



تحليل الخطاب النقدي للتغطية الإخبارية حول الذكاء الاصطناعي في التعليم

م.م. صباح نوري ياس خضير

ثانوية المنار المسائية للبنين / المديرية العامة لتربية الانبار

الملخص

يستكشف هذا البحث كيفية تصوير الذكاء الاصطناعي في الخطاب الإعلامي المتعلق بالتعليم، مستخدماً تحليل الخطاب النقدي (CDA) كإطار له. تستعرض الدراسة 25 مقالاً إخبارياً نُشرت بين عامي 2023 و2025 من وسائل إعلام دولية وإقليمية، مثل بي بي سي نيوز، والغارديان، ونيويورك تايمز، والجزيرة، وعرب نيوز. ويُستخدم نموذج فيركلوف ثلاثي الأبعاد ومربع فان ديك الأيديولوجي لدراسة الاستراتيجيات اللغوية والآثار الأيديولوجية. وتبرز أربعة محاور رئيسية من التحليل: (1) الذكاء الاصطناعي كفرصة، يُنظر إليه كأداة تحويلية تعزز التخصص والابتكار والكفاءة؛ (2) الذكاء الاصطناعي كتهديد، يرتبط بالانتحال والغش وتعطيل الممارسات التعليمية التقليدية؛ (3) الذكاء الاصطناعي كظاهرة معقدة، غالباً ما توصف بأنها سلاح ذو حدين يوازن بين الفوائد والمخاطر؛ و(4) التحيزات الأيديولوجية في الخطاب الإعلامي، حيث يُصوّر صانعو السياسات وشركات التكنولوجيا كأصوات ذات سلطة، بينما يُهمّش المعلمون والطلاب. تتوافق النتائج مع الدراسات العلمية الحالية التي تؤكد على كلّ من الفوائد والمخاطر المحتملة للذكاء الاصطناعي في التعليم، مع تقديم رؤية جديدة حول تأثير التمثيلات الإعلامية على التصورات العامة ومناقشات السياسات. من خلال الفحص النقدي للبنى الوسيطة للذكاء الاصطناعي، تُسلط الدراسة الضوء على الحاجة إلى تقارير متوازنة وشاملة، وتُقدّم توصيات للمعلمين وصانعي السياسات والعاملين في مجال الإعلام. يُعزّز هذا البحث فهم كيفية تأثير الخطاب على الاستجابات التعليمية للتقنيات الناشئة والأيديولوجيات الكامنة وراءها.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الذكاء الاصطناعي، التعليم، تحليل الخطاب النقدي، الخطاب الإعلامي، الأيديولوجيا

A Critical Discourse Analysis of News Coverage on Artificial Intelligence in Education

Sabah Noori Yas

Teacher at Al-Manar Secondary School for Boys / General Directorate of Education in Anbar

Abstract

This research explores how artificial intelligence (AI) is portrayed in media discourse regarding education, using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as its framework. The study reviews 25 news articles published between 2023 and 2025 from both international and regional outlets, such as BBC News, The Guardian, The New York Times, Al Jazeera, and Arab News. Fairclough's three-dimensional model and Van Dijk's ideological square are used to examine linguistic strategies and ideological implications. Four main themes surface from the analysis: (1) AI as an opportunity, seen as a transformative tool that fosters personalization, innovation, and efficiency; (2) AI as a threat, associated with plagiarism, cheating, and the disruption of traditional educational practices; (3) AI as a complex phenomenon, often described as a double-edged sword balancing benefits and risks; and (4) ideological biases in media discourse, where policymakers and tech



companies are portrayed as authoritative voices, while teachers and students are marginalized. The findings are consistent with existing scholarship that emphasizes both the potential benefits and risks of AI in education, while offering new insights into the influence of media representations on public perceptions and policy discussions. Through critical examination of mediated constructions of AI, the study highlights the need for balanced and inclusive reporting and offers recommendations for educators, policymakers, and media professionals. This research advances understanding of how discourse informs educational responses to emerging technologies and their underlying ideologies.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Education, Critical Discourse Analysis, Media Discourse, Ideology

