coloniality operates through machine learning algorithms that act as modern 'language police'.

A phenomenon of this sort can be classified as Linguistic Imperialism 2.0, in which language standardization is no longer enforced through physical disciplining but rather through binary code and autocorrect mechanisms. As stated by Ni and Jia, the role of Artificial Intelligence in pedagogy and its applications is, in general, the result of the underdeveloped technology's inability to understand the richly embedded cultural contexts (Ni & Jia, 2025). AI tends to view language variation as "error" rather than "innovation," thereby systematically marginalizing the dialects and sociolects of the Global South. The risk in using LLMs is the potential to eliminate this richness by suggesting a more conventional substitution to achieve "global readability." This suggests that algorithms, in a bid to maximize functional efficiency, are in the practice of normalizing meaning within a Western cognitive framework. The consequence is what can be referred to as ontological erasure, the disavowal of a locally situated reality that is invisible to narrow machine logics (Lamem, 2025; Ha & Nguyen, 2024).

The work of Arundhati Roy employs the subversive use of 'Linguistic Noise' as in "Locusts Stand I," which is radical in the digital decolonization debates. This approach is focused on the rhythm, sound, and structure of the language of

heterogeneous people, which often contradicts the logic of the conventional Natural Language Processing (NLP) framework of linearity and clarity. Roy's use of linguistic noise is radical because, on the one hand, it prioritizes the sound and rhythm of the language of the marginalized and, on the other, it also goes against the logic of linearity and clarity of the Natural Language Processing (NLP). Roy's linguistic noise is radical because, on one hand, it prioritizes the use of the language of the marginalized, and on the other hand, it goes against the natural language processing (NLP) paradigm of linearity and clarity. In attempting to achieve clarity, AI attempts to fix the context of the 'noise' created by the linguistic structures Roy employs. The AI does not understand that the 'noise' is part of the authorship and is a form of resistance to the colonial grammar structures (Ni & Jia, 2025; Ha & Nguyen, 2024). This is the reason why it is important for the proponents of the AI discourse to argue against the algorithm and to symbolize the resistance against the linguistic homogenization that the technology advocates. Furthermore, the reason is also to preserve the richness of the Indigenous language to combat the linguistic homogenization of technology.

The Indonesian context, represented by Laksmi Pamuntjak and Intan Paramaditha, reflects the struggle of "digital pages" to contain the multiplicity of non-Western history and mythology. Pamuntjak's intertextuality, which weaves the Mahabharata cosmology into global narratives, defies the AI tendency to categorize local specificities as non-significant "data gaps." Her work proves that local wisdom is not a missing variable to be filled by Western logic, but a complete epistemic system in its own right. Similarly, Paramaditha's metaphor of "a ghost which refuses to die" serves as a critique of AI's training in Western rationalist-secular traditions. AI often fails to grasp the socio-political and spiritual dimensions of the "archipelagic gothic," potentially trivializing such literature into mere exoticism (Lamem, 2025; Keshtkar et al., 2023). This inability to comprehend the "invisible" dimensions of the Global South risks reducing profound cultural critiques into shallow, "correct" prose devoid of their haunting, subversive power.

This discussion shows that the use of AI in English literature classes poses a real risk of Digital Epistemicide, the systematic killing of local systems of knowledge through digital means. The datasets dominated by the efficient writing style of the Global North's academic traditions create an exclusionary standard that discriminates against Global South thinking. Overreliance on technology devoid of any decolonial thinking can produce text that is grammatically correct but "periphery" in a cultural sense; a text that is "clean" but "soul-less" (Ni & Jia, 2025; Bahoo et al., 2025). This research, therefore, proposes the Pedagogy of Interruption. Within this framework, teachers and writers are encouraged to view grammatical inconsistencies as a defect, but as an expression of linguistic sovereignty.

This analysis reaffirms that the 21st-century decolonization struggle is shifting toward the realm of code and data. We need more inclusive strategies that are sensitive to the postcolonial author's complex semantics to counter the linguistic dominance of AI. A digital page should not be a medium for homogenization, a "factory" of monolithic texts, but rather a polyphonic space, a place to appreciate the diverse voices, rhythms, and the ghosts of the still un-digital, non-homogenized Global South.

