A STUDY OF SELECTED CHATGPT-GENERATED CONTENTS IN EDUCATIONAL DISCOURSE FROM NIGERIA AND GHANA: A FUNCTIONAL AND CRITICAL PERSPECTIVE

Ojerinde, Olatunde Adeyemi
&
Kingful, Princess

Abstract

Artificial Intelligence (henceforth, AI) has become a huge part of academic culture used to generate contents for academic purposes. However, while educational institutions take responsibility for the content of AI technologies adopted for service delivery, no one is held accountable for AI/ChatGPT's content when students use ChatGPT for academic purposes. In this study, ChatGPT educational discourse was examined using Mood analysis and van Dijk's triangulated Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) framework of discourse, cognition and society. The objective was to determine how AI/ChatGPT educational discourse was constructed. In a world driven by racial and class ideologies of dominance and the psychological warfare, the study specifically queried "whose opinion ChatGPT pushed in anonymity when it responded to questions from students"? The data constitute fifty (50) purposively selected ChatGPT-generated discourse, taken from Nigerian and Ghanaian undergraduates, using Mood analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis. It was discovered that ChatGPT is highly opinionated, authoritative and speciously anonymous and could be deployed as a hegemonic agent designed to perpetuate subsisting narrative of western supremacy over others. The paper concluded that such anonymity corrupts educational discourse and threatens educational achievements of students, especially those from Third World countries, who have gravitated towards AI technologies. It is thus suggested that policy makers must be deliberate and proactive about instituting a healthy control of ChatGPT's influence in educational discourses.

Key words: Artificial Intelligence, ChatGPT, Critical Discourse Analysis, Educational Discourse, and Mood

Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (henceforth, AI) has become a crucial part of academic culture as the most recent advancement in educational technologies. The evolution has been in phases. Except for occasional sound bites of job losses which have not been as prevalent as envisaged, not many practitioners in the academic industry have felt threatened by the emergence of AI. The advent of ChatGPT, however, has raised a different kind of concerns that must be carefully and deservedly considered. The last two decades have seen educational institutions embraced AI for some of their quotidian activities, in order to enhance ease of service delivery. Since the public launch of ChatGPT in November 2022 by San Francisco-based OpenAI, students have begun to carry out their academic tasks using the Chabot in an unprecedented manner that is discomforting for some universities. Some educational institutions have exemplified proactiveness towards the role of AI in academic sphere. According to Dumitrescu (2023):

> ...some universities, like Sciences Po in France, have banned ChatGPT for classwork, unless students have permission from instructors. Open universities of Australia [have] offered students guidelines for using ChatGPT ethically. The University of Toronto advises instructors to specify which digital tools are allowed for assignments but warn the instructors against using unapproved AI tools to evaluate student work (para. 3).

ChatGPT may be considered a new comer in the academia across the world but its rising popularity among students should worry educationists, especially those from Third World countries for two reasons: first, ChatGPT is essentially "artificial", humanly contrived and by implication, not anonymous; second, it is not defined whose opinion ChatGPT expresses when it responds to questions, content questions in particular, as experimented in this study. These concerns

define the objectives of this study as follows: (1) to analyse ChatGPT-generated educational discourse using Mood and Modal analysis of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL); (2) to interpret and explain the results of the analysis, using CDA; and (3) to evaluate the meaning potential of ChatGPT-generated contents under study and implications for education.

Literature Review

According to Bloor and Bloor (2004), "the grammar that systemic functional linguists have developed is known as Systemic Functional Grammar or SFG" (p. 2). Thus, SFG and SFL are used interchangeably. SFL holds its core features around language functions and meaning unlike Chomsky's Transformational Generative Grammar (TGG). For Halliday and Matthiessen (2004), "grammar is seen as a resource for making meaning" (p. 31), "an unlimited choice of ways of creating meaning" (Bloor & Bloor, 2014, p. 3). The centrality of function and meaning is the basis for the term **Metafunction** adopted to emphasize the primacy of function as an integral component within the systemic theory. Thompson (2014) summarised the three kinds of meanings attributable to language use in functional grammar as follow:

> We use language to talk about our experience of the world, including the worlds in our own minds, to describe events and states and the entities involved in them [experiential]. We also use language to interact with people, to establish and maintain relations with them, to influence their behaviour, to express our own viewpoint on things in the world and to elicit or change theirs [interpersonal]. Finally, in using language, we organize our messages in ways that include how they fit with the other messages around them and with the wider context in which we are talking or writing [textual]. (p.28)

