



# Reclaiming the Sonic Archive: AI, Data Sovereignty, and the Future of Mijikenda Music

Linus Wechuli Odeke & Amon Kipyegon Kirui

*Kabarak University, Kenya*

## Article History

Received: 2025-06-24

Revised: 2025-12-14

Accepted: 2025-12-19

Published: 2025-12-30

## Keywords

Artificial Intelligence

Ethics

Mijikenda

Music

Sonic archive

## How to cite:

Odeke, L. W. & Kirui, A. K. (2025). Reclaiming the Sonic Archive: AI, Data Sovereignty, and the Future of Mijikenda Music. *Journal of Visual and Performing Arts*, 3(1), 53-62.

Copyright © 2025



## Abstract

This paper examines the ethical implications and risks of applying artificial intelligence (AI) to Indigenous musical heritage, with a specific focus on the Mijikenda communities in the coast of Kenya. Traditional AI tools, deeply rooted in Western systems of knowledge, carry a significant risk of perpetuating digital colonialism. This manifests through the decontextualisation of sacred musical practices and the infringement of crucial data sovereignty rights. The study aims to analyse the fundamental effects emerging between conventional AI methodologies and the knowledge systems underpinning Mijikenda music. Furthermore, it seeks to identify cases of algorithmic bias and cultural appropriation that may arise from such applications. In response, the paper proposes a decolonial framework to guide the ethical development and deployment of AI within the field of African musicology. Employing a systematic review of existing literature, in line with documented perspectives of Mijikenda practitioners and a complete analysis of scholarly works, the research uncovers a significant divergence. The drawing apart forces exist between AI's often extractive logic and the holistic principles of Indigenous Knowledge Systems (IKS). A primary concern among Mijikenda communities is the widespread threat of cultural appropriation, alongside a strong emphasis on understanding music's core value beyond mere data reliant the paper concludes by advocating for a fundamental paradigm shift: moving away from AI as a tool for extraction towards its utilisation as a platform for community-led cultural care. This transformative approach necessitates grounding AI development firmly within the principles of IKS and decolonial theory, ultimately empowering Indigenous communities and ensuring the sustainable continuity of their living sonic heritage.

## Introduction

The sonic heritage of the Mijikenda, a collective of nine distinct yet related Bantu-speaking ethnic groups on the Kenyan coast, including the Giriama, Digo, and Duruma (Spear, 1978), is not an abstract art form but a dynamic, living archive woven into the fabric of social and spiritual life. Bound by a shared origin narrative from the mythical northern homeland of Shungwaya (Spear, 1978), their music is an embodied practice inseparable from its context. It serves as a medium that mediates between the physical and magical worlds (Shilabukha, 2025), a tool for education and celebration (UNESCO, 2009), and a central component of life's most significant rituals. Funerary ceremonies, for example, are prominent venues for performances such as the vigorous gonda dance, which serves to "make the



body happy" (*kufurahisha mwiri*) amidst mourning, underscoring music's integral role in communal processing of life and death (National Museums of Kenya, n.d.-b). This heritage is enacted within and tied to the sacred Kaya forests, the fortified hilltop settlements that are the crucibles of Mijikenda identity, ethics, and governance systems (UNESCO, 2009).

Into this rich milieu, Artificial Intelligence (AI) arrives as a "double-edged sword" (Chen & Lin, 2023). On the one hand, it presents unprecedented opportunities. AI could be a powerful tool for archiving and revitalising this heritage, addressing existential threats such as the physical decay of decades-old analogue reel-to-reel recordings that hold the last known versions of certain songs or dialects (Rivers, 2012). For Indigenous communities globally, AI offers the potential for language revitalisation, ecological protection, and the amplification of Indigenous knowledge on Indigenous terms. On the other hand, the uncritical deployment of these technologies carries profound risks of perpetuating digital colonialism, systemic data bias, and cultural appropriation on an industrial scale (Birhane, 2020; Dugeri, 2024).

