

Sovereign AI Pedagogy in Political Science: Toward Regionally Grounded AI-Enhanced Teaching of ASEAN Politics and International Relations

Nur Syahirah Mad Rosli¹

¹Centre for Languages and Foundation Studies, Universiti Sultan Azlan Shah, Perak, Malaysia

¹Email: syahirahmadrosli@gmail.com

Proceedings of the Kalijaga International Conference on Education 2026

Abstract. Political science education in Southeast Asia faces two related challenges. Curricula remain dominated by Western-centred theoretical frameworks that inadequately reflect the historical and institutional realities of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), and artificial intelligence (AI) tools used in education are trained predominantly on Global North data, risking the reproduction of epistemic dependencies. This conceptual study pursues three interrelated objectives: examining the current state of AI integration in ASEAN political science education, analysing how regional AI governance frameworks conceptualise the relationship between AI, education, and sovereignty, and proposing a structured pedagogical response. A qualitative research design combining document analysis and comparative policy analysis was adopted. Twelve primary policy and governance documents, supplemented by peer-reviewed literature published between 2021 and 2026, were analysed through a three-stage thematic coding procedure. The findings identify an epistemic dependency problem comprising four dimensions: theoretical, technological, pedagogical, and assessment dependency. The Discussion explains why this dependency arises and proposes the Sovereign AI Pedagogy Framework for Political Science (SAPF-PS), an integrated model comprising four interdependent pillars: Epistemic Grounding, AI-Enhanced Methods, Sovereign Assessment Design, and Critical Digital Literacy. As the findings derive from interpretive document analysis, the SAPF-PS is presented as a conceptual contribution pending future empirical validation. The study also considers the risk that AI sovereignty rhetoric may be appropriated to justify state control over information rather than to strengthen educational autonomy, and argues that this risk must be actively managed rather than assumed away. The study concludes that embedding AI sovereignty within curriculum design, classroom activities, and assessment practices may strengthen ASEAN's capacity to shape its own AI-informed political futures.

Keywords: *AI-enhanced pedagogy; AI sovereignty; ASEAN politics; digital literacy; political science education*

Abbreviations: AI = Artificial Intelligence; APSA = American Political Science Association; ASEAN = Association of Southeast Asian Nations; IR = International Relations; POFMA = Protection from Online Falsehoods and Manipulation Act; SAPF-PS = Sovereign AI Pedagogy Framework for Political Science; SEAMEO = Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization; UNESCO = United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

INTRODUCTION

The rapid growth of artificial intelligence (AI) has created major opportunities and challenges for higher education. This tension is particularly acute within political science, where AI tools for analysis, content generation, and prediction are reshaping how politics is studied [1]. UNESCO's 2023 guidance on generative AI in education does not offer ASEAN-specific direction for integrating AI into social-science curricula [1], and this absence, read alongside the STEM-focused frameworks that dominate current regional policy discourse, suggests that AI integration into political science teaching in Southeast Asia remains comparatively underdeveloped. Governments and political actors across ASEAN increasingly deploy AI, yet classrooms have been slow to adopt it as an active pedagogical tool [2].

This gap has direct pedagogical implications. AI-generated deepfakes, automated disinformation, and algorithm-driven diplomatic signalling already shape ASEAN elections and diplomacy [3], [4]. Students who cannot critically analyse these phenomena are ill-prepared for the political environments they will enter. Instructors also face a related integrity challenge, because institutional responses to AI in education focus mainly on detecting misuse rather than teaching AI competency [2], [5]. Left unaddressed, this narrow focus on detection leaves students to encounter AI-driven political manipulation without the analytical tools needed to interrogate it.

Political science pedagogy in the region remains predominantly lecture-driven. It also relies heavily on Western-centred theoretical frameworks developed outside ASEAN's historical and institutional context [6]. Students are, as a result, often trained to interpret Southeast Asian politics through paradigms that do not reflect regional realities [7], [8], [9].

AI sovereignty, understood as a region's capacity to exercise meaningful control over its AI infrastructure, data flows, and epistemic frameworks, adds a further dimension to this challenge [3]. When ASEAN political science programmes rely on AI tools trained predominantly on Global North data, they risk reproducing the epistemic dependencies the discipline should overcome [10]. Decisions about who develops AI, whose data trains it, and which values it embeds are, in this sense, political rather than purely technical questions [11].

