Celebes Journal of Elementary Education
Volume 4, Issue 1, June 2026 pp. 150-164
Open Access: https://ojs.unsulbar.ac.id/index.php/cjee/index

Generative AI as an Agent of Knowledge Socialization Among Elementary School Students

Darman Manda[1*], Dyan Paramitha Darmayanti[1], Iqbal Arifin[3], Ramdani Sidik[1]
[1*] *Faculty of Social Sciences and Law, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia*
[3] *Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Sulawesi Barat, Indonesia*

Article Info

Keywords:
Generative AI; Elementary School Students; Knowledge Socialization; Digital Anthropology; Cultural-Digital Literacy.

ABSTRACT

Generative artificial intelligence (Generative AI) such as ChatGPT, Gemini, and Meta AI is increasingly present in the lives of elementary school students, both through direct access and through various digital applications commonly used by families. Discussions of this phenomenon have so far been dominated by pedagogical and technological perspectives that view AI as a learning tool, while the social and cultural dimensions of children's interaction with AI have received relatively little attention. This study aims to examine the role of generative AI as an agent of knowledge socialization among elementary school students from a digital anthropology perspective. The method used is library research, with a narrative literature review of various sources published between 2020 and 2026, complemented by several foundational theoretical works as conceptual grounding. The findings show that generative AI cannot be understood merely as a technological tool. Its dialogic and personal mode of interaction leads children to perceive AI as a human-like figure and to position it as an authoritative source of knowledge. This condition enables AI to act as an agent of knowledge socialization, helping shape how children acquire, interpret, and internalize knowledge. The study also shows that the knowledge transmitted by AI is not neutral, as it is shaped by specific data, languages, and perspectives that do not always reflect the diversity of Indonesian culture. Based on these findings, the study proposes the concept of cultural-digital literacy as a framework to help children understand AI more critically, while preserving space for cultural diversity in the process of knowledge socialization in the digital era.

Article History
Received: 02-01-2026
Revised: 20-03-2026
Accepted: 11-05-2026
Published: 08-06-2026

DOI: ***https://doi.org/10.31605/cjee.v4i1.6654***

1. INTRODUCTION

Generative artificial intelligence (AI) has developed rapidly in recent years and is increasingly part of people's daily lives, including children's. Unlike conventional AI, which operates behind digital systems such as search algorithms, video recommendations, or email filters, generative AI can generate text, images, and answers automatically through platforms such as ChatGPT, Gemini, and Meta AI. The presence of this technology changes the pattern of human interaction with information, as users no longer just seek information but can also engage in direct dialogue with digital systems that provide human-like responses (Schuetz &

✉ *Corresponding Author; darmanmanda@unm.ac.id*

Venkatesh, 2020). In the context of education, generative AI is increasingly used as a learning resource, a tool for information search, and a companion for completing tasks. Many children even encounter it by accident through Meta AI, which is now attached to their parents' WhatsApp and Instagram accounts.

In Indonesia, children's proximity to devices and the internet is already very high. Data from the Databoks Indonesia (2025) shows that by March 2025, as many as 75.49% of elementary school students have used mobile phones and 72.26% have access to the internet. This figure shows that children are now growing up in a digital environment that allows them to interact directly with technology, including AI, from an early age. A 2025 survey by the APJII (2025) similarly noted that Generation Z has become the most dominant group of AI users in Indonesia, accounting for 43.7% of user.

Ideally, the use of digital technology in children should take place with the support of parents and the educational environment, so that children can use technology critically and in line with their developmental stages. But in reality, digital mentoring for children is still relatively low. A number of reports in 2026 note that more than 42% of children have used smartphones, but only about 28% have received parental assistance when accessing the internet (Media Indonesia, 2026). This situation is serious because the elementary school phase is a period of basic formation of thinking, social values, and the way children understand the reality around them (Pirozhenko et al., 2021; Ramlan et al., 2023). A study conducted by (Rubiyantoro, 2026) even found that screen exposure of more than four hours per day is closely related to increased anxiety and aggressive behavior in children.

Unfortunately, discussions about AI in children have been dominated by technological and pedagogical perspectives that see AI as a learning tool (Alam & Mohanty, 2023; Cimino et al., 2025). In fact, children's interaction with generative AI is not only about access to information but also about the process of knowledge formation and the way children understand their social world. When a child asks the AI and receives a specific answer, the child is learning who is considered to know, what kinds of knowledge are considered true, and how reality is explained. In this context, generative AI has the potential to become an agent of knowledge socialization, helping shape children's ways of thinking and meaning-making in the social world.

