

Bridging Cultures, Co-creating Voice: A Narrative-Intelligence Framework for Ethical Generative AI Use in Global Extended Education by Dr. Marilyn Brock, PhD Harvard Extension School/ Coastline College

Research Overview

This design-based study examines how narrative intelligence pedagogy can help multilingual writers use generative AI ethically while preserving voice. Across an intercultural digital writing studio, students co-create prompts, reflection logs, and source-tracing routines. We report shifts in agency, integrity, and belonging, and propose a scalable framework for shared AI literacy.

Purpose of Study

As generative AI enters everyday academic writing, many institutions respond with either blanket bans or permissive “use it however” policies—both of which can intensify inequity for multilingual writers, first-generation students, and learners navigating unfamiliar academic discourse norms. At the same time, “voice” is increasingly invoked in policy and pedagogy without a shared, research-informed definition—often reduced to style, originality myths, or plagiarism detection anxieties.

Aligned with the conference theme of bridging cultures and co-creating knowledge, this study asks:

1. How can narrative intelligence (identity, audience awareness, ethical stance, and meaning-making) be operationalized to support transparent, learning-centered AI use in writing?
2. What classroom routines help students integrate AI assistance while strengthening authorship, rhetorical decision-making, and source responsibility?
3. What tensions emerge (e.g., surveillance, privacy, cultural-linguistic bias, “standard English” pressures), and how can they be addressed through culturally sustaining, globally transferable design principles?

Research Methods

Using a design-based research approach in an extended-education/community-college writing context, the study iteratively develops and tests a “Co-created Voice Protocol” consisting of:

- Prompt co-design studios (students and instructors collaboratively design prompts tied to rhetorical goals)

- Process transparency artifacts (AI-use disclosure statements, revision memos, and “decision logs”)
- Source-tracing routines (verification steps and annotated evidence trails)
- Voice-as-stance heuristics (students identify where they accept, resist, or reframe AI suggestions and why)

Data sources include: student drafts and revision histories; reflective memos and decision logs; instructor feedback and scoring with a common rubric (rhetorical effectiveness, evidence practice, and authorship transparency); brief surveys on confidence, belonging, and perceived integrity; and semi-structured interviews/focus groups with students and faculty. Analyses combine qualitative coding (identity/stance, rhetorical agency, disclosure quality) with descriptive trends across iterations to refine the framework.

Results and Discussion

Preliminary patterns across design cycles suggest that when “voice” is taught as narrative stance + ethical authorship (not merely stylistic flair), students demonstrate:

- Greater rhetorical agency: clearer articulation of purpose, audience, and constraints; more deliberate acceptance/rejection of AI-generated options.
- Stronger integrity behaviors: more consistent disclosure, improved verification habits, and fewer “black-box” submissions because transparency is normalized and graded as process.
- Increased belonging and reduced shame among multilingual writers, who report that guided AI use can function as a scaffold—when paired with explicit instruction on ownership and evidence.

At the same time, tensions surface that matter for global contexts: students express concern about data privacy and the feeling of being monitored; some report that AI suggestions can “flatten” culturally marked phrasing toward dominant academic English norms; and instructors describe uncertainty about distinguishing legitimate assistance from overreliance without reverting to punitive detection.

The discussion proposes a transferable framework for institutions seeking culturally responsive AI literacy: (1) define voice as stance and decision-making, (2) assess transparency as a learning outcome, (3) build verification and citation practices into AI workflows, and (4) treat policy as co-created pedagogy rather than enforcement alone.

These implications directly support international education settings where language, culture, and power shape what counts as “good writing” and “authentic voice.”