Existing scholarship has begun to address parts of this problem. Ishiyama et al. examined how political science departments in North America respond to generative AI, but focused on integrity and detection rather than curriculum redesign [2]. Koh proposed AI-assisted simulation pedagogy for ASEAN diplomacy education, demonstrating pedagogical feasibility but without addressing the underlying theoretical or technological dependencies that shape which perspectives such simulations reproduce [12]. Sondarjee examined curriculum decolonisation in Global South international relations (IR) teaching generally, without engaging with AI governance or ASEAN-specific policy architecture [7]. What remains unexamined, therefore, is how ASEAN's own expanding AI governance architecture, comprising instruments such as the ASEAN Guide on AI Governance and Ethics (2024) and the ASEAN Responsible AI Roadmap (2025-2030), could be repurposed as pedagogical resources, and how assessment practices should adapt to generative AI within this regional context. This gap sits at the intersection of AI governance, decolonial pedagogy, and political science education, and it carries particular weight for a region navigating both rapid digitalisation and long-standing epistemic asymmetries.

This study repositions AI not merely as a tool for improving educational efficiency but as a subject of political inquiry and a method of political analysis [13]. It contributes new knowledge in two respects: first, by identifying four conceptually distinct dimensions of epistemic dependency that connect curriculum content, AI infrastructure, classroom practice, and assessment policy within a single analytical frame; and second, by proposing an integrated pedagogical framework, the Sovereign AI Pedagogy Framework for Political Science (SAPF-PS), that operationalises ASEAN's own governance instruments as teaching resources rather than treating them purely as external policy documents. Three interrelated objectives guide the study: (i) to examine the current state of AI integration in ASEAN political science higher education and identify pedagogical gaps; (ii) to analyse how regional AI governance frameworks, including the ASEAN Guide on AI Governance and Ethics (2024) [14] and the ASEAN Responsible AI Roadmap (2025-2030) [15], conceptualise the relationship between AI, education, and sovereignty; and (iii) to propose the SAPF-PS, which embeds AI sovereignty within curriculum design, classroom activities, and assessment practices appropriate to ASEAN's institutional context.

Related scholarship further frames AI sovereignty as an institutional higher-education concern and AI literacy as a competency domain requiring explicit curricular development [16], [17], [18].

METHODS

Study area

This conceptual study does not involve a physical field site; its “study area” is defined analytically as the regional AI governance and higher-education policy landscape of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) between 2021 and 2026. The scope encompasses regional AI governance instruments, international education policy documents, and institutional reports pertaining to political science pedagogy across ASEAN member states.

Procedures

Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative research design based on document analysis and comparative policy analysis. Qualitative document analysis is an established approach in political science research that enables examination of the ideological assumptions, discursive constructions, and policy logics embedded within official documents [19], [20]. This approach suits the present study because its primary sources, comprising regional AI governance frameworks, national education policies, and international guidelines, are authoritative, publicly accessible, and directly relevant to the research objectives [21], [22]. The study involved no human participants; no primary data were collected through interviews, surveys, or experiments, and institutional review board approval was therefore not required. All documents are fully cited, and the analysis is conducted transparently with respect to the interpretive framework adopted. As a document-based conceptual study, the findings reported below are interpretive rather than empirical, and the proposed framework should be read as a theoretically grounded proposal pending future field validation. SI units and percentage formatting for laboratory measurement are not applicable in this conceptual study.