CONCLUSION

This research concludes that the decolonization of perspective in the digital era is no longer merely an effort to curate literary texts from non-Western authors; it has evolved into an existential struggle against algorithmic imperialism. The analysis of works by Achebe, Roy, Pamuntjak, and Paramaditha demonstrates that the potency of postcolonial literature lies in its capacity to "disrupt" and "reclaim" the English language as a vessel for local ontologies. However, the rise of Artificial Intelligence (such as ChatGPT and Grammarly), built on Eurocentric datasets, threatens these achievements by imposing a sterile, linear, and ahistorical linguistic standardization.

Critically, this study asserts that algorithms are not neutral tools; they function as an extension of the epistemic power of the Global North. When technology flags local metaphors or circular sentence structures as "errors," it is exercising a colonial function: the homogenization of diverse human thought. Therefore, 21st-century decolonization demands the courage to defend meaningful "irregularity" and a refusal to submit to the logic of machine efficiency, which reduces cultural depth to mere functional data.

Implication

This study carries significant implications for the reorientation of English Language Teaching (ELT) curricula, particularly within the domain of academic writing. The findings advocate for a paradigm shift from rigid adherence to Standard English toward the broader recognition of World Englishes. In practice, the study suggests that students must be equipped with "algorithmic negotiation" skills, the ability to critically evaluate AI-generated suggestions while preserving their authentic cultural voice. Consequently, educators are encouraged to integrate Critical AI Pedagogies that involve auditing AI-generated texts to expose ideological biases, ensuring that global digital standards do not dilute local literary meanings.

In the sector of AI development and Natural Language Processing (NLP), this research provides a vital framework for data inclusivity within the Global South. It signals a necessary transition toward training Large Language Models

(LLMs) on localized datasets. The impact of this research lies in its challenge to current algorithmic standards; future AI must recognize non-Western metaphors and syntactical structures as legitimate linguistic variations rather than “noise.” Furthermore, the study contributes to the discourse on epistemic justice by prioritizing the prevention of cultural erasure and fostering a more equitable digital representation of national identities.

Within the creative and publishing industries, this study serves as a foundation for professionals to reclaim local dialects and experimental linguistic styles in digital editing standards. By dismantling the pressures of monocultural global norms, it empowers creators to maintain cultural authenticity in their English-language works. At a systemic level, the findings influence digital sovereignty policies, redefining digital literacy not merely as a technical proficiency but as the sovereign right to express national identity. This research advocates for literacy frameworks rooted in local wisdom to safeguard cultural heritage within the global digital landscape.

REFERENCES

- Achebe, C. (1958). *Things fall apart*. Heinemann.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (1989). *The empire writes back: Theory and practice in postcolonial literatures*. Routledge.
- Bahoo, S., Cuccurullo, C., & Arshad, I. (2025). Digital transformation and artificial Intelligence in the public sector: A bibliometric analysis. *Public Management Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2024.2312345>
- Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 610–623. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922>
- Birhane, A. (2020). Algorithmic colonization in Africa. *SCRIPTed*, 17(2), 389–409. <https://doi.org/10.2966/scrip.170220.389>
- Blodgett, S., Barocas, S., Daumé, H., & Wallach, H. (2020). Language (technology) is power: A critical survey of “bias” in NLP. *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 5454–5476. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.485>
- Bodden, M. (2012). *The 1965 massacre in Indonesian literature and art*. University of British Columbia Press.
- Bose, B. (1998). Beyond the wall: Polyphony and postcoloniality in Arundhati Roy’s “The God of Small Things”. *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, 37(1–2), 59–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449859808589288>
- Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Agarwal, S., Herbert-Voss, A.,