The central problem this paper addresses is not merely technical but ontological. The uncritical application of conventional AI systems, which are deeply rooted in Western epistemologies and an extractive logic, constitutes a form of epistemic violence against Mijikenda knowledge systems. The core function of these AI models is to abstract content from its context, converting rich cultural expressions into decontextualised training data for profit (Couldry & Mejias, 2019). This process fundamentally redefines Mijikenda music—transforming it from a relational, embodied, and spiritually significant practice into a quantifiable, disembodied object. This threatens to sever the music from its sacred connection to the Kayas (UNESCO, 2009), violate the principles of data sovereignty (Rainie et al., 2019), and automate historical patterns of cultural extraction that have long plagued Indigenous communities worldwide (Dugeri, 2024). The problem, therefore, is a fundamental clash between two ways of knowing and being in the world.

This paper dissects the above-referred epistemological conflict and, in response, proposes a decolonial framework for community-led technological stewardship. It begins by reviewing the literature on the contested politics of the dataset, examining the architecture of digital neo-colonialism in Kenya, the risk of "algorithmic flattening" of embodied performance, the creation of a "data desert" that marginalises Mijikenda heritage, and the historical precedents for cultural appropriation on the coast. Building on this critique, the paper then constructs a decolonial framework grounded in three core principles: centring Indigenous Knowledge Systems (IKS), operationalising data sovereignty, and repurposing AI for cultural care. The analysis concludes by offering concrete recommendations for Mijikenda communities, Kenyan policymakers, and the global technology industry, advocating for a paradigm shift that transforms AI from a tool of extraction into a platform for the sustainable continuity of a living sonic heritage.

### **Methodology**

The methodology employed in this study is a qualitative, interdisciplinary approach that focuses on a critical systematic review of the literature, legal frameworks, and digital heritage reports. The study synthesises peer-reviewed articles, WIPO policy texts, and UNESCO reports on Mijikenda intangible cultural heritage, drawing on ethnomusicology, critical data studies, and decolonial theory. The discussion particularly compares the extractive logic of existing AI training datasets, as evidenced by the marginalisation of non-Western music (Mehta et al., 2025), with the holistic epistemologies of Mijikenda IKS. The study of the Kaya forests through Indigenous Data Governance, using the CARE Principles, is used to develop a normative framework in which descriptive analysis is replaced by the



proposal of ethical rules that reverse the process of the so-called algorithmic flattening and guarantee digital data sovereignty.

### **Literature review**

The intersection of AI and Mijikenda music cannot be understood without first examining the political nature of the data upon which AI systems are built. The dataset is not a neutral collection of facts but a political artefact, shaped by historical power dynamics, systemic neglect, and colonial logics of extraction and representation. This review synthesises existing scholarship to map the contested terrain of the Mijikenda sonic archive, revealing a continuum of external control that creates the very conditions of vulnerability that modern data colonialism now exploits.

#### ***a. The architecture of digital neo-colonialism in Coastal Kenya***

Scholars increasingly frame the expansion of AI into Africa as a new iteration of colonial exploitation, termed digital neo-colonialism (Coleman, 2019; Kwet, 2019). This system mirrors the historical colonial script where raw materials were extracted from the continent, processed in the metropole, and sold back as expensive finished goods. In the 21st century, raw data is the new natural resource, and human cultural expression is the material to be mined in a process of "data colonialism" (Coudry & Mejias, 2019). This extractive supply chain begins with the physical mining of African minerals, such as cobalt in Congo, for the hardware that powers AI, and continues with the exploitation of low-wage cognitive labour, such as Kenyan data annotators who refine datasets for Western corporations for as little as \$2.20 per hour. The cycle culminates in the continent being positioned as a consumer market for foreign-designed AI products, thereby concentrating wealth and power in the Global North and reinforcing Africa's position of dependence in the global technological landscape (Salami, 2024).