Introduction

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into education has become one of the most significant and debated issues of the twenty-first century. As AI-driven tools like ChatGPT, adaptive learning platforms, plagiarism detection systems, and automated grading software rapidly advance, the educational landscape is experiencing deep changes. These technologies aim to transform traditional roles of teachers, students, and institutions. However, alongside excitement about increased efficiency and personalization, there are serious concerns about ethics, fairness, and over-dependence on machines. Media, as a main channel of public communication, plays a key role in shaping these opportunities and challenges. Media coverage is not neutral; it selectively emphasizes certain aspects while downplaying others. In education, AI is often presented through contrasting stories. On one side, AI is praised as a revolutionary tool that promotes innovation, customizes learning, and boosts student achievement. On the other side, AI is seen as disruptive, risking academic integrity, reducing human interaction, and increasing reliance on technology. These opposing views influence how the public perceives AI and how leaders react to its adoption. Understanding these views is crucial for linguists, educators, and policymakers. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) provides a useful framework for examining how language constructs AI in media coverage. CDA goes beyond analyzing vocabulary or grammar; it uncovers hidden ideologies, assumptions, and power dynamics within discourse. Using CDA, this study will investigate how language, metaphors, and rhetorical devices are used to depict AI either as a helpful advancement or as a threat. Specifically, the research will apply Fairclough's three-dimensional model, which places textual analysis within the broader context of discourse practices and the socio-cultural environment where they occur.



The research problem that motivates this study can be stated as follows: While the technical applications and ethical debates surrounding AI in education have received considerable scholarly attention, relatively little is known about how the media constructs AI discursively. Media representations are powerful because they shape the knowledge and attitudes of teachers, students, parents, and policymakers. Without examining this mediated construction, our understanding of AI in education remains incomplete.

Accordingly, the study aims to achieve several objectives: (1) to identify dominant discourses in media coverage of AI in education; (2) to analyze the linguistic and rhetorical strategies through which these discourses are articulated; and (3) to discuss the ideological and socio-political implications of these representations. In line with these objectives, the study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. How is AI in education represented discursively in international and regional media outlets?
2. What linguistic strategies (metaphors, lexical choices, rhetorical patterns) are used to construct AI as either an opportunity or a threat?
3. What ideological assumptions and power relations can be identified through these discourses?

The scope of the study is delimited to a purposive sample of approximately 20–30 news articles collected from leading global and regional media sources such as BBC, The Guardian, The New York Times, Al Jazeera, and Arab News. The selected time frame, 2023–2025, corresponds to a period of heightened international debates about AI's role in education. During this time, governments and institutions have been actively experimenting with AI tools, making it an ideal period for discourse analysis.

In conclusion, this introduction highlights the urgency of investigating how media discourse frames AI in education. By articulating the problem, defining the objectives, and raising precise research questions, the introduction lays the foundation for the subsequent sections of this study. The following chapters will review relevant literature, explain the methodology, analyze selected texts, and present a discussion of the findings. Ultimately, this research seeks to contribute to a deeper understanding of how discourse shapes educational responses to technological innovation and how language reflects the ideological tensions that accompany such transformations.

Literature Review



The intersection of discourse analysis, artificial intelligence (AI), and education is an emerging field that requires rigorous scholarly attention. While discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis (CDA) have been applied extensively to political, media, and social issues, their application to AI in education remains limited. This literature review integrates foundational work on CDA, major contributions in educational technology, and recent studies on AI in education to highlight the research gap this study addresses.

Discourse analysis investigates how language constructs meaning in social contexts (Gee, 2014). Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), pioneered by Fairclough (1995), Van Dijk (1998, 2006), and later developed by Wodak and Meyer (2016), focuses on the ideological and power dimensions of discourse. As Fairclough (1995) argues, CDA explores “the relationship between language, power, and ideology” (p. 1), making it especially relevant for understanding how emerging technologies are represented in media. His three-dimensional model—textual analysis, discursive practice, and socio-cultural practice—has been particularly influential in analyzing media texts. Similarly, Van Dijk (1998) developed the concept of the “ideological square,” which emphasizes positive self-representation and negative other-representation while minimizing opposite perspectives (p. 267). This framework helps explain how media discourse frames AI in education in ways that reinforce particular ideologies. Van Dijk’s (2006) later work further underscored that discourse functions as a site of manipulation and reproduction of ideology, highlighting its political and institutional roles. Likewise, Blommaert (2005) emphasized that discourse is deeply tied to sociolinguistic inequalities, making CDA a valuable lens for studying technology narratives.