Data Sources and Sampling

A total of 12 primary policy and governance documents were analysed, comprising five regional ASEAN AI governance frameworks, four UNESCO international education policy documents, and three additional institutional reports (the SEAMEO State of Higher Education in Southeast Asia report [23], the ASEAN Foundation's AI Ready ASEAN report [24], and the Oxford Insights Government AI Readiness Index 2024 [25]), supplemented by peer-reviewed scholarly literature. Document selection followed a purposive sampling strategy based on three criteria: documents had to be produced by authoritative regional or international organisations; they had to focus directly on AI governance, AI in education, or political science pedagogy; and they had to be published between 2021 and 2026, with earlier documents included only where they constitute foundational methodological or theoretical references with no direct recent equivalent. Of the 48 total sources cited in this manuscript, 31 (approximately 65%) were published within the last five years (2021-2026); the remaining sources are foundational theoretical or methodological references (for example, Bowen's document analysis method and Tickner's postcolonial IR critique) that have no direct recent equivalent and are retained for conceptual grounding rather than empirical currency. The proportion of recent sources was increased from the earlier draft of this manuscript by incorporating additional 2025-2026 institutional and peer-reviewed material identified during revision; the residual reliance on a small number of older foundational texts is disclosed transparently rather than concealed, since these texts remain the original and most authoritative statements of the theoretical positions they represent.

The supplementary peer-reviewed literature was identified through structured searches of Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar, using combinations of the search terms "AI" OR "artificial intelligence", "political science education" OR "international relations pedagogy", "ASEAN" OR "Southeast Asia", and "AI sovereignty" OR "epistemic dependency" OR "decolonial pedagogy". Searches were restricted to English-language, peer-reviewed journal articles, working papers from recognised disciplinary associations, and institutional or governmental reports published between 2013 and 2026, with the majority concentrated in 2021-2026. Records were screened by title and abstract for direct relevance to AI in political science or IR education, AI governance in ASEAN, or decolonial and postcolonial critiques of IR curricula; sources that addressed AI in education generally without disciplinary or regional relevance were excluded. An initial search identified 104 candidate sources, of which 48 met the inclusion criteria and were retained for citation following full-text screening. The regional AI governance frameworks and institutional reports are treated as primary sources subject to document analysis, distinct from the secondary peer-reviewed scholarship cited throughout the manuscript.

The five regional AI governance frameworks analysed were the ASEAN Guide on AI Governance and Ethics (2024) [14], the Expanded ASEAN Guide on AI Governance and Ethics for Generative AI (2025) [26], the ASEAN Responsible AI Roadmap (2025-2030) [15], the ASEAN Digital Masterplan 2025 [27], and the ASEAN AI Safety Network (ASEAN AI SAFE) Declaration (2025) [28]. The four UNESCO international education policy documents were the Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research (2023) [1], the AI Competency Framework for Teachers (2024) [29], the AI Competency Framework for Students (2024) [30], and the Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (2021) [31]. The three additional institutional reports were the SEAMEO State of Higher Education in Southeast Asia report (2024) [23], the ASEAN Foundation's AI Ready ASEAN report (2024) [24], and the Oxford Insights Government AI Readiness Index 2024 [25]. Scholarly literature comprised peer-reviewed articles from journals including *PS: Political Science and Politics*, *Frontiers in Political Science*, *Frontiers in Education*, the *Journal of Political Science Education*, and *Educational Policy*, together with country-level case studies examining AI and elections in Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, the Philippines, and Singapore.

Data analysis

Data analysis followed a three-stage process informed by the document analysis methodology of Bowen [19] and the reflexive thematic analysis approach of Braun and Clarke [32], underpinned by the pragmatic research paradigm of Morgan [33]. In the first stage, all selected documents were read thoroughly to establish familiarity with their content, scope, and conceptual framing. In the second stage, thematic coding identified recurring themes, including AI as a technical driver versus a pedagogical tool, Western-centric epistemology, AI sovereignty and data governance, simulation pedagogy, disinformation and electoral integrity, and digital literacy frameworks. In the third stage, comparative analysis identified similarities, differences, and gaps in how regional policy documents and scholarly literature conceptualise AI within political science education.

The four dimensions of epistemic dependency introduced in the Results, namely theoretical, technological, pedagogical, and assessment dependency, were operationalised as distinct coding categories during the second analytical stage. Theoretical dependency was coded where sources discussed curriculum

content, theoretical paradigms, or syllabus design. Technological dependency was coded where the focus concerned the origin, training data, or infrastructure of AI systems, independent of classroom use. Pedagogical dependency was coded where sources addressed classroom practice, instructional design, or teaching methods. Assessment dependency was coded separately where sources concerned evaluation practices, academic integrity policy, or grading criteria. Although these dimensions interact in practice, each source was assigned to a category based on its primary analytical focus, keeping the coding scheme conceptually distinct while capturing their interactions.