The problem becomes increasingly complex because most AI systems are developed using data dominated by Western global perspectives, which often makes them less sensitive to local cultural contexts and the experiences of minority groups (UNICEF, 2025). As a result, children can absorb knowledge and perspectives that do not fully align with their own socio-cultural context. This phenomenon shows that the problem of AI in children is not only related to educational technology but also concerns the relationships among knowledge, culture, and socialization processes in the digital society.

From a social constructionist perspective, Berger & Luckmann (1966) explain that knowledge is formed through a process of social interaction and internalization that occurs continuously in daily life. In the contemporary digital context, generative AI has the potential to be part of this process, as children no longer receive information only from humans but also from digital systems that can interact as social subjects. Research by Kosoy et al., (2024) shows that children aged 5–12 years tend to view AI as an entity that has human-like thoughts and feelings. These findings show that, in children's eyes, AI is not just a machine but a "figure" that can provide answers and knowledge.

A number of previous studies have mostly discussed the use of AI at the secondary education level, students' or teachers' readiness to face AI technology (Alfarwan, 2025; Ofem et al., 2025; Yim & Su, 2024). Studies that specifically discuss generative AI as an agent of knowledge socialization among elementary school children are still very limited, especially from a digital anthropology perspective. In fact, elementary school children are a group developing a fundamental understanding of knowledge, authority, and social beliefs. Based on these conditions, this article examines the role of generative AI as an agent of knowledge socialization among elementary school children from a digital anthropology perspective. Thus, this article is expected to expand understanding of AI not only as a learning tool but also as a socio-cultural force that shapes how children interpret knowledge and the world.

2. METHOD

This study uses a library research method with a narrative literature review approach. This approach was chosen because the purpose of the study was not to test hypotheses or measure relationships between variables, but to examine and interpret, conceptually and critically, the phenomenon of elementary school children's interaction with generative AI and its relationship to the knowledge socialization process. In contrast to a systematic literature review, which focuses on strict literature screening procedures and quantification of findings, a narrative literature review provides a space for authors to connect, compare, and interpret various cross-disciplinary literature in a more reflective manner (Baumeister & Leary, 1997). This approach is seen as appropriate from the perspective of digital anthropology, which places the interpretation of meaning, social experience, and knowledge construction at the center of the study.

The data sources in this study are secondary data from scientific journal articles, books, reports from official institutions, policy documents, and other academic publications relevant to the research theme. Literature searches were conducted through Google Scholar, Scopus, and ScienceDirect databases using keywords such as generative AI, children and AI, digital socialization, AI in elementary education, AI and knowledge construction, AI cultural bias, digital anthropomorphism, critical AI literacy, and digital anthropology, as well as their equivalents in Indonesian.

Literature is selected based on the relevance of the theme, the novelty of the publication, and its relevance to the focus of the study. This study prioritizes sources published between 2020 and 2026 to capture the latest developments in generative AI following the emergence of widely accessible AI platforms. In addition, the selected resources mainly discuss the use of generative AI in children, human interaction and AI, digital socialization, knowledge construction, and the social and cultural implications of digital technologies. Literature that focuses solely on the technical aspects of AI development, with no connection to user experience, education, or social processes, was not the main focus of this study.

However, this study also draws on a number of fundamental theoretical works published before this period, such as Geertz (1973) on culture as a system of meaning, Berger & Luckmann (1966) on the social construction of knowledge, and Reeves & Nass (1996) on human behavior towards the media. These works are used because they are the main references (seminal works) that remain relevant for explaining and interpreting contemporary phenomena related to generative AI.

In addition to academic sources, the study also uses data and reports from international institutions such as UNESCO and UNICEF, national institutions such as BPS and non-governmental organizations focused on child protection issues in the digital space, such as Internet Matters. The use of these sources aims to strengthen empirical research on the conditions of AI use among children, both globally and in Indonesia. On the other hand, theoretical frameworks regarding the social construction of knowledge, socialization, and digital anthropology are used to bridge contemporary digital phenomena with a more established conceptual foundation.

The data was analyzed using a qualitative content analysis technique. The first stage involves an in-depth reading of all selected sources to identify the main ideas relevant to the study's focus. The second stage involves categorizing findings into main themes: the pattern of children's interaction with generative AI, children's interpretation of AI, the position of AI in the knowledge socialization process, and the cultural implications of knowledge transmitted through AI. The third stage involves interpreting the relationship between themes through the lens of digital anthropology and the theory of the social construction of knowledge. Through this process, this study seeks to understand how generative AI is not only understood as a technological tool but also as a social actor that helps shape how children understand their knowledge and social reality.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Result

This section presents the study's findings from the search and analysis of various literature, then interprets them through the perspective of digital anthropology and the theory of the social construction of knowledge. In accordance with the four themes that focus the analysis, the discussion is organized into four interrelated parts. The first part examines the interaction patterns of elementary school children with generative AI. The second part discusses how children interpret AI in their daily experiences. The third part examines the role of generative AI in knowledge socialization, and the fourth part discusses the cultural implications of knowledge transmitted through AI. These four parts are arranged sequentially to show how seemingly technical interactions ultimately lead to the problem of knowledge formation and children's culture.