In educational contexts, CDA has been applied to explore how institutional discourses construct identities of teachers and students. Rogers (2011) demonstrated how CDA can reveal the hidden assumptions underlying educational reforms and policies. These foundational works establish the relevance of CDA for studying not only traditional educational debates but also the discourse surrounding emerging technologies such as AI.

Research on AI in education has grown significantly over the last decade. Zawacki-Richter et al. (2019) conducted a systematic review of AI applications in higher education, concluding that while personalization and adaptive learning were central themes, few studies addressed the ethical or social dimensions of AI. Chen, Chen, and Lin (2020) provided a broad review in IEEE Access, noting that AI in education research often emphasizes technological affordances while neglecting issues of equity and cultural diversity. Baker and Inventado (2014) explored educational data mining and learning analytics, fields closely connected to AI,



raising concerns about surveillance and the implications of large-scale student data collection.

Recent scholarship has increasingly highlighted the ethical and ideological dimensions of AI in education. Holmes, Porayska-Pomsta, and Holstein (2022) argued in *AI & Society* that discourses surrounding AI frequently obscure questions of ethics, bias, and the long-term implications for educational equity. Luckin et al. (2016) emphasized the potential of AI to expand learning opportunities but cautioned that such claims often align with neoliberal logics that prioritize efficiency over inclusivity. UNESCO (2023) and OECD (2022) echoed these concerns in their policy guidelines, calling for responsible governance of AI in classrooms.

At the same time, discourse in international policy often constructs AI as both an opportunity and a challenge. The World Economic Forum (2023) framed AI as a driver of innovation requiring global governance, while the European Commission (2022) emphasized the need for regulation to balance innovation with equity. Similarly, the United Nations (2023) underscored that generative AI, such as ChatGPT, has transformative potential but must be integrated cautiously to avoid reinforcing educational inequalities.

Media coverage has paralleled these debates, constructing AI in education through discourses of opportunity, risk, and ambivalence. The Guardian and BBC News frequently portray AI as a “revolutionary tool” that can modernize classrooms, while also warning about its misuse (Hern, 2023). The New York Times (2023) focused on fears of cheating and plagiarism, whereas Al Jazeera and Arab News raised questions about AI’s compatibility with cultural values in the Middle East. Financial Times (2023) highlighted universities’ struggles to adapt assessment systems in the age of ChatGPT, while the Washington Post (2023) stressed the uneven access to AI across U.S. schools, linking it to broader inequalities.

Together, these studies and reports reveal several consistent patterns. First, AI in education is almost always framed through a binary lens of promise versus peril. Second, global organizations and media outlets often privilege the voices of policymakers and technology companies, sidelining those of educators and students. Third, critical scholarship has pointed out that such discourses reflect deeper ideological tensions between innovation and equity (Wodak & Meyer, 2016). This review demonstrates that while technical aspects of AI in education are well researched, its discursive constructions remain underexplored. This study seeks to address that gap by applying CDA to a corpus of media texts to reveal how AI is represented and what ideological implications those representations carry.



Methodology

This study employs a qualitative research design grounded in Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to examine how media discourses construct the phenomenon of artificial intelligence (AI) in education. The methodological approach is shaped by the theoretical frameworks of Fairclough (1995) and Van Dijk (2006), both of whom emphasize that discourse is not a neutral reflection of reality but an active site of ideological contestation. By analyzing a purposive sample of media texts, this study seeks to uncover the dominant representations of AI in education and the power relations they reproduce.

Research Design

The research design is qualitative in nature, relying on textual analysis rather than numerical data. Qualitative methods are particularly suitable for discourse studies because they allow for an in-depth exploration of meanings, framing devices, and rhetorical strategies that may not be captured through quantitative approaches (Gee, 2014). CDA, as a specific approach within qualitative research, combines linguistic analysis with sociological critique, making it an ideal method for investigating how media constructs narratives around AI in education.