Internal factors within Kenya critically enable this external architecture of extraction. A significant vulnerability is the existence of profound "regulatory voids" (Ayana et al., 2024). Kenya's data protection laws and intellectual property frameworks have historically failed to provide robust, sui generis protections for communally owned Traditional Cultural Expressions (TCEs), creating loopholes for continued exploitation. While the Traditional Knowledge and Cultural Expressions Act of 2016 was a step forward, its implementation and enforcement remain challenging (WIPO, 2017). This legislative weakness is compounded by chronic infrastructure deficits, including unreliable electricity and high data costs, which make it prohibitively expensive for local innovators to build and maintain sovereign data centres and AI ecosystems (Salami, 2024). This forces a near-total reliance on foreign-controlled digital infrastructure, ensuring that even local innovation often generates profit for the very entities that dominate the global technological landscape. This dual structure of external corporate power and internal systemic weakness creates the ideal conditions for the digital colonisation of cultural heritage.

#### ***b. Algorithmic flattening and the "authenticity" of embodied performance***

A central threat posed by AI is its potential to enact a computational form of colonial "museumification", a process that historically sought to "preserve" Indigenous cultures by decontextualising them, ultimately ossifying living traditions into static artefacts (Kiragu, 2023). Early ethnomusicological projects, often intertwined with colonial ambitions, approached African music through archiving and the curation of staged performances, thereby isolating musical practices from their natural environments and promoting essentialist worldviews (Kiragu, 2023). This process is mirrored in the contemporary tourist trade on the Kenyan coast, where cultural expressions are often reduced to "staged authenticity". The Mijikenda kayamba (a raft rattle), for example, is frequently commercialised as a non-playable souvenir for tourists. This commodified object represents the



material culture but is disconnected from its performative function and sound, thereby distorting its cultural meaning for external consumption.

AI's inherent logic of datafication automates this very process. By design, AI models reduce fluid, embodied cultural practices into a "static, classifiable grid" of analysable patterns (APRA AMCOS, 2024). This "algorithmic flattening" threatens to strip away the holistic essence of Mijikenda performance – the *uvulana* (youthful energy) of the *gonda* dancers (National Museums of Kenya, n.d.-b), the sacred connection to ancestral spirits invoked through specific rhythms and chants (UNESCO, 2009), and the music's role as a bridge between the physical and magical worlds (Shilabukha, 2025). An AI trained on recordings of this music might learn to replicate its melodic and rhythmic structures but would remain ignorant of its meaning, purpose, and spiritual power. It would produce a sound devoid of soul, an infinitely replicable form of staged authenticity completely detached from the living community. Indigenous creators fear this exact outcome: the reduction of their work to a commodified sound element that has lost its "soul/spirit/human/lived experience" (APRA AMCOS, 2024).

### *c. The crisis of preservation and representation*

The systemic marginalisation of Mijikenda music has resulted in a "data desert": a critical lack of comprehensive, high-quality, and community-governed digital archives. This void is not a natural state or an indication of a lack of cultural richness; it is a direct consequence of a historical continuum of colonial and post-colonial neglect. The colonial-era preservationist mindset established a paradigm of external control over the sonic archive (Kiragu, 2023). This paradigm was followed by decades of state failure to adequately fund and support sustainable, community-led archiving initiatives. This has led to a crisis in which invaluable cultural knowledge, stored on decaying analogue media such as reel-to-reel tapes, is at risk of being lost forever (Rivers, 2012). Furthermore, digitisation is not a simple technical task. It is fraught with challenges, including the high cost of equipment and training, the lack of sustainable funding and maintenance for digital projects (Christen, 2011; Mutero, 2013), and the complex ethical protocols surrounding sacred knowledge, which cannot and should not be indiscriminately digitised and made public (Powell, 2012).