3.1.1 Interaction Patterns of Elementary School Children with Generative AI

Understanding the position of generative AI as an agent of knowledge socialization must start with the form of interaction between children and technology. Interaction patterns are important because the way a person relates to a technology also affects how it is interpreted. Technology positioned simply as a tool will produce a different relationship than technology treated as an interlocutor. Therefore, before discussing children's meanings of AI and its role in shaping knowledge, it is important to first understand how the character of elementary school children's interactions with generative AI is formed and what distinguishes it from previous digital technologies.

Based on the literature analyzed, elementary school children's interactions with generative AI exhibit different patterns than their interactions with previous digital technologies. In previous times, children generally played the role of information seekers, having to search for and select answers from various sources themselves. The presence of generative AI is transforming these patterns into more dialogical relationships. Alfarwan (2025), in his systematic review, explained that

one of the dominant patterns of generative AI use in the educational environment is dialogic tutoring, a process of learning through two-way conversations that occur in a responsive manner. Children no longer just type keywords to find information; they ask questions and receive answers composed directly, personally, and convincingly. This shift from "searching" to "asking" activities shows that AI is beginning to be positioned not only as a medium for searching for information, but also as a party capable of providing knowledge.

This change in pattern is in line with Turkle (2011) view that contemporary digital technology is increasingly shaping personal and emotional social relationships between humans and machines. In the context of elementary school children, the dialogue relationship with AI allows technology to be understood not as just a technical device, but as a "talking partner" that is responsive to their needs. This shows that generative AI presents a new form of interaction that is different from previous patterns of digital technology use that tended to be one-way and based on information searching.

These interactions also take place closer to children's daily lives. Platforms like ChatGPT, Gemini, and Meta AI aren't always accessible through dedicated apps, but they're often integrated into search engines, conversational apps, and family digital devices. As a result, children's encounters with generative AI occur repeatedly, often without their being fully aware of it, both for children and for parents. In this situation, interactions with AI are gradually shifting from occasional activities to a part of daily digital routine. Livingstone & Third (2017) explained that children's digital lives are increasingly merged with daily activities, so that the boundary between online space and daily social experiences blurs. Thus, the existence of generative AI is no longer a technology separate from children's lives, but rather part of their digital social environment.

The main character that distinguishes generative AI from previous digital technologies is its dialogical, responsive, and adaptive nature. AI can answer with flexible language, tailor responses to user questions, and sustain conversations. For elementary school children who are still in the concrete stage of cognitive development, the experience can resemble social interaction with humans. Kosoy et al., (2024) found that children aged 5–12 years tend to view AI as an entity that has human-like thoughts and feelings. Similar findings were shown by Andries & Robertson (2023) in their study of primary school children aged 6–11 years in Scotland. The children in the study tended to overestimate the intelligence of AI-based conversation assistants, weren't sure whether the system had feelings or a will, and even thought it was inappropriate to be rude to them. The convergence of findings from these two different cultural contexts shows a relatively consistent tendency toward anthropomorphism in elementary school-age children, namely when technology is understood as a figure with a human-like character. Reeves & Nass (1996) explain that humans tend to treat media and technology as if they have a human-like social character, especially when the technology can respond interactively. In this context, the child not only feels that he is using a machine but also that he is talking to "someone" who is considered to know a lot of things.

If interpreted further, the change in interaction patterns has implications that go beyond the technical problems of using technology. Berger & Luckmann, (1966) explain that knowledge and social reality are formed through the repeated interactions of daily life. In this perspective, what is important is not whether AI answers are always right or wrong, but how children receive, trust, and internalize them as part of everyday knowledge. The more often a child interacts with AI and

obtains answers that are considered helpful, the more likely it is that AI is perceived as a legitimate source of knowledge.

The process shows that generative AI is starting to play a role in shaping children's knowledge authority, that is, determining which sources are considered trustworthy for understanding the social world. In this position, AI not only complements the roles of a book, teacher, or parent but also has the potential to be one of the main references when children are looking for answers to various questions. Jose & Thomas (2025) remind us us that when users anthropomorphize AI, their epistemic alertness tends to weaken, leading trust in AI answers to go beyond critical attitudes toward the information received. This condition is important because elementary school children are still developing limited evaluative abilities compared to adults.