Positionality and Limitations

Document analysis is inherently interpretive, and both the selection and interpretation of documents reflect particular perspectives and research priorities. The study focuses exclusively on ASEAN member states; developments in other Southeast Asian countries outside ASEAN fall beyond its scope. Because AI governance evolves rapidly, some policy documents may have been revised or superseded between the completion of the analysis and publication. To minimise this limitation, the study reports publication dates transparently and attributes all findings directly to their original sources.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Current State of AI Integration in Political Science Education

The document analysis reveals a consistent, structurally embedded pattern. Although ASEAN member states have made substantial progress in developing regional AI governance frameworks, AI integration into political science curricula remains limited, fragmented, and predominantly framed in instrumental terms. The State of Higher Education in Southeast Asia [23] identifies digital literacy, curriculum relevance, and instructional quality as reform priorities, yet makes no specific reference to AI as a pedagogical approach within the social sciences. The ASEAN Digital Masterplan 2025 [27] similarly emphasises advanced digital competencies, but its education initiatives focus primarily on STEM disciplines, leaving the social sciences largely unaddressed.

This instrumental framing is corroborated by an APSA working paper, which found that institutional responses to AI in political science education focus largely on detecting and preventing misuse rather than incorporating AI as a pedagogical resource [2], [5]. A broader review of generative AI adoption in higher education confirms that assessment-integrity concerns dominate institutional policy discourse across disciplines [5]. Scholarship on AI in political science education is further dominated by studies originating from North American and European institutions [2], while research specific to Southeast Asian political science programmes remains scarce [12].

ASEAN's AI Governance Architecture as an Underutilised Resource

The analysis identifies an epistemic dependency problem comprising four conceptually distinct dimensions, summarised in Table 1: theoretical, technological, pedagogical, and assessment dependency.

Table 1. Dimensions of Epistemic Dependency in ASEAN Political Science Education

Dimension	Locus of Dependency	Illustrative Evidence
Theoretical	Curriculum content and theoretical paradigms	Continued dominance of realism, liberalism, and constructivism; postcolonial perspectives underrepresented [7], [8]
Technological	Origin, training data, and infrastructure of AI systems	AI systems trained predominantly on Global North data risk marginalising local languages and regional knowledge [10], [34]
Pedagogical	Classroom practice and instructional design	Instruction remains predominantly lecture-driven with limited AI-supported active learning [2], [5], [12]
Assessment	Evaluation practice and integrity policy	Grading and integrity policies treat AI chiefly as a risk to penalise rather than a competency to teach [5], [35], [36]

Note: Compiled by the author based on document analysis of the sources cited in each row.

The theoretical dimension concerns the continued dominance of Western IR theories, particularly realism, liberalism, and constructivism, in curricula, with postcolonial perspectives systematically underrepresented [7], [8]. The technological dimension is conceptually distinct: it concerns the origin and design of AI systems themselves rather than curriculum content. AI systems trained predominantly on Global North data risk marginalising local languages, indigenous knowledge systems, and region-specific political contexts when deployed in Southeast Asian classrooms [10], [34], [13]. A concrete illustration of this risk is Microsoft's Indonesian-language chatbot Rinna, which, in order to avoid politically or culturally sensitive missteps, was deliberately restricted from discussing politics, religion, or race, producing an AI

persona whose conversational competence never developed beyond a superficial, non-political register [37]. This example demonstrates how AI systems designed without regional political and cultural grounding tend either to misread local political contexts or to avoid substantive political engagement altogether, reinforcing rather than correcting epistemic dependency. The pedagogical dimension concerns classroom practice: instruction that remains predominantly lecture-driven with limited AI-supported active learning [2], [5], [12]. The assessment dimension concerns evaluation practice, with grading and integrity policies treating AI chiefly as a risk to penalise rather than a competency to teach [5], [35], [36].