This manufactured data desert creates a profound vulnerability in the age of AI. The vast majority of datasets used to train large-scale music generation models are overwhelmingly dominated by Western classical and popular music, with non-Western genres comprising a minuscule fraction (Bryan-Kinns & Liz, 2024). A recent study by Mehta et al. (2025) found that only 5.7% of music in existing datasets comes from non-Western genres. This gross underrepresentation means that AI systems will either ignore Mijikenda music entirely, rendering it invisible and further marginalising it in the global digital soundscape, or they will attempt to fill the gap with distorted, non-representative, or appropriated content. This can lead to a form of "algorithmic apartheid," where biased systems perpetuate digital discrimination and reinforce cultural hierarchies (Milner, 2023). The fact that major voice assistants like Siri and Alexa collectively serve zero of Africa's approximately 2,000 languages is a stark parallel, demonstrating how technological systems built on biased data can erase entire continents of knowledge.

### *d. From Taarab to generative AI*

The threat of AI-driven appropriation is not hypothetical; it follows a well-established historical blueprint of musical extraction on the Kenyan coast and across Africa. The region's musical history is rich with examples of cultural fusion and exchange, but also of power imbalances and appropriation. The celebrated coastal genre of *Taarab*, for instance, is a cosmopolitan form shaped by the appropriation of Indian and Arab sonic gestures and styles, used by Swahili-speaking Muslims to mediate their identity between the African and Indian Ocean worlds (Eisenberg, 2024). The more



modern genre of Bango, created by Mijikenda musician Mzee Joseph Ngala, skilfully fuses traditional Mijikenda music with jazz and rhumba. While these genres demonstrate creative synthesis, the broader history of engagement with external powers is fraught with exploitation.

The quintessential example is the Zulu song "Mbube," composed by Solomon Linda in 1939. Linda sold the copyright for a pittance, after which the song was reworked into "Wimoweh" and the global hit "The Lion Sleeps Tonight," generating immense royalties for American artists and publishers. At the same time, Linda's family lived in poverty (Dean, 2006). This narrative, in which an Indigenous creation is extracted, decontextualised, stripped of its original meaning, and monetised globally with no benefit flowing back to the source community, serves as a precise blueprint for the risks posed by generative AI (Dugeri, 2024). AI systems, trained on vast and often opaque datasets scraped from the internet without consent, are poised to automate and industrialise this exact pattern of appropriation. They can "cannibalise culture" on an unprecedented scale, detaching Mijikenda musical works from their cultural and spiritual contexts and transforming them into commodities, perpetuating a centuries-long pattern of exploitation under the guise of technological progress (Dugeri, 2024).

*e. Decolonial frameworks for resistance and sovereignty*

In response to these threats, a powerful global counter-movement has emerged, offering decolonial frameworks for resistance and technological autonomy. Central to this is the Indigenous Data Sovereignty (IDSov) movement, which asserts the inherent right of Indigenous Peoples to govern all data concerning their communities, lands, and knowledge systems (Rainie et al., 2019). IDSov reframes Indigenous communities not as passive data sources but as rights-holders, whose control over their data is intrinsic to their self-determination (Carroll et al., 2020).

The countermovement offers a critical alternative to dominant open-data paradigms and the data-centric FAIR Principles (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable), which often facilitate data sharing while overlooking the historical power imbalances and colonial contexts that render such openness dangerous for marginalised communities (Carroll et al., 2020). To address this, Indigenous scholars and allies developed the people- and purpose-oriented CARE Principles for Indigenous Data Governance (Collective Benefit, Authority to Control, Responsibility, Ethics). The CARE principles shift the focus from data accessibility to relational accountability, requiring that any data work must benefit the source community, be subject to their authority, be conducted responsibly, and adhere to their ethical systems. These principles are not abstract ideals but practical, decolonial tools for resistance, providing a foundation for communities like the Mijikenda to reclaim their sonic archives and engage with technology on their own terms (Mohamed et al., 2020).