Interpersonal Metafunction

Language as a resource for meaning facilitates communication among entities, human and non-human, and it occurs as either spoken

or written (Daramola, 2011). Interpersonal metafunction is simply "using language to interact with other people" (Thompson, 2014 p. 30), a kind of event in human social world that represents language in more active role with focus on the participants or the subject in clause structure. The clause in interpersonal metafunction is divided into two main parts: the MOOD and the RESIDUE. MOOD consists of Subject and Finite element while RESIDUE comprises Predicator, Complement and Adjunct. The order of Subject and Finite in the MOOD determines the MOOD types which are divided into two: Indicative and Imperative. Indicative Mood is further divided into Declarative Mood and Interrogative Mood which could be polar question or yes/no interrogative and content question also known as WH—interrogative.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

CDA embraces diverse definitions both "as a theory and a method" (Rebecca, 2004). It is a viable tool for researchers whose interests bestride language and society and who seek to describe, interpret and explain the connections between the two. The distinguishing core of CDA is its attempt to transcend mere description and interpretation to a more involved pedestal that offers explanations of "why and how discourse work" (Rebecca, 2004 p.2). Rather than reduce CDA to a single definition, Fairclough and Wodak (1997) cited in (Rebecca, 2004) offered defining principles of CDA as basic indicators for researchers. These principles are:

> [1]CDA addresses social problems; [2]power relations are discursive; [3]Discourse constitutes society and culture; [4]Discourse does ideological work; [5]Discourse is historical; [6]a sociocognitive approach is needed to understand how relations between text and society are mediated; [7]Disscourse analysis is interpretive and explanatory and uses a systematic methodology; [8]CDA is a socially committed scientific paradigm. (p. 3).

It is important to understand the notion of "critical" in CDA as "an attempt to describe, interpret and explain the relationship between form and function of language" (Rebecca, 2004 p.4) in a "problematic– or issue, oriented" (van. Dijk, 1995 p.17) context inherent in social and political life of the society. In other words, the intent of CDA is primarily targeted at identifying and projecting social problems and expounding how language is used to construct issues with an aim to disrupt such conditioned discourse forms. The problem-oriented posture of CDA contrast it against "the dominant, often asocial and uncritical, paradigms of other theories (van Dijk 2015 p.467). CDA does not have a specific theoretical framework of its own because of its multidisciplinary and multi-directional nature. Although van Dijk (2015) considered a "triangulated theoretical framework that relate discourse, cognition and society as the major dimensions of CDA" (p. 470), CDA draws more generally from wider disciplines and theories. It is this unique flexibility of CDA that makes it a perfect blend with SFL which is adopted in this study to serve as its analytical backbone.

Therefore, this study is based on the linguistic concept of Mood and Modal analysis from M.A.K. Halliday's SFL, and CDA, precisely Teun van Dijk's triangulated framework of discourse, cognition and society. On the one hand Mood analysis was considered a suitable option to quantitatively account for text structure in terms of number of clauses and interpersonal structure with a keen focus on meaning as the essence of language. On the other hand, for a qualitative approach in the second phase of analysis, we explicated the data further using CDA with the concept of power as control. Thus, the data was quantitatively described and qualitatively discussed. This allowed the study to explore a solid theoretical underpinning to the discourse of ChatGPT-generated texts in order to understand the meaning implication of ChatGPT educational discourse and its functional cum ideological implications for education in Nigeria and Ghana. SFL was considered apposite, because of its inherent focus on the function of language and emphasis on contexts, alongside with CDA because of

CDA's interpretative and explanatory posture towards discourse as a form of social action reflective in enactment of bias, display of power and perpetuation of inequality.

Related Studies

Noor et al. (2015) studied the last sermon of the Holy Prophet (pbuh) using SFL Mood analysis to highlight the manner of the speaker and evaluate the inter-relationship between the speaker and the audience. The study revealed that Declarative Mood was dominant in the speech recurring 32 out of the 56 clauses examined. The dominance was interpreted by the researchers to mean that the clauses in Declarative Mood indicated "the expressions [as] conclusive, strong and factual" (p. 7). This was attributed to religious context where a speaker, considered to be of "high and influential status among the audience" (Noor et al., 2015 p. 8) spoke from a point of authority and made statements considered divine, and by implication not subject to disputation with the listeners.