AI, Disinformation, and Electoral Politics as Pedagogical Content

Regional case studies on AI, disinformation, and electoral politics offer pedagogically valuable material largely absent from current curricula. During Indonesia's 2024 presidential election campaign, AI-generated deepfake audio and video content, including a synthetic video depicting former president Suharto endorsing the Golkar party, circulated widely on social media before being identified as synthetic by civil-society fact-checking organisations [38], [39]. Much of the initial identification and public debunking of AI-generated election content was conducted by Indonesia's CekFakta coalition of newsrooms and by MAFINDO (Masyarakat Anti Fitnah Indonesia), which operates the Kalimasada WhatsApp-based verification service, rather than by government agencies alone [40], [38], [39]. Malaysia's documented exposure to AI-generated political disinformation offers a directly relevant local case study [4], [39], while Singapore's Protection from Online Falsehoods and Manipulation Act (POFMA) illustrates how governments balance free expression against information integrity [41]. The IRLens simulation framework [42] demonstrates the educational potential of AI-assisted geopolitical scenario learning, and simulation-based learning is broadly associated with stronger student engagement and higher-order analytical skills, although evidence on its overall effectiveness remains mixed [35], [43].

Discussion

Why Epistemic Dependency Occurs?

The four dependencies identified in the Results are not coincidental; they are structurally reinforcing. Theoretical dependency persists because IR curricula were historically formed within Western academic institutions and exported through colonial and postcolonial educational ties, embedding realism, liberalism, and constructivism as default analytical lenses [6], [8], [9]. This historical process is consistent with Tickner's argument that IR as a discipline developed largely within, and for, a small number of core Western academic centres, marginalising theoretical contributions from the Global South even when regional scholars actively produced them [8]. Technological dependency compounds this legacy: Couldry and Mejias's concept of data colonialism describes how contemporary data extraction reproduces colonial-era patterns of resource appropriation, applied here to AI training data drawn disproportionately from Global North sources [10]. Building on this, Ortiz Freuler and Verhulst explain algorithmic dependence through four interconnected mechanisms: data colonialism, infrastructure dependence, epistemic colonialism, and governance colonialism [34]. Epistemic colonialism is especially relevant to political science education, because AI systems trained on Global North knowledge bases generate outputs that consistently interpret Southeast Asian politics through external perspectives rather than regional experience, as illustrated by the Rinna case above [34], [37]. In contrast, pedagogical dependency arises less from deliberate choice than institutional inertia: lecture-driven formats persist partly because active, AI-supported learning requires investment in staff development that many institutions have not yet made [2], [5]. Assessment dependency, by comparison, reflects a risk-averse institutional posture in which academic integrity offices treat generative AI primarily as a threat, crowding out consideration of AI as an assessable competency [5], [36]. Crucially, these dimensions interact: a curriculum reform addressing theoretical dependency alone will not resolve technological dependency if the AI tools used in class remain trained predominantly on Global North data, and assessment reform without pedagogical reform simply relocates the same instrumental logic to a different stage of the course.

How SAPF-PS Addresses Epistemic Dependency?

Sovereign AI Pedagogy Framework for Political Science (SAPF-PS) is proposed as a direct structural response to the interlocking dependencies identified above. Rather than treating AI sovereignty as a single intervention, the framework organises four interdependent pillars, summarised in Table 2, that are deliberately sequential and mutually reinforcing.

Table 2. Sovereign AI Pedagogy Framework for Political Science (SAPF-PS)

Pillar	Dependency Addressed	Core Mechanism
Epistemic Grounding	Theoretical dependency	Repositions Western IR theory as one tradition among several rather than the default analytical lens [44]
AI-Enhanced Methods	Technological and pedagogical dependency	Regional security simulations, AI-mediated election analysis, and AI

Pillar	Dependency Addressed	Core Mechanism
		governance workshops using regionally grounded material [12], [45]
Sovereign Assessment Design	Assessment dependency	Treats AI literacy as a graded competency rather than solely an integrity risk [36]
Critical Digital Literacy	Cross-cutting civic and professional capacity	Generalises competencies from the first three pillars into transferable engagement with ASEAN's digital public sphere [29], [30], [24]

Note: Interdependence of the four SAPF-PS pillars, from Epistemic Grounding through AI-Enhanced Methods and Sovereign Assessment Design to Critical Digital Literacy.