**Discussion**

This section goes beyond simply critiquing colonial logic and moves toward the practical application of decolonisation through a decolonial framework for use with the Mijikenda sonic archive. Instead of attempting to eliminate bias within the established Western paradigm, it seeks a radical epistemological transformation of how we conceptualise AI as "Computation as Consultation" - where the AI does not supplant the wisdom of the people who are the source community, but instead acts to stimulate conversation and create additional social relationships between members of the community. To implement such an AI system based on this philosophy, this framework is rooted in three related elements: The centring of indigenous knowledge systems, the operationalisation of data sovereignty, and the repurposing of AI for cultural care.



### **A decolonial framework for AI and the Mijikenda sonic archive**

Critiquing the colonial logic of AI is necessary but insufficient. To move from analysis to action, this paper proposes a decolonial framework for the ethical development and deployment of AI in the context of the Mijikenda sonic archive. This framework is not about making existing AI systems "fairer" or "less biased" within their current paradigm. Instead, it calls for a fundamental epistemological shift, rejecting the premise of automated, decontextualised decision-making and replacing it with a model of "computation as consultation." It is grounded in three interdependent principles: centring Indigenous Knowledge Systems, operationalising data sovereignty, and repurposing AI for cultural care.

#### ***a. Centring Indigenous Knowledge Systems (IKS)***

Any ethical application of AI must begin by rejecting the technology's default Western epistemology and grounding itself in Mijikenda cosmology. Mijikenda IKS, like many Indigenous worldviews, understands the world through relationality, where humans are "suspended in webs of significance they have spun themselves," and the boundary between the human and natural worlds is dialectical and sacred (Shilabukha, 2025). Music is not a dataset; it is a medium for maintaining this delicate balance—a way of communicating with ancestors, connecting to the land of the Kayas, and reinforcing communal bonds (UNESCO, 2009).

A powerful counter-model to the opaque "black box" of Western AI can be found in other African knowledge systems, such as the Yoruba divination system of *Ifá*. *Ifá* operates on a binary computational logic remarkably similar to modern AI, using an 8-bit structure to arrive at one of 256 possible outcomes (*odù*), which map to a vast oral corpus (Omorie, 2025). However, the crucial difference lies in its process. The *odù* is not an answer; it is a reference point that initiates a dialogue. Its meaning emerges only through social interpretation, consultation, and conversation among the priest, the client, and the community, tailored to the specific context of the inquiry (Omorie, 2025). The *Ifá* algorithm is intentionally incomplete without human wisdom and moral responsibility.

Applying this logic to the Mijikenda context means designing AI systems that serve a similar function. An AI tool could be used to analyse rhythmic patterns or melodic fragments from an old recording, but its output would not be presented as a definitive "reconstruction." Instead, it would serve as a prompt for dialogue among community elders, musicians, and youth, facilitating a collective process of remembering and reinterpretation. The technology's role shifts from providing automated answers to provoking culturally grounded conversations, thereby deepening human wisdom rather than attempting to replace it. This is the fundamental distinction between merely "diversifying" AI with new data and truly "decolonising" its function.

#### ***b. Operationalising data sovereignty for the sonic archive***

Grounding AI in IKS requires a robust governance structure to protect the community's digital heritage. This involves the practical application of the CARE Principles (Carroll et al., 2020) to the Mijikenda sonic archive, transforming data sovereignty from an abstract concept into an operational reality.

##### ***i. Collective benefit***

AI tools must be designed to address community-defined needs and priorities. Instead of creating generative models for commercial entertainment, the focus should be on developing applications that directly benefit the Mijikenda people. This could include developing interactive educational materials to teach youth about their musical traditions; tools for language revitalisation across the nine dialects; or systems that help community musicians



reconstruct and learn forgotten melodies from fragmented archival recordings. The goal is cultural continuity and empowerment, not external profit.

*ii. Authority to control*

Ultimate authority over the sonic archive, what is digitised, how it is used, and who can access it, must rest with the Mijikenda community, governed through their traditional structures, such as the Kambi (Councils of Elders) (UNESCO, 2009). These councils are the rightful custodians of the heritage and are best positioned to determine which knowledge is sacred and must remain restricted, and which can be shared under specific protocols (Mutero, 2013; Powell, 2012). This authority can be implemented digitally through tools such as Traditional Knowledge (TK) labels, which are community-generated notices that clarify permissions and restrictions governing the access to and use of cultural materials.