Afful (2007) also studied sermonic discourse using Mood analysis to examine James Baldwin's *Go Tell it on the Mountain.* Afful (2007) discovered that 25 out of 34 clauses analysed were in Declarative Mood while nine were structurally Imperative and exclamatory in function. Afful (2007) drew from this that "that many of the clauses are declarative implies the position from which the preacher speaks is one of certainty, conviction and immense power" (p. 155). This meaning implication of Declarative Mood is typical of religious or sermonic texts which are perceived to have emanated from a seemingly unquestionable source. The absence of variation may as well suggest a monolithic pattern typical of a discourse instantiation hostile to contestation; that is, an unthinking entity or a context that presumes the listeners do not, or should not, have a right or freedom to think other than as declared by the source.

Bankole and Ayoola (2014) in a similar study analysed selected sermonic texts and found that Declarative Mood was also dominant. 85% of the clauses analysed were in Declarative Mood. In one of the

texts, 30 out of 31 clauses, amounting to 97%, were in Declarative Mood while the texts with the least percentage had 67%. Imperative Mood came a distant second with 22 out of 194 at 11% while seven clauses were in Interrogative Mood at 3.6%. According to Bankole and Ayoola (2014), "the dominance of declarative mood in our analysis indicates that the writer's chief concern in the articles is to simply offer the readers some information convincingly enough to get the readers persuaded" (p. 141).

Amalia et al. (2018) also analysed a text using SFL Mood and Modal concept and found Declarative Mood dominant in a speech delivered by Susilo Bambag Yudhoyono. The study revealed 96% high Declarative Mood against 3.9% Interrogative Mood and 0.9% Imperative Mood. Amalia et al (2018) concluded that "the speaker is declaring his speech courteously, or in the median politeness" (p. 26). The interpretation of the Declarative Mood in Amalia et al. (2018) is slightly different from Afful (2007), Noor et al. (2015) and Bankole and Ayoola (2014) because of the discourse context. Suprijadi and Rahmawati (2021) after analysing a speech delivered to the United Nations Assembly discovered the dominance of Declarative Mood at 86.3% against 9.6% and 4.1% of Imperative Mood and Interrogative Mood respectively. The dominance of Declarative Mood was interpreted to mean that the "speaker mostly gave information about himself, his personal life and his organisation. This interpretation is apposite in the context of the exchange which was basically non-educational and unreligious context.

Chatbots have been studied in different disciplines. Wang et al., (2021) explored the differences in human discourse and human-computer conversation with an intent to "evaluate the selected chatbots with linguistic method and knowledge through semantics and pragmatics" (p. 287). A vital implication of the study is the revelation that "near 60% of the Millennial generation have used chatbots, among which 70% have a positive user experience (p. 287). In a similar study of chatbots, Tonts (2019) investigated user's perceptions about conversation experience with chatbots in terms of "pragmatic aspects of

communication in order to understand how the shortcomings influence the overall experience" (p. 10). Tonts (2019) attempted to situate the communicative ability of chatbots in the context of meaning making realised by language, written or spoken. Tonts' (2019) study revealed the challenge of communication with chatbots where the construction and deconstruction of meaning from language, beyond decodification of linguistic items, includes functional human mind and social experience which are not, at present at least, features found in chatbots.

Hill et al., (2015) explored how humans tend to communicate and compared same with how humans communicate with fellow humans particularly investigated how "communication changes when people communicate with an intelligent agent as opposed to with another human" (p. 245). Surprisingly, Hill et al., (2015) found that "people communicated with the Chabot for longer durations (but with shorter messages) than they did with another human"(p. 246). In related research, Ribino (2023) investigated politeness in a human-Chabot conversation. Politeness is ordinarily a feature of human social interaction that reflects in human and human conversation. However, Ribino (2023) studied Chabot-human conversation to understand whether such behavioural expectation is appropriate in a conversation with chatbots, if present at all.

Annamalai *et al.*, (2023) investigated Chabot from the pedagogical perspective focusing how Chabot could be deployed as a partnering tool with teachers to help students in language learning. The study found that chatbots actually "improve English language learners' competence, autonomy and relatedness" (Annamalai et al, 2023, p. 7) thereby projecting the vital roles chatbots can play in language pedagogy if effectively deployed as complementary support. This study emphasised the potential benefits of Chabot to both teachers and learners.