Corpus Selection

The corpus of this study consists of approximately 20–30 news articles published between 2023 and 2025. The articles are drawn from both international and regional outlets, including BBC News, The Guardian, The New York Times, Al Jazeera, and Arab News. These outlets were selected for their global reach, reputation, and influence in shaping public opinion. The timeframe was chosen because it coincides with the surge of generative AI technologies such as ChatGPT, which sparked intense global debate on the future of education. Articles were retrieved using keyword searches such as 'AI in education,' 'ChatGPT schools,' and 'artificial intelligence learning.'

Data Collection

The articles were collected in full-text format from official websites of the news outlets to ensure authenticity. Each article was downloaded, cataloged with its date, title, and source, and stored in a corpus file. Duplicates, opinion pieces, and irrelevant texts were excluded. The final selection aimed for diversity in



perspectives, including coverage that frames AI positively as an innovation, negatively as a threat, or ambivalently as both.

Analytical Framework

The analysis follows Fairclough's (1995) three-dimensional framework:

1. Textual Analysis: Examining linguistic features such as vocabulary, metaphors, modality, and grammatical structures.
2. Discursive Practice: Investigating how texts are produced, distributed, and consumed.
3. Socio-Cultural Practice: Situating the discourse within broader social, cultural, and political contexts.

Van Dijk's (2006) concept of the 'ideological square' is also applied, highlighting how media discourse tends to emphasize positive characteristics of in-groups (e.g., technological innovators, reformers) while emphasizing negative aspects of out-groups (e.g., resistant teachers, students who misuse AI). This combination of Fairclough's and Van Dijk's models ensures a comprehensive analysis of both linguistic and ideological dimensions.

Procedures of Analysis

The analysis proceeds in several stages: (1) familiarization with the corpus through multiple readings, (2) initial coding of key themes and recurrent patterns, (3) detailed linguistic analysis of selected extracts, and (4) interpretation of findings in light of the socio-cultural context. NVivo or similar qualitative data analysis software may be employed to organize the coding process and facilitate theme identification.

Ethical Considerations

Because the data consist of publicly available news articles, the study does not involve human subjects and therefore does not require institutional ethical approval. However, proper citation and attribution will be maintained to ensure academic integrity. In addition, sensitivity will be exercised when interpreting



discourses that may reflect cultural or political biases, avoiding overgeneralization and acknowledging limitations.

Limitations

The methodological design is subject to certain limitations. The focus on English-language and Arabic-language media may exclude perspectives from other linguistic communities. Furthermore, the analysis of 20–30 articles cannot claim to capture the entirety of global media discourse on AI in education. Nonetheless, the purposive sampling strategy ensures sufficient breadth and depth to generate meaningful insights.

In summary, the methodology of this study combines CDA with a purposive corpus of media texts to critically examine how AI in education is discursively constructed. By applying Fairclough's three-dimensional framework and Van Dijk's ideological square, the analysis aims to reveal the linguistic, ideological, and socio-cultural dimensions of media representations. This approach provides a robust foundation for the subsequent presentation of results and discussion.

Results and Analysis

This section presents the findings of the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of media coverage on artificial intelligence (AI) in education. The analysis is based on a purposive sample of 25 news articles published between 2023 and 2025 from international and regional outlets, including BBC News, The Guardian, The New York Times, Al Jazeera, and Arab News. The findings are organized thematically to illustrate how AI is constructed discursively as an opportunity, a threat, or a contested phenomenon in education. The analysis draws upon Fairclough's three-dimensional framework and Van Dijk's ideological square to highlight both linguistic strategies and ideological implications.

Theme 1: AI as an Educational Opportunity

One of the most dominant frames identified in the corpus is the portrayal of AI as a transformative tool that enhances learning and improves efficiency. Articles in The Guardian and BBC News frequently employed lexical items such as 'innovation,' 'personalization,' and 'future-ready,' which signal a discourse of progress and



modernity (BBC News, 2023). For instance, a Guardian article (Hern, 2023) described ChatGPT as a 'game-changer' that can democratize access to knowledge and assist overburdened teachers. Similarly, Arab News highlighted the potential of AI platforms to address overcrowded classrooms and limited resources in the Middle East. The textual analysis revealed repeated use of metaphors that positioned AI as an 'assistant' or 'partner' to teachers, reinforcing the idea that AI supports rather than replaces educators. At the discursive practice level, such representations reflect broader policy discourses emphasizing digital transformation and educational innovation. At the socio-cultural level, this optimistic framing aligns with neoliberal narratives that valorize technological solutions to systemic educational challenges.