*iii. Responsibility*

Technology developers and partner institutions have a profound responsibility that extends beyond technical implementation. They must commit to building community capacity, ensuring that Mijikenda members are not treated as passive data providers or end users but are empowered as active co-designers, developers, and long-term stewards of the technology (Kirui et al., 2025). This involves transparent processes, skills training, and ensuring the project's sustainability is not dependent on external funding in perpetuity (Chigwada et al., 2025).

*iv. Ethics*

The entire AI lifecycle, from data collection and model design to application deployment, must be aligned with Mijikenda ethical frameworks. These ethics are rooted in principles of communal well-being, respect for ancestral knowledge, and the maintenance of social and spiritual harmony (UNESCO, 2009). This requires a shift from the individualistic, consent-based ethics of Western frameworks to a relational ethic that prioritises the collective and its enduring connection to its heritage.

***c. Repurposing AI for cultural care and revitalisation***

The final principle of this framework entails a proactive, activist reappropriation of technology. It reframes AI from a tool of extraction and representation to a platform for community-led cultural care. This approach aligns with a broader decolonial movement that rejects technological determinism and instead seeks to repurpose digital capabilities to serve community-led goals, ensuring African perspectives shape the digital frontier (Kirui et al., 2025). This involves developing specific, culturally attuned applications that actively strengthen the Mijikenda sonic heritage.

*i. Language preservation and education*

As urbanisation and social transformations draw younger generations away from the Kayas (UNESCO, 2009), the nine distinct Mijikenda dialects face increasing pressure. AI-powered natural language processing tools, co-designed with community linguists, can be used to transcribe oral histories, analyse linguistic nuances, and create interactive learning applications for children and youth, thereby helping to ensure intergenerational transmission of language, the vessel of culture.

*ii. Embodied musical pedagogy*

AI can be used to create sophisticated educational tools that go beyond simple playback. For instance, an interactive system could analyse the complex polyrhythms of Mijikenda drumming on instruments like the *mshondo* and *chapuo* (National Museums of Kenya, n.d.-a)



and provide real-time feedback to a learner. Another tool could model the unique playing style of the one-stringed *mbeveve* fiddle (Ballard, 2011), helping to preserve virtuosic techniques that might otherwise be lost.

iii. *Contextual archival interfaces*

Instead of a standard digital database that lists song titles, a decolonial AI system could create a relational interface for community members to engage with their heritage. A song could be linked geographically to its specific Kaya of origin, narratively to the oral traditions with which it is associated, and contextually to the specific ceremonies (funerals, weddings, initiations) in which it is performed (National Museums of Kenya, n.d.-b; UNESCO, 2009). This would use AI not to decontextualise, but to digitally re-contextualise and enrich the community's connection to its own sonic archive.

## Conclusion

The expansion of Artificial Intelligence into the domain of Indigenous cultural heritage represents a critical juncture. Unchecked, its default Western-centric, extractive logic is poised to function as a powerful vector of digital neo-colonialism, perpetuating historical patterns of appropriation and misrepresentation. For the Mijikenda communities of coastal Kenya, this threatens to decontextualise sacred sonic practices, violate their data sovereignty, and computationally flatten a living, breathing heritage into a static dataset. This process is not inevitable. A proactive, decolonial framework grounded in Indigenous Knowledge Systems, operationalised through data sovereignty, and oriented toward cultural care can fundamentally repurpose AI. It can transform a potential threat into a powerful tool for cultural resurgence, linguistic revitalisation, and community-led stewardship of the sonic archive, ensuring its continuity for generations to come. The struggle over the Mijikenda sonic archive is thus a microcosm of a larger global battle for epistemic futures. Its outcome will help determine whether technology serves as a tool for liberation or a new, more insidious mechanism of colonial control.