Thus, children's interaction with generative AI cannot be understood solely as a relationship between users and technology. These interactions are social processes that enable AI to establish itself as a trusted source of knowledge. From here, it can be seen that generative AI is beginning to assume a role akin to a social actor in the socialization of children's knowledge. This interaction pattern then becomes the basis for how children interpret AI in their daily lives

3.1.2 Elementary School Children's Interpretation of Generative AI

After understanding how interaction patterns are formed, the next question is how children interpret AI in their daily experiences. Meaning is important because that is where a technology finds its place in the world of children. A technology that is interpreted as a machine will be treated differently from a technology that is interpreted as a friend, teacher, or all-knowing resource. This meaning determines the degree of trust in AI's answers, as well as the position given to AI among other sources of knowledge that have been present in their lives before, such as parents, teachers, and peers.

The tendency to interpret AI as a human-like figure is becoming more real as AI access expands to younger age groups. The UNICEF Innocenti report (2025) notes that generative AI is no longer in the background of children's lives, but is now a direct conversational partner that feels increasingly human. In fact, services like Gemini are starting to roll out to children under 13 with parental permission, expanding AI access to groups most vulnerable to the influence of meaning. In other words, children's understanding of AI is not formed at a mature age of critical thinking, but at a time when children are still developing their basic understanding of the world.

Based on the literature analyzed, elementary school children tend to interpret generative AI not as a passive machine but as a figure capable of resembling humans. Andries & Robertson (2023) found that children in Scotland overrated the intelligence of AI-based conversation assistants and doubted whether the system had feelings or wills. Kosoy et al., (2024) report a similar tendency among children aged 5–12 years who believe AI has thoughts and feelings. This interpretation is not just a cognitive error, but a child's way of interpreting technology that speaks, answers, and responds like a social being. Jose & Thomas (2025) refer to this phenomenon as digital anthropomorphism, which is the tendency to attribute human qualities empathy, intelligence, and trustworthiness to non-human systems. Thus, children's interpretation of AI does not occur only at the cognitive level but also at the affective level.

This meaning does not stop at perception alone, but has implications for how children place AI in the hierarchy of their knowledge sources. When AI is interpreted

as a "know-it-all" figure, the answers it provides tend to be accepted as trustworthy information, even without being verified first. Jose & Thomas (2025) remind us that this tendency toward anthropomorphism can weaken epistemic vigilance, the vigilance required to assess the credibility of information sources. In elementary school, children whose critical thinking skills are still developing, this weakening of epistemic vigilance is a serious problem. Children do not yet have sufficient analytical tools to distinguish between fluent answers and correct answers, between convincing delivery and accurate information. As a result, AI is not only seen as a source of knowledge but also as an authoritative source.

This meaning is reinforced by the emotional qualities inherent in children's interactions with AI. Generative AI not only answers, but also greets, praises, and responds in a friendly tone. Turkle (2011) explains that technologies that can elicit emotional responses tend to foster attachment because humans naturally respond to social signals, even when they come from machines. These findings were confirmed in the Internet Matters (2025) report, which found that more than a third (35%) of children who use AI chatbots say that chatting with AI feels like talking to a friend, with this figure rising to 50% among children in vulnerable conditions. The same report also found that nearly a quarter (23%) of children have sought advice from AI chatbots. In elementary school children, this emotional quality makes AI not just a tool for asking questions, but also a space that feels safe to express curiosity, confusion, and even complaints. The definition of AI as a "talking partner" explains why children's interactions with AI tend to be intense and repetitive, without the emotional exhaustion that often arises when children deal with adults.

(Internet Matters2025) also underscores three main risks that accompany this kind of meaning: over-reliance and emotional attachment, exposure to inaccurate and harmful advice, and the blurring of the line between AI and real relationships in children's eyes. These three risks show that children's understanding of AI has gone beyond mere perception and has transformed into a form of social relations with implications for children's development. When interpreted in the framework of the social construction of knowledge, Berger & Luckmann (1966) explain that the meaning of an object is not formed once but through repeated experiences, which then crystallize into an understanding considered reasonable and undeniable. When children repeatedly ask AI questions and receive answers that feel certain, AI is gradually interpreted not only as a source of answers, but also as a legitimate source to trust. This meaning is crucial: at a time when children place AI as a knowledge authority on par with, or even surpassing, parents and teachers, AI has shifted from just a tool to an actor in the process of socializing knowledge. This shift will be further examined in the next section by placing AI among the socialization agents already known to children.