- Krueger, G., Henighan, T., Child, R., Ramesh, A., Ziegler, D., Wu, J., Winter, C., ... Amodei, D. (2020). Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 1877–1901. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2005.14165>
- Dohale, V., Verma, P., Gunasekaran, A., & Akarte, M. (2022). Manufacturing strategy 4.0: A framework to usher towards industry 4.0 implementation for digital transformation. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 123(1), 10–40. <https://doi.org/10.1108/imds-12-2021-0790>
- Foulcher, K., & Day, T. (2002). *Clearing a space: Postcolonial readings of modern Indonesian literature*. KITLV Press.
- Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2015). *Introducing global Englishes*. Routledge.
- Gedara, N., Xu, X., DeLong, R., Aryal, S., & Jaber-Douraki, M. (2021). Global trends in cancer nanotechnology: A qualitative scientific mapping using content-based and bibliometric features for machine learning text classification. *Cancers*, 13(17), Article 4417. <https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers13174417>
- Gikandi, S. (1991). *Reading Chinua Achebe: Language and ideology in fiction*. James Currey Publishers.
- Ha, T., & Nguyen, N. (2024). Artificial Intelligence in language education: A systemic review of context-aware applications. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*.
- Hockly, N. (2023). Artificial Intelligence in English language teaching: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *RELC Journal*, 54(2), 445–451. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882231168504>
- Jalilzadeh, K. (2025). Student perspectives on teacher interpersonal behaviours in AI-mediated higher education: A Q methodology study. *European Journal of Education*, 60(4). <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.70293>
- Jenkins, J. (2009). *World Englishes: A resource book for students*. Routledge.
- Jordan, S., Smith, W., & Sala, O. (2024). Ecosystem service indicators on military-managed drylands in the western United States. *Ecological Applications*, 35(1). <https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.3044>
- Keshtkar, F., Zhou, Y., & Li, M. (2023). Cultural sensitivity in Large Language Models: A survey on mythology and historical data gaps. *ACM Transactions on Asian and Low-Resource Language Information Processing*.
- Kwet, M. (2019). Digital colonialism: US empire and the new imperialism in the Global South. *Race & Class*, 60(4), 3–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306396818823172>
- Lamem, K. (2025). Ontological erasure in the age of AI: A postcolonial critique of digital knowledge systems. *Digital Humanities Quarterly*.
- Lin, M., Mariné-Roig, E., & Molina, N. (2022). Gastronomy tourism and well-being: Evidence from Taiwan and Catalonia Michelin-starred restaurants.

- International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(5), Article 2778. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19052778>
- Mignolo, W. D. (2011). *The darker side of Western modernity: Global futures, decolonial options*. Duke University Press.
- Mittelstadt, B., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. *Big Data & Society*, 3(2), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951716679679>
- Ngema, F., Mdhluli, B., Mmileng, P., Shungube, P., Makgaba, M., & Hossana, T. (2024). A bibliometric review of predictive modelling for cervical cancer risk. *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2024.1493944>
- Ni, L., & Jia, X. (2025). Linguistic Imperialism 2.0: AI and the standardization of English in the Global South. *Language Policy*.
- Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. NYU Press.
- Pamuntjak, L. (2014). *The question of red*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Paramaditha, I. (2013). Traces of the uncanny in Indonesia's dark history. *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, 14(3). <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649373.2013.801602>
- Paramaditha, I. (2018). *Apple and a knife*. Brow Books.
- Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America. *Nepantla: Views from South*, 1(3), 533–580.
- Roy, A. (1997). *The god of small things*. IndiaInk; Flamingo.
- Sakupapa, T. C. (2023). Tracking the decolonial in African Christian theology. *International Review of Mission*, 112(2), 202–217. <https://doi.org/10.1111/irrom.12476>
- Silova, I., Millei, Z., & Piattoeva, N. (2017). Interrupting the coloniality of knowledge production in comparative education: Postsocialist and postcolonial dialogues after the Cold War. *Comparative Education Review*, 61(S1), S74–S102. <https://doi.org/10.1086/690458>
- Staines, Z. (2022). Social quarantining in the construction and maintenance of White Australia. *Sociology*, 57(5), 1017–1039. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00380385221129046>
- Tiffin, H., Ashcroft, B., & Griffiths, G. (2007). *The empire writes back: Theory and practice in postcolonial literatures* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Tiong, S., Yang, X., Touzet, A., Millward, C., Zipser, C., Tetreault, L., ... & Davies, B. (2025). *Development of a core outcome set for neurological disorders (COS-Neuro): An AI-assisted thematic framework analysis*. [Preprint]. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.09.22.25336392>

- Veracini, L., & Weaver-Hightower, R. (2023). 'New' media: Decolonial opportunities or digital colonialism? *Humanities*, 13(1), Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.3390/h13010002>
- Wanniarachchi, V., Mathrani, A., Sušnjak, T., & Scogings, C. (2022). Methodological aspects in the study of fat stigma in social media contexts: A systematic literature review. *Applied Sciences*, 12(10), Article 5045. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app12105045>
- Xie, X., Alnafrah, I., & Dagestani, A. (2025). Tokenizing innovation: A blockchain-based innovation system as a step toward achieving sustainable development. *Sustainable Development*, 33(3), 4075–4098. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.3325>
- Young, R. J. C. (2016). *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell.