Why Feminist Design Matters for GenAI: Perspectives from Lusophone Innovation Ecosystems

Amanda Lopes Oliveira[1], Rodrigo Hernandez-Ramirez[2] and Hande Ayanoglu[1]
[1]UNIDCOM/IADE, Unidade de Investigação em Design e Comunicação, Lisboa, Portugal
[2]Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning, Australia

amandalopesoliv@gmail.com
rodrigo.hernandez@sydney.edu.au
hande.ayanoglu@universidadeeuropeia.pt

Abstract: This paper examines professionals' perceptions of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) and its impact on innovation ecosystems in Brazil and Portugal through a feminist and intersectional design lens. It explores how GenAI shapes work experiences, gender dynamics, and organizational practices, highlighting both perceived opportunities and structural challenges across diverse roles and identities. The study addresses the tension between AI's technological promise, often framed in terms of efficiency, creativity, and innovation, and its implications for equity, diversity, and inclusion in professional contexts. This inquiry is grounded in systemic conditions: AI development remains dominated by a narrow demographic whose assumptions and values are embedded in technological systems, while biased datasets and workplace automation risk reproducing inequalities and widening gendered skill gaps. Empirically, the research draws on 23 semi-structured interviews with cisgender and transgender women and men, as well as non-binary professionals working with AI-driven tools in Brazil and Portugal. Using thematic analysis informed by feminist and intersectional design frameworks, the findings reveal a complex landscape. Participants recognized GenAI's potential to streamline processes and support innovation, while also expressing concerns about the reproduction of hierarchical power relations and the superficiality of many corporate diversity initiatives. The results reinforce that GenAI is not a neutral technology, but a sociotechnical construct embedded in existing power structures. Its deployment can either reinforce systemic disparities or contribute to more equitable innovation ecosystems. The paper offers guidance on the responsible use of GenAI, grounded in feminist design principles and emphasizing ethical practice and inclusive governance.

Keywords: Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI), Feminist design, Gender equity, Design justice, Innovation ecosystems

1. Introduction

The rapid advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AI) is reshaping global innovation by transforming economies, labor markets, and cultural imaginaries. Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI), in particular, promises new efficiencies and creative possibilities, yet its adoption has made increasingly visible that innovation is not a neutral process. AI, as a sociotechnical system, mirrors the society from which it emerges (Howcroft & Rubery, 2019). Despite this, dominant debates often treat AI bias as a purely technical problem, presumed solvable through data debiasing or algorithmic adjustments. Feminist and design scholars, however, argue that bias is rooted in deeper structural conditions. Technologies are built upon value-laden binaries; as Baker (2025) notes, oppositions such as "masculine/feminine" and "modern/traditional" are constructed through hierarchical valuations that become encoded into technological systems. Gender thus shapes not only user experience but also work processes, organizational dynamics, and what ultimately gets designed (Etayo Ballesteros et al., 2025).

These structural conditions are reinforced by limited diversity within development teams, extending beyond flawed datasets to design cultures shaped by systemic prejudice. As Hicks, James, and Slater (2024) emphasize, Large Language Models (LLMs), trained on massive text corpora to generate outputs that appear human-produced, are not designed to accurately represent the world but to simulate such accuracy. This highlights the relevance of design justice, which examines how intersecting forms of oppression, including white supremacy, cisnormativity, heteropatriarchy, capitalism, and settler colonialism, are embedded in technological artifacts (Costanza-Chock, 2018, 2020). From this perspective, GenAI is understood as a social construct shaped by power relations rather than an autonomous technical agent. Guided by an intersectional and decolonial perspective grounded in transmodernity (Ballestrin, 2013), this study examines how technology professionals in Brazil and Portugal perceive the intersections of design, GenAI, and gender equity. These Lusophone contexts—situated in the Global South and the Global North, respectively, and shaped by shared colonial legacies—were intentionally selected to enable a comparative analysis that challenges Eurocentric assumptions about technological development. By framing AI as an issue of social justice and power, the study asks: Why is GenAI a Feminist Design matter?

2. Background

Gender disparities in the adoption of AI, particularly GenAI, are not merely the result of individual preferences but reflect and reinforce broader social inequalities and power structures. AI research and development remain predominantly led by white cisgender men, thereby reproducing existing social, cultural, and institutional frictions (Howcroft & Rubery, 2019; Klein & D'Ignazio, 2024). Collins's (1990) concept of the matrix of domination shows how overlapping systems of oppression, white supremacy, heteropatriarchy, capitalism, and settler colonialism, shape social life, while design processes systematically encode these hierarchies into sociotechnical systems (Ciston, 2019; Costanza-Chock, 2020). Empirical data illustrate the consequences of these gaps: women are 20% less likely than men to engage with GenAI (Otis et al., 2024) and represent only 29% of global R&D positions (UNESCO, 2023). In Europe, women hold just 22% of tech roles, although doubling their participation could add €260–600 billion to GDP (McKinsey & Company, 2023). Exclusion from technological development, therefore, concentrates economic opportunities and income among groups with privileged access to emerging technologies.

When women are excluded from technological development and adoption, inequalities tend to deepen. The challenge of AI extends beyond algorithms to the purposes for which they are developed. Embedded in capitalist power dynamics, AI functions as an extractive industry reliant on mineral exploitation, high energy consumption, cheap labor, and mass data collection (Varon & Peña, 2022; Altieri, Sancho, & Carrasco-Campos, 2025). Women are disproportionately represented in jobs most vulnerable to automation, whereas men are more often employed in roles augmented by AI (World Economic Forum, 2025). Consequently, AI adoption is not neutral and can reproduce gendered and racialized stereotypes in both outputs and implementation contexts (Kore, 2022). These effects are intensified by a trust gap: only 61% of women GenAI users feel encouraged by their companies, compared to 83% of men (Deloitte, 2025), and some women report a greater risk of being penalized or perceived as "cheating" when using AI. Lower adoption rates lead to "early biases" in training data, in which women's preferences and needs are insufficiently sampled, thereby amplifying disparities through feedback loops (Otis et al., 2024). In the public sector, AI systems also raise concerns about surveillance and exclusion, expanding the monitoring of poor and vulnerable populations (Varon & Peña, 2022). Poverty, often described as the "feminization of poverty," is rooted in structural inequalities in access to education and employment (Aguilar, 2011), and AI can "automate inequality," punishing poor women and producing non-recognition for trans, migrant, or racialized people (Varon & Peña, 2022).

Intersectionality (Crenshaw, 2002; Kerner, 2012; Collins et al., 2021) and decoloniality (Quijano, 1989; Ballestrin, 2013) provide essential tools for analyzing these asymmetries, aligning feminist critiques of modernity with the notion of the "coloniality of power" (Federici, 2004). Feminist standpoint theory, defined by hooks (2000) as "a movement to end sexism, sexist exploitation, and oppression," emphasizes women's experiences as legitimate epistemological starting points (Bardzell, 2010). As articulated by Crenshaw (2002) and Collins (1990), intersectionality reveals how race, gender, and class intertwine to produce specific vulnerabilities. These perspectives show that sociotechnical systems encode power asymmetries even in the absence of intentional exclusion (Costanza-Chock, 2020; Tonkinwise, 2015; Montuori & Nicoletti, 2021). Design, therefore, is never neutral: Buckley (1986, 2020) demonstrated how patriarchy underpins women's historical marginalization in the field, while feminist critique positions design as a means to expose and transform power relations embedded in artifacts (Escobar, 2018). Design Justice examines whether artifacts reinforce privilege or support marginalized communities, rejecting the "unmarked user" in favor of an intersectional validation matrix (Costanza-Chock, 2018, 2020).

Feminist critiques of digital technologies further reveal how datafication, algorithmisation, and automation reconfigure relations among humans and non-humans, framing AI as a form of large-scale violence (Ricaurte, 2019). Such violence is often obscured where consent cannot be freely exercised, particularly when datafication becomes mandatory for accessing social benefits (Varon & Peña, 2021). In response, Klein & D'Ignazio (2024) outline six principles of data feminism (i.e, rethinking binaries, examining power, considering context, legitimizing affect and embodiment, making labor visible, and embracing pluralism) that are applicable to AI design. Bardzell's (2010) feminist interaction design qualities (i.e., pluralism, participation, advocacy, ecology, embodiment, and self-disclosure) further expand design practice, aligning with decolonial and community-based approaches that emphasize responsibility, consent, collectivity, and technologies oriented toward conviviality, reciprocity, and repair.

Overall, the gender gap in AI adoption is part of broader processes that sustain inequality. AI systems, operating as "certificates of power" (Altieri, Sancho, & Carrasco-Campos, 2025), risk becoming "status quo machines"

when women and marginalized groups are excluded from their development and use (Klein & D'Ignazio, 2024). The shift required is from Design by AI, focused on efficiency, to a Design of AI for Justice, grounded in ethical and social intentionality. Without active participation from these communities, AI will continue reproducing the matrix of domination, keeping them, as Varon and Peña (2022) warn, "absent from the future."

3. Methodology

This research is grounded in 23 in-depth semi-structured interviews with technology professionals working in innovation ecosystems. The interviews explored participants' professional contexts, perceptions of gender dynamics in the workplace and broader ecosystem, current uses of GenAI tools, ethical concerns related to these technologies, and expectations regarding the future impact of AI on diversity and inclusion in innovation environments.

3.1 Sample

The sample comprised professionals from two geographic contexts: Brazil (N = 12) and Portugal (N = 11). Participants ranged in age from 26 to 45 years (M = 31.14; SD = 6.29). Gender diversity was intentionally sought, including 10 women (9 cisgender, 1 trans), 10 men (9 cisgender, 1 trans), and 3 non-binary individuals. The sample also reflected racial and ethnic diversity consistent with the sociopolitical contexts of both countries. Notably, four participants interviewed in Portugal were Brazilian immigrants residing in the country, contributing to a trans-Lusophone perspective. Interviewees occupied roles central to innovation ecosystems, including UX/UI designers, HR and Diversity & Inclusion (D&I) specialists, entrepreneurs (CEOs, COOs, and startup founders), software engineers (including AI and machine learning specialists), data scientists, and managers in innovation-related fields.

3.2 Data Analysis and Theoretical Framing

Data were analyzed using Thematic Analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), guided by a feminist and intersectional design lens. This framework oriented the analysis toward identifying how power asymmetries manifest in technological practices and workplace dynamics. Analytical categories were not defined a priori but emerged from four areas addressed in the interview guide: (1) gender dynamics and D&I initiatives; (2) GenAI usage; (3) ethics and AI; and (4) the role of AI in D&I within the workplace. The analysis focused on recurring patterns, tensions, and contradictions in participants' narratives, prioritizing local knowledge and lived experiences across both ecosystems, while also generating insights into ethical concerns and the future role of AI in workplaces and innovation environments.

4. Discussion and Results

4.1 Gender Dynamics and D&I Initiatives

The interviews reveal persistent gender inequality across innovation ecosystems in Brazil and Portugal, though with notable contextual differences. Women and gender minorities remain underrepresented, especially in technical and leadership roles, yet Brazilian respondents reported comparatively greater visibility and progress. Eight of the twelve Brazilian interviewees described workplaces with gender parity or women-majority teams, particularly in design and leadership. Transgender and non-binary visibility was also stronger in Brazil. One non-binary participant noted a rapid cultural shift toward increased diversity: "When I joined two years ago, the number of women was very small. Today, it's much larger."

In Portugal, participants described a more conservative landscape. Even when gender proportions appear balanced, leadership remains male-dominated. One developer highlighted that his company is "50/50," but leadership "is mostly men." A transgender man who worked in both countries emphasized that Portugal is "behind" Brazil in preparing companies for trans inclusion. Together, these findings illustrate how regional specificities intersect with gender, class, and migration status—reinforcing the importance of an intersectional lens (Crenshaw, 2002; Kerner, 2012).

Experiences of prejudice also differ across contexts. Portuguese cis women reported subtler, structural biases, often concentrated in traditional corporate cultures. Brazilian participants described more direct and at times hostile forms of discrimination, especially among trans and non-binary professionals. Brazilian cis women frequently recounted expectations to adopt "masculine" behaviors to advance, reproducing gendered performance norms. These patterns underscore the structural nature of inequality. Homogeneous teams tend to reproduce narrow worldviews and design technologies that reinforce existing hierarchies, echoing Collins's

(1990) critique of hierarchical dichotomies. Diversity in teams, therefore, emerges as a central condition for equitable design.

D&I initiatives exhibit varying degrees of maturity, and critiques of superficial "diversity washing" have emerged in both countries. Brazilian interviewees described more robust formal programs, including diversity committees and AI-supported recruitment processes designed to mitigate bias. External initiatives like "UX para Minas Pretas" and "Programaria" were cited as crucial for training women and minorities. Portuguese interviewees described a more fragmented landscape, in which diversity often emerges "organically" or is driven by multinational companies that import global policies. Local Portuguese initiatives such as "Ladies that UX" and "Women Tech Portugal" fill gaps left by companies lacking structured governance. This contrast suggests that while larger Brazilian companies are more advanced in operationalizing D&I, Portuguese firms often remain in earlier or less formalized stages.

Across both contexts, awareness of AI-driven solutions for D&I remains limited, revealing a critical gap: although the potential of AI to support equity is widely acknowledged, its translation into widely adopted, concrete tools remains incipient. This aligns with Klein and D'Ignazio's (2024) argument that AI design must explicitly interrogate power structures, aiming to redistribute privileges and disrupt embedded oppressions. The intersectional practice in design requires designers to critically reflect on their privileged positions and the transformative potential of their work (Søndergaard & Hansen, 2017). By doing so, it strengthens the link between feminist activism and technology, highlighting the urgency of gender equity policies both within and outside professional environments.

4.2 GenAI Tools: Adoption and Usage

Participants across both contexts reported the increasing adoption of GenAI tools, though with varying levels of awareness and experimentation. Despite cultural differences, the core activities for which GenAI is used are similar across both ecosystems: optimizing communication and research, code generation, content summarization, and brainstorming. These activities are thus considered essential for productivity. ChatGPT is the most frequently cited tool for general use, followed by GitHub Copilot for coding, test generation, and documentation. Gemini and Perplexity are also mentioned for research and data analysis.

Interviewees from both countries reported that GenAI significantly reduces time spent on operational tasks, thereby freeing capacity for critical and strategic thinking. The most significant change reported in the professional workflow concerns process optimization and a refocusing of the professional's role toward higher-value tasks. Adoption patterns, however, differ. In Brazil, the use of GenAI appears to be more rapid and integrated. Brazilian respondents described their workplaces as innovation-driven, leveraging AI not only for productivity but for strategic transformation. In Portugal, adoption appears more cautious and technically focused. Portuguese professionals often framed GenAI as an "accelerator" that enhances reliability and efficiency within well-defined tasks. A Portuguese entrepreneur noted that excessive caution may slow broader adoption. This difference suggests that the Brazilian ecosystem incorporates GenAI as a natural element of innovation and experimentation, while the Portuguese process tends to be incremental, prioritizing reliability and technical compliance before expanding use.

Despite these differences, both groups highlighted similar benefits, including improved documentation, faster coding, text generation, language support, and strategic synthesis. Brazilian interviewees emphasized AI's role in reshaping organizational models, requiring leaders to manage interactions between human teams and AI agents. The main risk identified across both countries is overdependence, which, as participants described, leads to "dumbing down", a decline in critical thinking and foundational knowledge. This concern aligns with critiques of AI's indifference to truth, as described by Hicks et al. (2024) as a capacity to generate "*bullshit*." A Brazilian male designer explicitly articulated this dependence: "We are becoming too dependent on artificial intelligence to think. So when you take that away from professionals, they no longer know how to do their jobs." Participants emphasized the need for sustained human discernment, particularly because GenAI may generate insecure code or incorrect reasoning.

Interviewees also highlighted psychosocial risks. The speed of AI outputs accelerates workplace expectations, increasing pressure, anxiety, and demand for immediacy. From a design perspective, some participants described AI failures as fundamentally "design issues", reflecting misalignment between user intent and system interpretation. These concerns resonate with Data Feminism (D'Ignazio & Klein, 2024), which urges designers to consider context and recognize that data and artifacts emerge from unequal power relations. Its principles (i.e., embracing pluralism and making labor visible) challenge the invisibilization of feminized, vernacular, and unpaid

forms of design work, thereby underscoring the necessity of human critical engagement and responsible design at the center of AI development. Overall, both Brazilians and Portuguese converge on the view that AI should be a tool for amplifying capabilities, not replacement, emphasizing the importance of critical sense and ethics as central conditions for its responsible use.

4.3 Ethics and Bias in AI

Participants overwhelmingly agreed that AI is not currently being developed ethically. The primary reason cited is that AI is trained on data reflecting deeply biased societies—racist, sexist, homophobic, and unequal—turning AI into an amplifier of structural injustices. A Brazilian COO explained: “AI is a mirror of humanity. If we live in a racist, sexist society, it will be a magnifying glass.” Portuguese participants echoed this, stressing human responsibility at every stage of model training and deployment. Kore (2022) highlights that algorithmic bias reflects the “circumstances and culture that produce it,” underscoring that AI ethics comprises principles, values, and practices that guide responsible development.

The absence of diverse perspectives within development teams exacerbates these problems. Brazilian participants, especially women and Black professionals, emphasized how exclusion from design and engineering leads to technologies blind to their lived realities, turning AI into an instrument of exclusion. As stated by a D&I expert (black woman): “AI does have this bias in terms of gender and race. And because it is created in a much more masculine environment, we bring masculine biases into AI, and we don’t consider what is feminine. We need to strike a balance.” Complementing this, a transgender man argued that AI lacks “sensitivity” to understand gendered experiences: “It is the people, the designers, who must bring diversity into products and services.” This finding aligns with Bardzell’s (2010) argument that technological design is deeply intertwined with the reproduction or transformation of social inequalities. Furthermore, some interviewees highlighted that AI still cannot discern social and cultural contexts, suggesting that while AI can contribute to equality, "the people behind AI" are the ones who will "make the difference." This view aligns with Ciston's (2019) argument that intersectional strategies should be polyvocal, multimodal, and experimental, and that community-focused and artistic practices can help imagine AI’s intersectional possibilities and begin to address its biases.

Beyond social biases, interviewees identified a lack of transparency and the corporate drive for profit as key ethical inhibitors in AI development. At least eight participants pointed to limited visibility into how models are constructed and which data sources they rely on, the classic “black box” problem, as a major obstacle to ethical oversight. As Kore (2002) observes, “A lack of transparency increases the risk and magnitude of harm when users do not understand the systems they are using.” Portuguese interviewees further emphasized that AI systems embed cultural biases, as pointed by a Portuguese male AI specialist: “The problem isn't just the model; artificial intelligence does what it does. The problem is who feeds it, who trains it, who makes it, who builds it.” Following that, Varon and Peña (2022) posit that, rather than focusing on technological "solutionism," AI design should be guided by transfeminist, decolonial, and cooperative values, ensuring that the resulting solution respects community relations and autonomy.

Across both Brazil and Portugal, participants agreed that the speed with which technology companies race to release products and maximize profit often relegates ethical considerations to a secondary concern. This challenge is intensified by the concentration of AI development and data infrastructure among a few large corporations (Big Techs), whose agendas and inherent biases shape the global technological landscape. Participants also raised concerns regarding data security, privacy, and the misuse of technology. To counter these dynamics, interviewees implicitly point toward the need for an approach to AI design that cannot be disentangled from broader commitments to sustainability, multispecies justice, and decolonial temporalities—resonating with hooks’ (2000) call for a visionary feminism that situates technological development within a “white supremacist capitalist patriarchy” and urges the cultivation of justice-oriented, life-affirming practices.

Participants also underscored that ethics must be embedded in design practices from the outset, rather than retrofitted after deployment. Three priority areas for ethical AI were identified: (1) Team diversity (ensuring interdisciplinary, multicultural participation across design and validation stages); (2) Data quality (using socially representative datasets and synthetic data to mitigate imbalance); and (3) Transparency (promoting interpretability and explainability in AI outputs). Ultimately, the findings confirm critiques in feminist HCI and Data Feminism (Bardzell, 2010; D’Ignazio &, 2020), arguing that ethics cannot be an appendix but must be at the center of technological conception. The proposed solutions, which focus heavily on biases embedded in the data and the people who build the system, confirm that AI cannot be understood apart from the social structures that shape it.

4.4 Strategies for Fairer AI and Future Roles

Interview findings indicate three central pillars for developing fairer AI systems: regulation, team diversity, and governance. AI was broadly perceived as a transformative force within innovation ecosystems, with the potential to enhance productivity and generate new solutions, particularly in health, climate, and operational efficiency. Some participants described it as the "next boom of humanity." However, these opportunities coexist with concerns about labor precarization, loss of creativity, and increased corporate concentration.

Regarding regulation, participants stressed the need for binding frameworks that transform ethics and diversity from optional principles into legal obligations. In Brazil, the absence of robust regulatory oversight leads local ecosystems to mirror standards from the Global North. Portuguese participants similarly emphasized enforceable governance, frequently referencing the European AI Act as a necessary safeguard. The second pillar—diversity in AI teams—was associated with expanding participation beyond engineers to include domain experts, social scientists, lawyers, and designers. This epistemic diversity was considered essential for overcoming technologically reductionist worldviews. The third pillar, governance, highlighted the importance of ethical management within organizations and ensuring that LLMs reflect local contexts and regional representations rather than relying exclusively on universalized global models.

Concerns about job displacement and power concentration were evident across genders and both countries. Participants warned that dominance by a small number of companies threatens economic and labor rights, with some arguing that unrestricted use of AI may "kill innovation" by favoring repetition over creativity. Representational risks were also emphasized: if women remain underrepresented among GenAI users, systems will be trained on datasets that insufficiently capture their needs, further widening gender disparities in adoption and economic opportunity (Otis et al., 2024). Several participants framed AI strategically not as an end in itself, but as a means, emphasizing the "orchestration" of AI through inclusive design choices from the outset. This perspective aligns with Varon and Peña's (2022) call for critical reflection prior to system development, asking: "Why build it?"; "Is it really needed?"; "On whose request?"; "Who profits?"; "Who loses?"; and whether a system may oppress specific groups or should be developed at all.

Participants generally reported limited awareness of AI systems explicitly designed to promote diversity and inclusion, suggesting that implementation in this domain remains incipient. Women in both countries expressed cautious optimism, while some men, particularly Portuguese participants, were more skeptical, viewing AI as technically promising but insufficient to address cultural or structural inequalities. One Portuguese developer summarized this limitation: "I sincerely don't believe that AI will solve these problems, because society's problems are not caused by algorithms or machines, they are human problems." Others highlighted AI's potential as a democratizing tool, capable of expanding access to knowledge and supporting minority career development when intentionally designed for equity.

Examples cited included accessibility tools (such as real-time translation, support for people with visual or hearing disabilities, and personalized learning for neurodivergent individuals) and performance equalization within organizations, as GenAI can flatten learning curves and enable less-experienced workers to deliver results more quickly. Another proposed application positioned GenAI as a sensitization and support tool, using chatbots or intelligent agents to promote gender-neutral language, inclusive behaviors, and awareness of reporting channels, contributing to psychological safety in the workplace.

Overall, the findings indicate that AI's future role in advancing gender equity depends less on technological sophistication than on intentional design grounded in ethics, diversity, and social responsibility. While participants acknowledged AI's potential to expand access, reduce bias in specific processes, and democratize opportunities, they emphasized that technology alone cannot address structural inequalities. Achieving this requires robust regulation, multidisciplinary and diverse teams, and systems designed to recognize context, validate embodied knowledge, and make invisible labor visible.

5. Conclusions

This study addresses the research question*,* "Why is GenAI a Feminist Design matter?"*,* by demonstrating that GenAI is a sociotechnical artifact that codifies and amplifies structural power dynamics, translating pre-existing inequalities into technical and economic outcomes. The findings confirm that AI is never neutral: it mirrors and magnifies patriarchy, racism, and colonial legacies through homogeneous teams and market logics that automate inequality. This reinforces the need to view AI not merely as a tool for corporate efficiency, but as a critical domain of social justice.