3.1.3 The Position of Generative AI in the Knowledge Socialization Process

After examining interaction patterns and children's interpretations of generative AI, the next question is where exactly AI fits in the process of socializing children's knowledge. Knowledge socialization refers to how a child learns what is considered right, what is trustworthy, and from whom knowledge should be obtained. This process is not just about transmitting information, but also about forming authority, trust, and a perspective on the world. In the context of children growing up alongside dialogical technologies such as generative AI, the question of who plays a role in the socialization of knowledge becomes worth revisiting.

In classical social science studies, children's socialization is understood as a process that occurs through several main agents, namely the family, school, peers,

and the media. Berger & Luckmann (1966) explain that primary socialization occurs in the family and forms the basis of the child's understanding of the world, while secondary socialization takes place outside the family and expands the child's understanding of broader social institutions. Within this framework, authority over knowledge is generally attributed to figures with a certain social legitimacy. Teachers gain legitimacy through their institutional roles in education, parents through affective relationships and family authority, while peers through shared experiences in everyday life.

The presence of generative AI adds new entities to the socialization map, but with a different character from classic agents. AI has no body, no life experiences shared with children, and does not occupy formal social positions. Nonetheless, AI can be available at any time, answer almost any question, and do so quickly, patiently, personally, and continuously. In children's daily practice, AI is beginning to occupy a space previously reserved for adult figures or other sources of knowledge. AI can answer questions when the teacher is not in class, when parents are not accompanying, or when children do not have friends to discuss with.

It is this dialogical character that distinguishes generative AI from conventional media. Unlike television, books, and earlier digital media, which generally conveyed information in one direction, generative AI enables the negotiation of meaning through conversations that occur in a personal and adaptive manner. Children can ask follow-up questions, ask for simpler explanations, and even correct or question the answers given. Thus, AI does not simply convey information, but is involved in an interaction process that resembles social relationships. Livingstone & Third (2017) have shown that children's digital lives are increasingly integrated with their social lives. In this context, generative AI can no longer be understood solely as a medium for conveying information, but rather as part of the digital social environment in which children build knowledge.

This view is also in line with the development of human interaction studies and AI, which increasingly places AI as a social actor. Kasneci et al., (2023) show that generative AI, such as ChatGPT, enables personalized and adaptive interactions in learning, distinguishing it from previous digital media that are generally one-way. In line with this, Jose & Thomas (2025) show that this kind of interaction tends to trigger anthropomorphism, leading users to deny human qualities such as empathy and trustworthiness in AI systems, thereby building relationships that resemble social ones. In elementary school children, this tendency becomes stronger because the ability to distinguish critically between human and non-human agents is still in its developmental stage. Therefore, the experience of interacting with AI not only results in the exchange of information but also shapes social relationships that, in turn, influence how children understand knowledge.

In this framework, generative AI is more appropriately understood as an agent of knowledge socialization, that is, the party that participates in determining what is considered known, how something is explained, and from which point of view reality is understood by children. This position makes AI not just an additional technology in the learning process, but part of the socialization ecosystem that also shapes children's understanding of the world. Reeves & Nass, (1996) explain, through the concept of the media equation, that humans tend to treat the media as social actors when they can respond interactively. In generative AI, this tendency finds a stronger form because AI not only responds but also adjusts communication styles, recalls the context of the conversation, and creates a sense of social presence that was previously difficult to find in other digital technologies.

The shift in AI's position from a tool to a socialization agent has several important consequences. First, the authority of knowledge is no longer entirely in the hands of adult figures who are personally known to the child. Some of that authority is beginning to shift to entities that are not physically present, unbound by certain social relationships, and that operate through algorithmic mechanisms invisible to the user. Second, the process of knowledge socialization becomes more private and more difficult to supervise. In contrast to conversations between children and teachers or parents that take place in observable social spaces, interactions with AI often occur privately on screens accessible only to children.

Third, knowledge sources tend to become more concentrated. While AI appears capable of presenting a wide range of perspectives and information, all those responses are essentially mediated by the same model, trained on specific datasets and shaped by technical logic that users don't always understand. As a result, the diversity of perspectives that children usually gain through interactions with many people can be narrowed to a single filtered perspective. In the long run, this condition can affect the way children understand differences, diversity of views, and the complexity of social realities.

This condition is important to consider because each AI system is built through a process of selecting data, language, and certain perspectives. Thus, the knowledge received by children is never completely neutral but always carries traces of the social, cultural, and value systems behind its formation. As AI increasingly serves as a reference for answering everyday questions, children not only receive information but also absorb certain ways of understanding and explaining the world. This problem shows that the discussion about AI cannot stop at information accuracy alone; it is necessary to consider the cultural dimension that accompanies the production and transmission of knowledge.