Epistemic Grounding establishes the conceptual orientation without which AI-Enhanced Methods would simply digitise an already Western-centred curriculum; it directly targets theoretical dependency by repositioning Western IR theory as one tradition among several rather than the default lens [44]. AI-Enhanced Methods, comprising regional security simulations, AI-mediated election campaign analysis, and AI governance policy workshops, addresses technological and pedagogical dependency simultaneously by requiring students to use AI tools reflexively on regionally grounded material rather than passively consuming AI outputs [12], [45]. Sovereign Assessment Design ensures the analytical habits cultivated through AI-Enhanced Methods are formally recognised and rewarded rather than existing only as informal classroom activity, directly countering assessment dependency by treating AI literacy as a graded competency rather than solely an integrity risk [36]. Critical Digital Literacy, finally, generalises the competencies developed across the first three pillars into transferable civic and professional capacities, closing the loop between classroom learning and students' engagement with ASEAN's digital public sphere [29], [30], [24]. It is this interdependence, rather than any single pillar in isolation, that constitutes the framework's principal analytical contribution: each pillar closes a gap the others cannot close alone.

Connecting Findings to the ASEAN Context

The 2024 Government AI Readiness Index scored Singapore at 84.25, the highest score among ASEAN and East Asian governments and second highest globally after the United States, while other ASEAN member states recorded considerably lower scores, reflecting substantial resource and infrastructure disparities within the region [25]. These disparities matter pedagogically, because a single ASEAN-wide pedagogical framework must remain adaptable to member states with markedly different levels of AI infrastructure, regulatory maturity, and institutional capacity.

A Critical Counterpoint: The Risk of State Control

AI sovereignty is not an unambiguous good, and the SAPF-PS framework must be read with this caveat firmly in view. Comparative analysis of AI governance models shows that sovereignty rhetoric can be, and has been, appropriated to concentrate control over information and digital infrastructure in the hands of state security agencies, using the language of security and sovereignty to legitimise surveillance, censorship, or content filtering rather than genuine educational or epistemic autonomy [46]. The People's Republic of China's state-centric AI governance model illustrates this risk starkly: its regulatory framework requires AI systems to adhere to prescribed political values and to exclude politically sensitive content from training data, embedding information control directly into AI outputs under the banner of sovereignty [47]. For ASEAN, where instruments such as Singapore's POFMA have themselves drawn international criticism for restricting legitimate political expression [41], the SAPF-PS must therefore distinguish carefully between AI sovereignty as a project of epistemic and pedagogical autonomy, which this study advances, and AI sovereignty as a pretext for narrowing the range of permissible political interpretation in the classroom. Embedding Critical Digital Literacy as a standing pillar of the framework is one safeguard against this risk, since it explicitly trains students to interrogate the political motivations behind any governance framework, including ASEAN's own, rather than treating regional AI governance instruments as authoritative simply because they originate within the region.

Connecting Findings to Political Science Pedagogy

For the discipline specifically, the findings suggest that AI integration cannot be treated as a generic digital-skills add-on. Political science pedagogy depends on students' capacity to interrogate power, values, and institutional design, and this is precisely what an unreflective adoption of Global North AI tools risks eroding [11], [13]. By anchoring AI-enhanced methods in authentic regional material, such as election deepfakes, ASEAN governance documents, and cross-border security disputes, SAPF-PS treats AI simultaneously as a disciplinary subject and an analytical method, aligning with calls to reposition AI as an object of political inquiry rather than a purely administrative concern [2], [13].

CONCLUSION

This study has argued that integrating AI sovereignty into political science curricula is both a timely and significant opportunity for higher education in Southeast Asia. Three converging developments create this opportunity: the growing influence of AI within ASEAN's political landscape, the continued dominance of Western-centred epistemological traditions in IR education, and the emergence of a comprehensive regional AI governance architecture.

The Results identified four interlocking dimensions of epistemic dependency, namely theoretical, technological, pedagogical, and assessment dependency, and the Discussion showed how the proposed SAPF-PS may address each through four interdependent pillars: Epistemic Grounding, AI-Enhanced Methods, Sovereign Assessment Design, and Critical Digital Literacy. Together, these pillars aim to cultivate political science graduates who are not merely competent users of AI technologies but critical, regionally grounded scholars capable of evaluating AI's broader political implications, including the risk that AI sovereignty itself may be misused to justify state overreach.