The research reveals both opportunities and critical gaps, highlighting two key tensions central to the feminist critique. First, regarding gender and minority perception: While women and marginalized groups express cautious optimism about AI's potential to D&I proposes, they are simultaneously the most exposed to its structural harms, including job displacement and the reinforcement of harmful cultural stereotypes. In contrast, male perspectives tend to emphasize functional augmentation and efficiency, often expressing skepticism about AI's capacity to generate big cultural change. Across groups, awareness of AI tools explicitly designed to support diversity and inclusion remains limited. Second, regarding national contexts: Differences between Brazil and Portugal illustrate how local culture influences the adoption. Brazil exhibits greater visibility of gender and minority representation and a faster pace of adoption, both of which are frequently linked to product-oriented innovation strategies. Portugal, by contrast, adopts a more incremental approach, prioritizing institutional compliance and corporate efficiency. These differences suggest that the core "design issue" underlying AI's ethical failures, its lack of contextual sensitivity, is rooted in the absence of pluriversal representation in both development teams and regional datasets.

The findings demand a repositioning of GenAI: it is not an autonomous solution but a sociotechnical artifact whose impact is dictated by the ethical and political commitments of its creators and governors. By examining Brazil and Portugal, this study highlights a North-South perspective in which shared colonial histories intersect with asymmetric positions in global innovation, revealing how GenAI is governed under distinct cultural and institutional conditions. Interview-based strategies emphasize AI as an assistant—never a substitute—requiring continuous validation and responsible data handling to mitigate risks of diminished autonomy and the reproduction of hierarchies. Ultimately, articulating feminist perspectives with design transcends the mere inclusion of gender; it necessitates a radical re-evaluation of the power relations embedded in technological ontologies. Future research should apply feminist design principles to collective practices, co-creating GenAI solutions for community needs and informing policies that ensure justice within innovation ecosystems. By confronting coded systems of privilege, feminist design paves the way for technologies grounded in reciprocity, reparation, and pluriversal justice.

Acknowledgements

This work is supported by FCT - Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia, I.P., in the framework of the Project UID/00711/2025- Research Unit in Design and Communication - UNIDCOM/IADE -, with the DOI identifier 10.54499/UID/00711/2025 (https://doi.org/10.54499/UID/00711/2025)

Ethics and AI Declaration. This research required no formal ethical clearance. Interviews were voluntary, anonymized, and conducted with informed consent. LLM tools supported only writing structure; no participant data were processed by AI. All interpretations are the author's own.

References

Aguilar, P. L. (2011). The feminization of poverty: Current theories and analytic potential. *Revista Katálysis*, 14(1), p. 126.

Altieri, D. H. C., Sancho, G. R. and Carrasco-Campos, Á. (2025) Poder y política de la Inteligencia Artificial. *Teknokultura. Revista de Cultura Digital y Movimientos Sociales*, 22(2), pp. 131–136. https://doi.org/10.5209/tekn.101728

Baker, S. E. (2025) A Hesitant Futurist's Reflections on Feminist Design Beyond Binaries. *Journal of Futures Studies*, 29(3), pp. 13–19.

Ballestrin, L. (2013) América Latina e o giro decolonial. *Revista Brasileira de Ciência Política*, (11), pp. 89–117. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0103-33522013000200004

Bardzell, S. (2010) Feminist HCI: Taking stock and outlining an agenda for design. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '10)*. Association for Computing Machinery, pp. 1301–1310. https://doi.org/10.1145/1753326.1753521

Buckley, C. (1986) Made in patriarchy: Toward a feminist analysis of women and design. *Design Issues*, pp. 3–14.

Buckley, C. (2020) Made in patriarchy II: Researching (or re-searching) women and design. *Design Issues*, 36(1), pp. 19–29.

Ciston, S. (2019) Intersectional AI is essential: polyvocal, multimodal, experimental methods to save artificial intelligence. *Journal of Science and Technology of the Arts*, 11(2), pp. 3–8. https://doi.org/10.7559/citarj.v11i2.665

Collins, P. H. (1990) *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge.

Collins, P. H. *et al.* (2021) Intersectionality as Critical Social Theory: Intersectionality as Critical Social Theory, Patricia Hill Collins, Duke University Press, 2019. *Contemporary Political Theory*, 20(3), pp. 690–725. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41296-021-00490-0

Costanza-Chock, S. (2018) Design Justice: Towards an intersectional feminist framework for design theory and practice. In Storni, C. *et al.* (eds.) *Design as a catalyst for change - DRS International Conference 2018*. [Conference Paper]. https://doi.org/10.21606/drs.2018.679

Costanza-Chock, S. (2020) *Design Justice: Community-Led Practices to Build the Worlds We Need*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Crenshaw, K. (2002) Documento para o encontro de especialistas em aspectos da discriminação racial relativos ao gênero. *Revista Estudos Feministas*, 10(1), p. 171.