Nonetheless, the inclusion of generative AI as a socialization agent does not mean that family, school, and peers are losing their roles. These classic socialization agents remain the main space for the formation of children's values, identities, and social meanings. Generative AI does not replace them, but rather inserts between them and fills spaces previously untouched by traditional socialization agents. It is this position that makes AI a distinctive socialization agent: it does not replace others, but is dialogical, personal, and continuously available in children's daily lives.

The most important consequence of this shift is not just a change in how children obtain answers, but also in the content of the knowledge they receive and internalize. When AI begins to take on a role as a socialization agent, the important question is no longer just "does AI give the right answers", but "knowledge from the point of view of who actually reaches the child". The question draws attention to power relations in knowledge production, especially when AI systems are developed using data sources, languages, and perspectives that may not reflect the local experiences of Indonesian children. Therefore, the next section will examine the cultural implications of knowledge transmitted through generative AI to primary school children.

3.1.4 Cultural Implications of Knowledge Transmitted through Generative AI

If generative AI has established itself as an agent of knowledge socialization, then the question no longer stops at whether the information provided by AI is true or false. The more fundamental question is: what kind of knowledge is transmitted to the child, from which cultural perspective it comes, and how it affects the way the child understands the world. Previous sections have shown that AI does not work

neutrally. Therefore, the following discussion focuses on three main cultural consequences arising when generative AI becomes a source of knowledge for elementary school children: the reproduction of cultural biases, the formation of children's cultural identity, and educational challenges in responding to generative AI's influence.

One of the earliest cultural consequences to emerge is the reproduction of cultural bias through seemingly simple, neutral AI responses. UNESCO (2024) found that large language models tend to reproduce unbalanced representations of certain social groups. In the context of elementary school children, this kind of bias does not always manifest as misinformation, but rather through examples, illustrations, or cultural references that AI uses to explain something.

When a child asks about family, food, celebrations, famous people, or daily activities, the AI may provide factually correct answers. However, the content of his knowledge is not culturally neutral. An empirical study conducted by Tao et al., (2024) on five versions of GPT (from GPT-3 to GPT-4) found that these models' responses were consistently aligned with the cultural value systems of English-speaking countries and Protestant Europe and underrepresented those of other regions of the world. As an illustration in the Indonesian context, the celebrations referred to by AI, the figures used as examples, and the habits considered common may not reflect the daily experiences of children across regions, from Java to Maluku. What appears in the AI's answers seems universal, but is actually rooted in one dominant cultural viewpoint in its training data.

At first glance, these conditions may seem insignificant. However, cultural influences don't always work through big, explicit messages. Cultural influences are often present through small, repetitive experiences in everyday life. Solyst et al., (2024) explain that the social and cultural implications of AI are often unknown to users, especially vulnerable groups such as children. When children receive thousands of answers that use specific cultural references, they also slowly absorb certain ways of understanding the world.

This is what sets AI apart from conventional media. If television or books convey knowledge in one direction, AI conveys knowledge through personalized, responsive, and repetitive conversations. As a result, the cultural influence that AI brings can feel closer and more acceptable because it comes in the form of interactions that resemble everyday conversations.

The next consequence concerns the formation of children's cultural identity. From an anthropological perspective, culture is not merely a passively accepted inheritance but a system of meaning continuously reinterpreted through social experience (Geertz, 1973). Primary school is an important period when children begin to understand who they are, where they come from, and how they stand in the wider social environment. At this stage, the source of knowledge used by the child has a great influence on the formation of the identity.

Lakshmi (2025) refers to AI as a cultural intermediary that redistributes various narratives and knowledge derived from large amounts of data. The problem is that the process does not always represent all cultural groups equally. Kay et al., (2024) explained that this condition can give rise to epistemic injustice, a situation in which the knowledge and experience of certain groups take precedence over those of others. As a result, some perspectives gain more space to perform, while others become less visible.

When most explanations of the world come from sources that are more representative of a particular cultural context, the child runs the risk of building an

understanding of the world that draws on sources that do not entirely come from his own cultural environment. The consequences have to do not only with the knowledge the child has, but also with the way the child assesses and places his own culture among the various other cultures introduced through AI.

This issue is becoming increasingly important in Indonesia, which has very high cultural diversity. Children in Papua, Bali, Sulawesi, Java, Sumatra, and Maluku grow up with different social and cultural experiences. However, when AI becomes a primary source of knowledge and is not sensitive to such diversity, children from different cultural backgrounds may receive explanations of the world through a relatively uniform framework. In the long run, this condition can encourage the homogenization of knowledge and reduce the space for diverse local perspectives in the child's learning process.