Building on these findings, this study further recommends that regional organisations such as ASEAN, SEAMEO, and the ASEAN Foundation consider developing discipline-specific AI pedagogy guidelines for social science educators, building on AI Ready ASEAN and UNESCO's competency frameworks [29], [30], [24].

As a conceptual study, the SAPF-PS has not yet been empirically piloted, and its practical value depends on future implementation and evaluation. Future research should pursue mixed-methods longitudinal studies of educators and students implementing AI-enhanced practices across diverse ASEAN institutional contexts, alongside comparative research on national AI literacy strategies in social science education. ASEAN's capacity to shape its own AI-informed political future may depend in part not only on technological advancement but also on the quality of political science education equipped to analyse AI critically and safeguard the epistemic sovereignty of Southeast Asian political thought.

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Miao, W. Holmes, and M. Huang, *Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research*. Paris, France: UNESCO, 2023.
- [2] J. Ishiyama, K. Bruce, and M. Rothman, "Teaching and learning political science in the era of AI," *Amer. Polit. Sci. Assoc.*, Washington, DC, USA, Working Paper, 2026.
- [3] N. Hamadeh and K. Amin, "Digital sovereignty and AI education: reconceptualising national security in the age of generative AI," *J. Inf. Policy*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 45-68, 2025.
- [4] I. Adilah and H. Sabri, "AI-generated deepfakes and political disinformation in Malaysia: threats to democratic integrity," *Asian Polit. Policy*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 112-130, 2024.
- [5] L. Hughes, J. Dwivedi, and R. Rana, "Navigating the challenges of generative AI adoption in higher education," *Australas. J. Educ. Technol.*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 88-106, 2025.
- [6] D. Jones, "Western bias in international relations theory: towards a critique of epistemic parochialism," *Int. Stud. Rev.*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 890-912, 2021.
- [7] P. Sondarjee, "Teaching international relations in the Global South: curriculum decolonisation and epistemic justice," *J. Polit. Sci. Educ.*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 305-322, 2023.
- [8] A. B. Tickner, "Seeing IR differently: notes from the Third World," *Millennium: J. Int. Stud.*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 295-324, 2003.
- [9] M. De Freitas, "Decolonising IR pedagogy in the Global South: towards a pluriversal approach," *Contexto Int.*, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 1-25, 2025.
- [10] N. Couldry and U. A. Mejias, *The Costs of Connection: How Data Is Colonizing Human Life and Appropriating It for Capitalism*. Stanford, CA, USA: Stanford Univ. Press, 2019.
- [11] S. Ahmed, "Who owns AI? Power, politics, and the geopolitics of artificial intelligence," *Global Policy*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 22-39, 2026.
- [12] D. Koh, "Simulating ASEAN diplomacy: an immersive pedagogy for international relations education," *J. Polit. Sci. Educ.*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 88-105, 2024.
- [13] P. Salden, "Digital sovereignty in higher education: conceptual foundations and institutional implications," *Tertiary Educ. Manag.*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 24-41, 2025.
- [14] ASEAN Secretariat, "ASEAN guide on AI governance and ethics," Jakarta, Indonesia, 2024.
- [15] ASEAN Secretariat, "ASEAN responsible AI roadmap 2025-2030," Jakarta, Indonesia, 2025.
- [16] M. Webb, "AI sovereignty and higher education policy: global trends and institutional responses," *Stud. Higher Educ.*, vol. 49, no. 8, pp. 1320-1336, 2024.
- [17] F. Baskara, "AI literacy competency domains in higher education: a systematic review," *Educ. Inf. Technol.*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 2015-2039, 2025.
- [18] S. Hervieux and A. Wheatley, "Developing a GenAI literacy framework for higher education," *Portal: Libr. Acad.*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 567-590, 2024.