Deloitte (2025) *Women and generative AI*. Deloitte Insights. Available at: https://www.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/industry/technology/technology-media-and-telecom-predictions/2025/women-and-generative-ai.html

Escobar, A. (2018) *Designs for the pluriverse: Radical interdependence, autonomy, and the making of worlds*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Etayo Ballesteros, O. *et al.* (2025) Implementing gender-sensitive design methods for inclusive innovation. In Kurosu, M. and Hashizume, A. (eds.) *Human-Computer Interaction. HCII 2025. Lecture Notes in Computer Science* (Vol. 15772). Springer. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-93982-2_21 (Accessed: 6 December 2025).

Federici, S. (2004) *Caliban and the witch*. New York: Autonomedia.

Hicks, M.T., Humphries, J. and Slater, J. (2024) ChatGPT is bullshit. *Ethics Inf Technol*, 26, 38. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-024-09775-5.

hooks, b. (2000) *Feminism is for everybody: Passionate politics*. London: Pluto Press.

Howcroft, D. and Rubery, J. (2019) 'Bias in, Bias out': gender equality and the future of work debate. *Labour & Industry: A Journal of the Social and Economic Relations of Work*. https://doi.org/10.1080/10301763.2019.1619986

Kerner, I. (2012) Tudo é interseccional?: Sobre a relação entre racismo e sexismo. *Novos Estudos - CEBRAP*, (93), pp. 45–58.

Klein, L. and D'Ignazio, C. (2024) Data Feminism for AI. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAccT '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, pp. 100–112. https://doi.org/10.1145/3630106.3658543

Kore, A. (2022) *Designing Human-Centric AI Experiences: Applied UX Design for Artificial Intelligence*. Berkeley, CA: Apress. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4842-8088-1

McKinsey & Company (2023) *Women in tech: The best bet to solve Europe's talent shortage*. Available at: https://www.mckinsey.com.br/capabilities/mckinsey-digital/our-insights/women-in-tech-the-best-bet-to-solve-europes-talent-shortage

Montuori, B. F. and Nicoletti, V. M. (2021) Perspectivas decoloniais para um design pluriversal. *Pós. Revista do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Arquitetura e Urbanismo da FAUUSP*, 28(52), e176954. https://www.revistas.usp.br/posfau/article/view/176954

Otis, N. G. *et al.* (2025) *Global Evidence on Gender Gaps and Generative AI* (Harvard Business School Working Paper, No. 25-023).

Quijano, A. (1989) Paradoxes of modernity in Latin America. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, 3(2), pp. 147–177.

Ricaurte, P. (2019) Data Epistemologies, The Coloniality of Power, and Resistance. *Television & New Media*, 20(4), pp. 350–365. https://doi.org/10.1177/1527476419831640

Søndergaard, M. L. J. and Hansen, L. K. (2017) Designing with Bias and Privilege? *Nordes*, 7(1).

Tonkinwise, C. (2015) Design for Transitions – from and to what? *Design Philosophy Papers*, 13(2), pp. 85–92. https://doi.org/10.1080/14487136.2015.1085686

UNESCO (2023) *Does artificial intelligence advance gender equality?* Available at: https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/does-artificial-intelligence-advance-gender-equality

Varon, J. and Peña, P. (2021) Artificial intelligence and consent: A feminist anti-colonial critique. *Internet Policy Review*, 10(4), pp. 1–25. https://doi.org/10.14763/2021.4.1602

Varon, J. and Peña, P. (2022) *Not My A.I.: Towards Critical Feminist Frameworks to Resist Oppressive A.I. Systems* (Carr Center Discussion Paper, issue 2022-10). Harvard Kennedy School.

World Economic Forum (2025, May 6) *How AI is worsening workplace gender gaps—and how we can course-correct*. Available at: https://www.weforum.org/stories/2025/05/how-ai-is-worsening-workplace-gender-gaps-and-how-we-can-course-correct-7828b8eae9