The cultural consequences of generative AI also pose new challenges for the world of education. Various studies show that the integration of AI in education still focuses more on technical skills in using technology than on the social, cultural, and ethical aspects that accompany it (Yeter & Anders, 2024). In fact, the main challenge is not only how children use AI, but also how they understand the perspective it offers.

In this context, schools and teachers have an important role as cultural companions. Solyst et al., (2024) emphasize, through the concept of critical AI literacy, the importance of building students' ability to question, interpret, and evaluate AI-generated information. At the elementary school level, these skills do not have to be taught through complicated technical concepts. Teachers can start with simple questions such as: "Where did the AI get this information from?" "Does this explanation match your experience?", or "Is there another way to look at the same problem?" These questions help children realize that all knowledge is always born from a certain point of view.

Thus, the role of teachers is not being replaced by AI; rather, it is becoming increasingly important. Teachers not only function as conveyors of information, but also as companions who help children understand the social and cultural context of the knowledge they receive. At the same time, schools need to be spaces that allow children to bring together the global knowledge gained through AI with the local experiences of their daily lives.

In the end, the problem of generative AI among elementary school children is not only a technological problem, but also a question of how the younger generation builds a way of seeing the world. AI not only provides children with answers, but also shapes a certain way of understanding reality. Therefore, the main challenge for education in the AI era is not only to improve the ability to use technology, but to ensure that the process of knowledge socialization continues to provide space for cultural diversity, local experiences, and children's critical thinking skills.

4. CONCLUSION

This study examines the role of generative AI as an agent of knowledge socialization among primary school children from a digital anthropology perspective. Based on the literature review, generative AI cannot be understood solely as a neutral learning tool. The dialogical interaction pattern, the tendency of children to interpret AI as a human-like figure, and the ability of AI to be personally and continuously present in daily life make it more than just information technology. Within the framework of the social construction of knowledge, generative AI has shifted from being just a technological tool to a social actor that also influences what

is considered right, who is trusted, and how children understand the social realities around them. Thus, AI not only teaches answers to children, but also teaches a certain way of understanding the world.

The shift carries important cultural implications because knowledge transmitted by AI is not entirely neutral. This knowledge is shaped by data, language, and certain perspectives that do not necessarily reflect the diversity of Indonesian children's cultural experiences. If the process of knowledge socialization through AI takes place without mentoring and cultural awareness, children are at risk of growing up with a framework of understanding that is not fully rooted in their own cultural experiences. Therefore, the problem of generative AI in elementary school children cannot be seen solely as an issue of educational technology, but also as a cultural issue related to the process of inheriting knowledge, forming identity, and producing meaning in a digital society. In this context, basic education is strategically positioned to develop cultural-digital literacy, the ability to understand that every piece of information generated by AI is always born from a specific social and cultural context.

However, this study has several limitations. This study is conceptual and based on a literature review, so the arguments built have not been tested through direct observation of the practice of using generative AI in elementary school children in Indonesia. In addition, most of the empirical literature cited comes from Western contexts, while empirical studies specifically addressing the interaction of Indonesian children with generative AI are limited. Therefore, a number of international findings used as analytical footing still require further validation in the Indonesian context. Based on these conditions, further research is needed through empirical approaches, especially digital ethnography and field studies in family and school environments, to better understand how Indonesian children interact with, interpret, and use generative AI in their daily lives. On the other hand, teachers, schools, and policymakers need to start viewing AI not only as a learning tool, but also as part of an ecosystem of knowledge socialization that requires critical, ethical, and cultural mentoring.

REFERENCES

Alam, A., & Mohanty, A. (2023). Educational technology: Exploring the convergence of technology and Pedagogy Through Mobility, Interactivity, AI, and Learning Tools. *Cogent Engineering*, *10*(2), 2283282.

Alfarwan, A. (2025). Generative AI use in K-12 education: A Systematic Review. *Frontiers in Education*, *10*, 1647573. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1647573

Andries, V., & Robertson, J. (2023). “Alexa Doesn’t Have that Many Feelings”: Children’s Understanding of AI Through Interactions with Smart Speakers in Their Homes. arXiv. https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.05597

APJII. (2025). *Profil Internet Indonesia 2025*. Asosiasi Penyelenggara Jasa Internet Indonesia. https://apjii.or.id

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1997). Writing Narrative Literature Reviews. *Review of General Psychology*, *1*(3), 311–320. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.1.3.311

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Doubleday.

Cimino, S., Maremmani, A. G. I., & Cerniglia, L. (2025). The Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Early Childhood Education. *Societies*, *15*(12), 341.