- [19] G. A. Bowen, "Document analysis as a qualitative research method," *Qual. Res. J.*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 27-40, 2009, doi: 10.3316/QRJ0902027.
- [20] C. Cardno, "Policy document analysis: a practical educational leadership tool and a qualitative research methodology," *Educ. Admin.: Theory Pract.*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 623-640, 2018.
- [21] A. Boeren, "Understanding the methodological basis of document analysis in qualitative education research," *Qual. Inq. Educ. Pract.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 12-28, 2022.
- [22] R. B. Atkhamovich, "AI tools in political science and international relations classrooms: opportunities, challenges, and pedagogical strategies," *Central Asian J. Educ.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 40-58, 2026.
- [23] SEAMEO, *The State of Higher Education in Southeast Asia*. Bangkok, Thailand: SEAMEO Secretariat, 2024.
- [24] ASEAN Foundation, "AI ready ASEAN: building AI literacy across Southeast Asia," Jakarta, Indonesia, 2024.
- [25] Oxford Insights, *Government AI Readiness Index 2024*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Insights, 2024.
- [26] ASEAN Secretariat, "Expanded ASEAN guide on AI governance and ethics for generative AI," Jakarta, Indonesia, 2025.
- [27] ASEAN Secretariat, "ASEAN digital masterplan 2025," Jakarta, Indonesia, 2025.
- [28] ASEAN Secretariat, "ASEAN AI safety network (ASEAN AI SAFE) declaration," Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, 2025.
- [29] UNESCO, *AI Competency Framework for Teachers*. Paris, France: UNESCO, 2024.
- [30] UNESCO, *AI Competency Framework for Students*. Paris, France: UNESCO, 2024.
- [31] UNESCO, *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence*. Paris, France: UNESCO, 2021.
- [32] V. Braun and V. Clarke, "Thematic analysis: a practical guide," *Qual. Res. Psychol.*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 424-431, 2022.
- [33] D. L. Morgan, "Pragmatism as a paradigm for social research," *Qual. Inquiry*, vol. 20, no. 8, pp. 1045-1053, 2021.
- [34] J. Ortiz Freuler and S. Verhulst, "Governing AI for the Global South: sovereignty, development, and digital justice," *Internet Policy Rev.*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2025, doi: 10.14763/2025.1.1701.
- [35] C. Raymond and S. Usherwood, "Assessment in political science simulations," *PS: Polit. Sci. Polit.*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 623-630, 2013.
- [36] Digital Education Council, *Global Survey on AI Use in Higher Education: Assessment Practices and Institutional Policies*. Geneva, Switzerland: Digital Educ. Council, 2026.
- [37] EngageMedia, *Governance of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Southeast Asia*. Jakarta, Indonesia: EngageMedia, 2023.
- [38] R. Tapsell and D. McIntyre, "AI-generated disinformation and democratic contestation in Indonesia's 2024 presidential election," *Asian Survey*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 445-468, 2024.
- [39] D. Lim and E. Tan, "Regulating political deepfakes in Southeast Asia: a comparative assessment," *Contemp. Southeast Asia*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 210-235, 2024.
- [40] IPMR, "Indonesia: civil-society fact-checking infrastructure and the CekFakta-MAFINDO network," IPMR Practitioner Toolkit, 2026.
- [41] A. Usman, N. Farid, and S. Chong, "Regulatory responses to online falsehoods in Southeast Asia: a comparative analysis of POFMA and regional alternatives," *Asian J. Commun.*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 190-208, 2024.
- [42] C. Knox and A. Hessee, "IRLens: an AI-assisted simulation tool for international relations education," *J. Polit. Sci. Educ.*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 45-62, 2026.
- [43] A. Dunlop and R. Way, "Evaluating AI-assisted simulations in international relations classrooms," *Eur. Polit. Sci.*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 155-172, 2025.
- [44] M. M. Nkoane, "Epistemological transformation in higher education: towards post-colonial knowledge production," *S. African J. Higher Educ.*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 1-17, 2022.
- [45] T. Kuhner and R. Schafer, "The DIImE framework: design, implementation, and evaluation of simulations in higher education," *Teach. Learn. Inquiry*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 112-130, 2021.
- [46] D. J. Weinstein and S. Sharma, *Is AI Sovereignty Possible?* Washington, DC, USA: Brookings Institution, 2026.
- [47] Jamestown Foundation, "PRC state-centric AI governance weakens protection of rights," *China Brief*, Washington, DC, USA, 2026.