On the one hand, Yang, (2022) also studied chatbots with a focus on teachers' views on the integration of chatbots in English education. Different types of chatbots including commercially used

chatbots, educational chatbots and generic chatbots were identified and Yang's (2022) study found that "chatbots are useful as teaching and learning aids for both teachers and students" (p. 51). On the other hand, Cakmak (2022) studied chatbots with a focus on L2 students' perceptions of Chabot-human interaction on speaking skills. Cakmak's (2022) study reported that L2 students have a negative perception of chatbots as English conversation partners even though the students confirmed that it helped them improve their speaking ability. The study concluded that students' overall impression was not positive.

Satar (2021) studied Chabot-human interaction in language teaching and learning noting potential issues that require urgent attention. In spite of the allure of Chabot, Sata (2021) opined that (i) Chabot may become redundant or irrelevant due to its high level of predictability, (ii) Chabot has limited capacity for effective communication, (iii) lack of ideal human interaction features, (iv) Chabot has peculiar specifications designed on rigid algorithm.

Holmes' et al.'s (2022) studied chatbots from the economic perspective emphasizing that the disruption caused by chatbots will cause through its economic impact within education systems including probability of displacement of human teachers as well as increasing ethical concerns and displacement of learners, and others, whose authorial attribute may be lost and creativity may be disappeared due by phantom authorship and anonymity. According to Holmes et al (2022), "education is mostly about knowledge transmission: ensuring that school students learn the content that has been mandated by policy maker, selected by curriculum developers, packaged by textbook publishers, taught by teachers and assessed by examinations ...which [now] appears to be the aim of most AI tools that have been designed to support learners" (p. 27). In other words, the process of education is an economic chain. Therefore, there is a need to pay attention to economic dimension of chatbots in language learning.

Methodology

This study adopted both quantitative and qualitative analyses using STL's Mood and Modal and CDA. Mood and Modal provided a template for quantitative analysis at the first level which serves as a base for CDA's qualitative analysis at the second level. Therefore, selected ChatGPT content were quantitatively described and qualitatively discussed. The first phase of analysis is based on clause as the fundamental unit of organization. The data for the study was generated from students' interactions with ChatGPT. Five content questions were shared among 50 students selected from Olabisi Onabanjo University in Nigeria (30 students) and Takoradi Technical University in Ghana (20 students). It was confirmed that all the students have used the Chabot prior to this study. The five questions were distributed to the 50 participants with no consideration or discrimination on the basis of gender or discipline.

For each question, there were ten students posting the same on their personal ChatGPT and the Chabot responded with ten different answers each of them. Thus, there were 50 separate responses to the five questions. The duplication of each question among ten students was to ascertain the fact that ChatGPT could respond to many students with different responses to the same question. Although the responses for each question are related in meaning, they were differently shuffled. Therefore, for this analysis, one response was randomly chosen for each question. Hence, five texts were used for the analysis.

The texts were classified into clausal units and only main clauses with propositional values were analysed while minor clauses and embedded clauses were exempted since they do not function as propositions or proposals. This model of analysis is adopted from Halliday and Matthiessen (2004). Samples of tabular representation showing how the data were analysed is presented below while others were reported. The following keys were adopted in the tabular analysis:

1. Subject of the clause was <u>underlined.</u>
2. Finite element was processed in **bold face.**

3. Predicator was in *italics* and that was the only part of the Residue marked in the analysis; complement and adjunct were not specially highlighted.
4. Where the finite element and the predicator were fused in a single word, the word appeared as ***bold and italic.***
5. The symbol ˆ is used to mean "before"; hence, SˆF means Subject before Finite.

Data Analysis

Table 1: ChatGPT response to Question 2 "Can democracy thrive in Africa??"

Clause		Mood	Deicticity	Polarity
Text 2 Cl. 1	Yes, democracy **can** *thrive* in Africa,	Declarative SˆF	modal	positive
Text 2 Cl. 2	but it ***is*** not without its challenges.	Declarative SˆF	temporal	positive
Text 2 Cl. 3	Africa **has** *made* significant progress in democratization over the past few decades,	Declarative SˆF	temporal	positive
Text 2 Cl. 4	However, there ***are*** still many obstacles to overcome, such as political instability, corruption, weak institutions, and a lack of respect for human rights.	Declarative SˆF	temporal	positive

Discussion of Data

Table 2: Summary of ChatGPT responses to Q1 to Q5.