## References

- APRA AMCOS. (2024). *AI and music report*. [https://assets.apraamcos.com.au/images/PDFs/AI-and-Music-by-Goldmedia-for-APRA-AMCOS\\_FINAL.pdf](https://assets.apraamcos.com.au/images/PDFs/AI-and-Music-by-Goldmedia-for-APRA-AMCOS_FINAL.pdf)
- Ayana, G., Dese, K., Daba, H., Mellado, B., Badu, K., Yamba, E., & Kong, J. D. (2024). Decolonising global AI governance: Assessment of the state of decolonised AI governance in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Royal Society Open Science*, 11(7), 231994. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.231994>
- Ballard, T. (2011). *Musical instruments on display at the MIM* [Photograph]. Wikimedia Commons. [https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Musical\\_instruments\\_on\\_display\\_at\\_the\\_MIM\\_\(14165167608\).jpg](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Musical_instruments_on_display_at_the_MIM_(14165167608).jpg)
- Birhane, A. (2020). Algorithmic colonisation of Africa. *SCRIPT-ed*, 17(2), 389-409. <https://doi.org/10.2966/scrip.170220.389>
- Bryan-Kinns, N., & Li, Z. (2024). *Reducing barriers to the use of marginalised music genres in AI* (arXiv:2407.13439v1) [Preprint]. arXiv. <https://arxiv.org/html/2407.13439v1>
- Carroll, S. R., Garba, I., Figueroa-Rodríguez, O. L., et al. (2020). The CARE principles for Indigenous data governance. *Data Science Journal*, 19(1), 43. <http://doi.org/10.5334/dsj-2020-041>
- Chen, J. J., & Lin, J. C. (2023). Artificial intelligence as a double-edged sword: Wielding the POWER principles to maximise its positive effects and minimise its negative effects. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 25(1), 146-153. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14639491231169813>



- Chigwada, J., Ngulube, P., & Mapara, J. G. (2025). Influence of Indigenous data governance principles on Indigenous knowledge management: Lessons from the Southern African Intangible Cultural Heritage Project. *IFLA Journal*, 0(0), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03400352251331471>
- Christen, K. (2011). Opening archives: Respectful repatriation. *The American Archivist*, 74(1), 185-210. <https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.74.1.4233nv6nv6428521>
- Coleman, D. (2019). Digital colonialism: The 21<sup>st</sup>-century scramble for Africa through the extraction and control of user data and the limitations of data protection laws. *Michigan Journal of Race & Law*, 24(2), 417-439. <https://doi.org/10.36643/mjrl.24.2.digital>
- Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. A. (2019). *The costs of connection: How data is colonising human life and appropriating it for capitalism*. Stanford University Press.
- Dean, O. (2006, April 14). Copyright in the courts: The return of the lion. *WIPO Magazine*. World Intellectual Property Organisation. <https://www.wipo.int/web/wipo-magazine/articles/copyright-in-the-courts-the-return-of-the-lion-35180>
- Dugeri, M. (2024). Generative AI and the risk of cultural appropriation of Indigenous African musical works. *Journal of Intellectual Property and Information Technology*, 4(1), 17-34. <https://doi.org/10.52907/jipit.v4i1>
- Eisenberg, A. J. (2024). *Sounds of other shores: The musical poetics of identity on Kenya's Swahili coast*. Wesleyan University Press.
- Kiragu, N. (2023). What's the deal? The link between the sustainability and commercial aspects of the kayamba of the Mijikenda community. *Journal of Music and Creative Arts (JMCA)*, 2(1), 35-45. <https://doi.org/10.51317/jmca.v2i1.407>
- Kirui, A. K., Wanyama, M. N., & Mapaya, M. G. (2025). Epistemics of African music performance: Navigating knowledge, tradition, and the digital frontier. *African Musicology Online*, 14(2), 14-24. <https://doi.org/10.58721/amo.v14i2.1107>
- Koros, C., Mulindwa, C., & Nzuki, C. (2025, May 27). *IP and music in Kenya – How royalties battles and artists are shaping Kenya's creative economy*. CIPIT, Strathmore University. <https://cipit.strathmore.edu/ip-and-music-in-kenya-how-royalties-battles-and-artists-are-shaping-kenyas-creative-economy/>
- Kwet, M. (2019). Digital colonialism: US empire and the new imperialism in the Global South. *Race & Class*, 60(4), 3-26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306396818823172>
- Mehta, A., Chauhan, S., Djanibekov, A., Kulkarni, A., Xia, G., & Choudhury, M. (2025). *Music for All: Representational bias and cross-cultural adaptability of music generation models*. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2502.07328>
- Milner, Y. (2023, October 14). *Apartheid is an algorithm*. Data for Black Lives. <https://d4bl.org/dispatch/109-apartheid-is-an-algorithm>
- Mohamed, S., Png, M. T., & Isaac, W. (2020). Decolonial AI: Decolonial theory as sociotechnical foresight in artificial intelligence. *Philosophy & Technology*, 33, 659-684. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-020-00405-8>
- Mutero, E. (2013, June 10). Challenges faced by African archivists in digitising traditional cultural expressions. *Records and Archives Management*. <https://recordsandarchives.wordpress.com/2013/06/10/35/>
- National Museums of Kenya. (n.d.-a). *The drums of the Mijikenda*. Google Arts & Culture. <https://artsandculture.google.com/asset/the-drums-of-the-mijikenda/1QHrIRF6gmnnTg?hl=en>
- National Museums of Kenya. (n.d.-b). *Mijikenda traditional dance*. Google Arts & Culture.