Databoks Indonesia. (2025). *Data on Indonesian Students Using Mobile Phones, Laptops, and the Internet in 2025*.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. Basic Books.

Internet Matters. (2025). *Me, Myself and AI: Understanding and Safeguarding Children's Use of AI Chatbots*. Internet Matters. https://www.internetmatters.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/Me-Myself-AI-Report.pdf

Jose, B., & Thomas, A. (2025). Digital anthropomorphism and the psychology of trust in generative AI tutors: An opinion-based thematic synthesis. *Frontiers in Computer Science*, *7*, 1638657. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomp.2025.1638657

Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., … Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *103*, 102274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274

Kay, J., Kasirzadeh, A., & Mohamed, S. (2024). *Epistemic injustice in generative AI*. arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2408.11441

Kosoy, E., Jeong, S., Sinha, A., Kraljic, T., & Gopnik, A. (2024). *Children's mental models of generative visual and text-based AI models*. arXiv. https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.13081

Lakshmi, S. D. (2025). Rebranding Empire in the Age of Generative AI. *Frontiers in Communication*, *10*, 1604361. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2025.1604361

Livingstone, S., & Third, A. (2017). Children and young people's rights in the digital age: An emerging agenda. *New Media & Society*, *19*(5), 657–670. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816686318

Media Indonesia. (2026). Perlindungan digital: Tantangan AI dan regulasi baru bagi anak Indonesia. *Media Indonesia*. https://mediaindonesia.com/humaniora/874609

Ofem, U. J., Orim, F. S., Edam-Agbor, I. B., Amanso, E. O. I., Eni, E., Ukatu, J. O., Ovat, S. V., Osang, A. W., Dien, C., & Abuo, C. B. (2025). Teachers' Preparedness For The Utilization of Artificial Intelligence in Classroom Assessment: The Contributory Effects of Attitude Toward Technology, Technological Readiness, and Pedagogical Beliefs With Perceived Ease of Use and Perceived Usefulness as Mediators. *Frontiers in Education*, *10*, 1568306. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1568306

Pirozhenko, T., Khartman, O., & Soroka, I. (2021). The features of pre-school and Primary School Children's Value Formation Process and The Development of Their Worldviews. *Psychological Journal*, *7*(5), 38–49.

Ramlan, R., Iskandar, D., Permana, J., & Husin, M. R. (2023). Character Values of Elementary School Education from the Perspective of Local Wisdom of Sundanese Culture. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, *13*(3), 119–129.

Reeves, B., & Nass, C. (1996). *The Media Equation: How People Treat Computers, Television, and New Media Like Real People and Places*. Cambridge University Press.

Rubiyantoro, Y. (2026). *Dampak Penggunaan Gawai yang Berlebihan pada Anak SD*. https://ditsd.kemendikdasmen.go.id/artikel/detail/dampak-penggunaan-gawai-yang-berlebihan-pada-anak-sd

Schuetz, S., & Venkatesh, V. (2020). The Rise of Human Machines: How Cognitive Computing Systems Challenge Assumptions of User-System Interaction. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, *21*(2), 460–482.

Solyst, J., Friedman, B., Yip, J., Sands, R., Walker, B., & Schaeffer, S. (2024). Critical Artificial Intelligence Literacy: A Scoping Review and Framework Synthesis. *International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction*, *43*, 100708. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcci.2024.100708

Tao, Y., Viberg, O., Baker, R. S., & Kizilcec, R. F. (2024). Cultural Bias and Cultural Alignment of Large Language Models. *PNAS Nexus*, *3*(9), pgae346. https://doi.org/10.1093/pnasnexus/pgae346

Turkle, S. (2011). *Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other*. Basic Books.

UNESCO. (2024). *Generative AI: UNESCO Study Reveals Alarming Evidence of Regressive Gender Stereotypes*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/generative-ai-unesco-study-reveals-alarming-evidence-regressive-gender-stereotypes

UNICEF. (2025). *Policy Guidance on AI for Children*. United Nations Children's Fund.

Yeter, I. H., & Anders, J. B. (2024). Global Initiatives and Challenges in Integrating Artificial Intelligence Literacy in Elementary Education: Mapping Policies and Empirical Literature. *Future in Educational Research*, *2*(4), 382–402. https://doi.org/10.1002/fer3.59

Yim, I. H. Y., & Su, J. (2024). Teachers' Perceptions, Attitudes, and Acceptance of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Educational Learning Tools: An Exploratory Study on AI Literacy For Young Students. *Future in Educational Research*, *2*(4). https://doi.org/10.1002/fer3.65