ChatGPT content	No. of clauses	Mood		Modality		Polarity	
		Type	Number	Type	Number	positive	Negative
Text 1	12	Declarative	12	can	7	12	~
Text 2	10	Declarative	10	Can	2	10	~

Text 3	9	Declarative	9	Will	1	9	~
Text 4	9	Declarative	9	~~	~~	9	~
Text 5	10	Declarative	10	can	2	9	1
Total	50		50		12		

From the data presented in Tables 2 showing analysis of texts 1 to 5, the five texts were analysed to highlight different Mood types realised in the clauses. The first text [Text 1] had a total of 12 clauses and all were in Declarative Mood. The Finite elements in the 12 clauses had five temporal and seven Modal realised with the use of low degree modality "can". The second text [Text 2] had 10 clauses and all the clauses were also in Declarative Mood with only two Finite Modal realised with "can" while the other eight were temporal. The third and the fourth texts [Text 3 and Text 4] had nine clauses each and 18 Declarative Mood with only one Finite Modal in Clause 8 of Text 3. The last text analysed [Text 5] had 10 clauses and all were in Declarative Mood. There were two Finite Modal and one of them was the only Finite operator to exhibit negative polarity. The five texts had a total of 50 clauses and all realised only Declarative Mood with 12 Finite Modal and one negative polarity.

The analyses of the five texts showed that the exchanges between the students and ChatGPT were basically a question-and-answer session reflecting the typical conversational mode of a learner asking questions and getting responses from a professor except that there was no follow-up to the responses from ChatGPT which could have stretched the exchanges beyond the first response. The questions were randomly topicalised but intentionally formed as content question to evoke stretched responses that would be more detailed. It is therefore, understandable that responses were given as simple statements resonating confidence and factuality.

The understanding of the dominance of Declarative Mood can be considered similar to the interpretation of Bankole and Ayoola (2014), who averred that dominant use of Declarative Mood simply suggests a writer's intent to "simply offer the readers some information convincingly enough to get the readers persuaded". Afful (2007) also submitted that such dominance is suggestive of a speaker in the position of "certainty, conviction and immense power". Noor et al. (2015) agreed that Declarative Mood is naturally "conclusive, strong and factual". These interpretations are apposite to the discourse instantiations in this study.

Considering the import of education in the context of these discourse instantiations, the authoritative posture of ChatGPT, has serious implications on students whose disposition is relaxed to acquire knowledge through series of information given by a teacher, a role played by the Chabot, and gives AI/ChatGPT power over the students' mind. According to van Dijk (2015) power is the ability to "control the acts and minds of (members of) other group" (p. 469) through privileged access to social resources as knowledge and information. Such control is hinged on control of text and context of discourse, mind control and discourses of domination.

In the control of text and context of discourse, ChatGPT responses to students' inquiries were dominantly authoritative in a context of knowledge discourse which leaves the students, susceptible to mind control through information manipulation. In every context of discourse, one of the interlocutors must necessarily wield power over others. For instance, judges control courtroom discourse with institutional power over all else in the courtroom; so also do teachers and professors in classroom discourse. Consequently, students occupy a powerless status in classrooms and are compelled to defer to their professors in educational discourse. The replacement of teachers with ChatGPT will therefore compel similar deference and that will engender mind control. As van. Dijk (2015) noted, "action is controlled by our minds…if we are able to influence people's mind—for example,

their knowledge, attitude, or ideology—we indirectly may control (some of) their actions" (p. 470).

Therefore, if ChatGPT becomes a teaching agent, it automatically begins to control educational discourse through its authoritative and dominant posture. On the one hand, if students, with such deferential attitude, begin to acquire knowledge from ChatGPT, particularly because it carries an allure of modern technology, and a response for every one of their questions, who will the students be considered deferential towards: the AI or an anonymous person(s) somewhere? On the other hand, ChatGPT has a posture of a pseudo-alpha that knows so much about everything; whereas, it does not. For what ChatGPT lacks, he invents, often inaccurately. Dumitrescu (2023) lamented that ChatGPT can invent non-existing information as well as churn out materials with plausible facts and bibliographic references that are wholly imaginary. This was tested, with a different inquiry, and confirmed during this study. This aggravates the danger it poses to students as seekers of knowledge who know little themselves. It therefore becomes imperative to pay keen attention to the question of authorship to understand who wields institutional power in African educational discourse.