- <https://artsandculture.google.com/asset/mijikenda-traditional-dance/UwGGmUwRhYpPZQ?hl=en>
- Omoregie, U. (2025, August 22). What Ifá, an Indigenous binary knowledge system can teach us about AI. *Impact of Social Sciences*. London School of Economics.
- Powell, T. (2012, February 14). Digitising some Native American recordings while keeping others sacred. *WHYY*. <https://whyy.org/articles/digitizing-some-native-american-recordings-while-keeping-others-sacred/>
- Rainie, S. C., Kukutai, T., Walter, M., Figueroa-Rodriguez, O. L., Walker, J., & Axelsson, P. (2019). Issues in open data: Indigenous data sovereignty. In T. Davies, S. Walker, M. Rubinstein, & F. Perini (Eds.), *The state of open data: Histories and horizons* (pp. 300–319). African Minds and International Development Research Centre (IDRC). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2677801>
- Rivers, X. (2012, March 1). Indigi-Digitisation. *Indigenous Portal*. University of British Columbia. <https://indigenous.ubc.ca/2012/03/01/indigi-digitization/>
- Salami, A. O. (2024). Artificial intelligence, digital colonialism, and the implications for Africa’s future development. *Data & Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/dap.2024.75>
- Shilabukha, K. (2025). Harnessing Indigenous Knowledge and Management Systems of Marine Ecosystems Among the Mijikenda of Coastal Kenya. *Journal of the Kenya National Commission for UNESCO*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.62049/jkncu.v5i2.298>
- Spear, T. T. (1978). *The Kaya complex: A history of the Mijikenda peoples of the Kenya coast to 1900*. Kenya Literature Bureau.
- UNESCO. (2009). *Traditions and practices associated with the Kayas in the sacred forests of the Mijikenda*. Intangible Cultural Heritage. <https://ich.unesco.org/en/USL/traditions-and-practices-associated-with-the-kayas-in-the-sacred-forests-of-the-mijikenda-00313>
- WIPO. (2017). *The Protection of Traditional Knowledge and Cultural Expressions Act, 2016*. [https://www.wipo.int/en/web/traditional-knowledge/w/tklaws/article\\_0081](https://www.wipo.int/en/web/traditional-knowledge/w/tklaws/article_0081)