Another vital concern with students' use of ChatGPT is accountability. It is important to be conscious of the need for accountability and responsibility in educational discourse. What students learn in schools is usually traceable to a definite source which can be held accountable for consequences that may arise from their learning. This accountability extends to online sources as well since websites or learning applications with verifiable authors in site and App developers. ChatGPT lacks this. The information churned out on the Chabot is not traceable to any known entity that may be held accountable. The lack of accountability threatens knowledge itself in a way that may make learners actively unintelligent. It is vital to state that ChatGPT itself may not be particularly intelligent despite the appellation AI. It does not have the ability to think. ChatGPT as a bot only engages in conversational dialogue enabled through large scale

language model basically, sourcing its content—responses to whatever inquisition put to it—through myriads of material data fed to it by humans. It is a sheer garbage in garbage out process which explains why it sometimes makes so many errors in its outputs. So, who takes responsibility for its content? This leads to the question of anonymity.

ChatGPT is not anonymous. As a teaching agent, ChatGPT exercises active control of educational discourse over students through the institutional power wielded by teachers in classroom discourse using powerful grammatical construct in declarative sentences. Once ChatGPT is allowed to take control of educational texts and context of discourse, it automatically begins to control students' mind and that will lead to sustained reproduction of hegemonic tendencies and cultural cum ideological dominance of African students. This is deducible from the fact that ChatGPT is programmed to source its content from certain areas and to exclude certain areas. The danger in this is that knowledge will be defined from a narrow perspective of those who designed it as it would only source according to the algorithm of areas programmed in it. For instance, its argument for democracy thriving in Africa were sourced data available and prepared by some people. The tendency to ignore sourcing information from certain areas, Africa for example, could be arguably hinged upon low internet penetration and coverage. Hence, other people with resources to swamp the Internet with contents will tell other people's stories. This is how groups, Western nations, will perpetuate domination of other group, Africans for instance.

For instance, the response to Question 2 "Can democracy thrive in Africa?" and Question 3 "Will Africa ever develop?", ChatGPT gave responses that were so cleanly worded and expressed in simple language. The question to ask, however, is, whose opinion was that? The first clause in response to Q3 is dangerously appealing because of the optimism expressed in it and the reasons advanced through the discourse until the final clause where it projected a great future for Africa. Meanwhile, the conspicuous impacts of colonialism and roles of foreign government and international sub-government agencies

particularly of Western origin and identity were not mentioned at all. For African historians and nationalists, would it be considered a valid to dissect Africa's political and socio-economic challenges without elaborating the roles of western influence? And will an African student of History take this as a balanced view of Africa? So, whose view excluded the well-known impacts of centuries of slavery, decades of colonialism and roles of foreign governments, particularly erstwhile colonial masters from the discourse of development and democracy in African? When ChatGPT gave a beautifully worded response but failed to mention the roles of the exploitation of Africa by powerful western nations, it definitely was expressing someone's, or some people's opinion as well as excluding some people's opinions too.

Therefore, questions must be raised about the latent identity of those using ChatGPT as a smokescreen for an agenda. While the concern of some European countries, Italy for example, is the muddled copyright issues on the content generated by ChatGPT, the concern of the Third World should be more ideological. The education discourse needs to be protected and the sanity of the entire educational system protected from the danger posed by the Chabot. What ChatGPT churns out are opinions, and those are not anonymous. While ChatGPT does not on its own think, it carries out the thinking of some people who determine how it is coded. Therefore, AI is a systematic legitimization of hegemonic tendencies of a few people obsessed with ideas of micro-controlling humanity. So, educational institutions need to be concern about who is responsible for what the students are now learning. If AI/ChatGPT's influence on African educational discourse is not regulated, African nations might be threatened by a generation of misinformed and misguided youths, who will embrace cultural and historical narratives skewed against them.

Conclusion

In this paper, AI/ChatGPT educational discourse was analysed using Mood and Modal analysis and CDA. The analysis revealed that ChatGPT used Declarative Mood predominantly in its responses to

inquiries from students. The implications of that predominance were discovered to include extreme arrogation of authority, factuality and finality of expression, and confident disposition. It was discovered that ChatGPT responded to content questions with absolute confidence and factuality despite its inherent inadequacies. The study however found that the anonymous posture of ChatGPT remains the most prominent concern and that is considered to be a formidable threat to education discourse and outcomes in many countries of the Third World in particular. AI has served all societies excellently well in many areas but it appears ChatGPT may be designed to serve a difference purpose that could be detrimental to many countries' education system. This study concluded that the specious anonymity it portrays is a threat to education in Third World nations, in particular.

It is therefore suggested that further research is conducted on the implications of ChatGPT's influence on education discourse in developing countries. Specifically, scholars in humanities, and social scientists are challenged to critically explore this influence with intent to uncover: firstly, the humans behind the opinions expressed by ChatGPT; secondly, those whose opinions are covered as well as those whose opinions are excluded; lastly, reasons for inclusion and exclusion, and the ideological design embedded in it.

References

Afful, J.B.A. (2007). Applying systemic functional grammar to the study of sermonic discourse in a literary text. *Lagos Paper in English Studies*, 2. 148-159.

Amalia, M., Subandowo, D., Faliyanti, E & Thresia, F. (2018). An analysis of mood and modality of interpersonal meaning in Susilo Bambag Yudhoyono (SBY)'s speech. *English language Teaching Educational Journal (ELTEJ),* 1.1. 22–28

Annamalai, N., Eltahir, M.E., Zyoud, S.H., Soundrarajan, D., Zakarnah, B. & Al Salhi, N.R. (2023). Exploring English language via chatbot: A case study from a self-determination

theory perspective. *Computer and Education* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100148

Bankole, M.A. & Ayoola, M.O. (2014). Mood and modality in Christian magazines: A systemic functional analysis of *Christian Women Mirror*. *International Journal of Humanities and asocial Science*, 4, 14. 138-149.

Bloor, T. & Bloor, M. (2004). *The functional analysis of English: A Hallidayan approach (2nd Ed.)*. London: Arnold.

Cakmak, F. (2022). Chatbot-human interaction and its effect on EFL students' L2 speaking performance and speaking anxiety. *Noritas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 16, 2. 113–131.

Daramola, A. (2011). The English language as vehicle of discourse for development in Nigeria. *British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, 3.2, 143-156

Dumitrescu, A. (2023, March 24). Will ChatGPT kill the student essay? Universities aren't ready for the answer. https://thewalrus.ca/chatgpt-writing

Halliday, M.A.K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K. & Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar (3rd Ed.)*. London: Arnold.

Hill, J., Ford, W.R. & Ferreras, I.G. (2015). Real conversation with artificial intelligence: A comparison of human-human online conversation and human-chatbot conversations. *Computer in Human Behaviour*, 49, 245–250. https://doi.org//10.1016/j.chb.2015-02.026

Rebecca, R. (2004). An introduction to critical discourse analysis. In Rebecca, R. (Eds). *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education.* London: Laurence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Noor, M., Ali, M., Muhabat, F. & Kazemian, B. (2015). Systemic functional linguistics: Mood analysis of the last address of the

last address of the holy prophet (pbuh). *International Journal of Language and Linguistics,* 13 (5-1), 1-9.

Ribino, P. (2023). The role of politeness in huma-machine interactions: A systematic literature review and future perspectives. Artificial Intelligence Review. https://doi.org/10.1007/310462-023-10540-1

Suprijadi, D. & Rahmawati, R. (2021). The mood types analysis in script of RM's speech at the United Nation. *Professional Journal of English Education*, 4.4, 574-580.

Song, Z. (2013). Transitivity analysis of *A Rose for Emily. Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3.12, 2291-2295.

Thompson, G. (2014). *Introduction to functional grammar (3rd Ed.).* London: Routledge.

Tonts, S. (2019). Chatbots_will they ever be ready? Pragmatic shortcomings in communication with chatbots. MSc. Thesis, Politenico Di Milano (Unpublished).

van. Dijk, T. A. (1995). Aims of critical discourse analysis. *Japanese Discourse,* 1. 17~27

van. Dijk, T. A (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schifrin, D. Tannen, & H.E. Hamilton (eds.) *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

van. Dijk, T. A (2015). Critical discourse analysis. D. Tannen, H.E. Hamilton & D. Schifrin. (Eds.) *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis (2nd Ed.).* John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Wang, Y., Yue, S. & Zhong, Y. (2021). Understanding differences between human language processing and natural language processing by synchronised model. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research,* 637, 287–294.

Yang, J. (2022). Perceptions of preservice teachers on AI chatbots in English education. *International Journal of Internet, Broadcasting and Communication,* 14(1) 44–52. http://dx.doi.org/10.7236/IJIBC.2022.14.1.44