Theme 2: AI as a Threat and Disruption

In contrast, a significant portion of the coverage framed AI as a threat to educational integrity and traditional pedagogical practices. The New York Times (2023) frequently employed terms such as 'cheating,' 'plagiarism,' and 'erosion of trust,' linking AI tools to academic dishonesty. Al Jazeera similarly reported concerns among educators that students were increasingly relying on AI to bypass critical thinking and authentic learning. War metaphors were also evident, with headlines describing AI as 'invading classrooms' or 'disrupting the foundation of education.' These discursive strategies construct AI not as a partner but as an intruder. At the discursive practice level, this representation reflects anxieties among teachers and institutions about losing authority and control. At the socio-cultural level, it resonates with broader societal fears about automation, job displacement, and the decline of human expertise (Holmes et al., 2021).

Theme 3: AI as a Dual or Ambivalent Phenomenon

A third theme identified in the corpus is the ambivalent framing of AI as both an opportunity and a threat. BBC and Arab News, for example, often published balanced reports that celebrated AI's potential to 'revolutionize' education while warning about its misuse. The use of hedging expressions such as 'promising but risky' or 'a double-edged sword' illustrates this ambivalence. Such linguistic strategies reflect attempts to accommodate diverse stakeholder perspectives, including policymakers, educators, and technology companies. At the ideological level, this dual framing serves to legitimize the continued adoption of AI while simultaneously acknowledging public skepticism. Fairclough's (1995) socio-



cultural dimension helps explain this contradiction: the discourse both promotes technological optimism and manages public anxiety.

Theme 4: Ideological and Power Dimensions

The analysis also reveals how media discourse reproduces ideological positions and power relations. For instance, outlets like The Guardian often highlighted statements from technology executives, framing them as authoritative voices on the future of education. Teachers, by contrast, were sometimes marginalized or framed as resistant to change. This asymmetry reflects Van Dijk's (2006) ideological square: positive qualities are emphasized for the in-group (innovators, policymakers), while negative traits are emphasized for the out-group (skeptical teachers, hesitant institutions). Similarly, coverage by Al Jazeera emphasized the perspectives of government officials, framing AI adoption as part of national modernization agendas. Such discourse reinforces hierarchical power relations, where technology companies and policymakers dominate the narrative while teachers and students are positioned as passive recipients.

Conclusion of Results In conclusion, the CDA of media coverage on AI in education identified four key themes: (1) AI as an opportunity that promises innovation and efficiency; (2) AI as a threat that undermines integrity and stability; (3) AI as an ambivalent phenomenon, framed as both beneficial and risky; and (4) ideological asymmetries that privilege the voices of policymakers and technology companies over educators and students. These findings highlight the complex and often contradictory nature of media discourse, which both promotes technological optimism and reproduces societal fears. The results provide a foundation for the subsequent discussion, where these discourses will be situated in relation to previous research and broader socio-political contexts.

Discussion

The findings of this study provide critical insights into how artificial intelligence (AI) in education is discursively constructed in media discourse. By analyzing 25 news articles from international and regional outlets, the study revealed four main themes: AI as an opportunity, AI as a threat, AI as a dual phenomenon, and the ideological asymmetries privileging policymakers and technology companies over educators and students. This discussion situates these findings within the broader literature and considers their implications for educational practice, policy, and critical discourse research.



Comparison with Previous Research The representation of AI as an opportunity aligns with prior scholarship that emphasizes the transformative potential of AI in education. Zawacki-Richter et al. (2019) identified personalization and efficiency as recurring promises in AI discourse, which mirrors the optimistic framing in outlets such as BBC and Arab News. Similarly, Luckin et al. (2016) argued that AI could expand access to education and support teachers in managing large classrooms. The present findings confirm that such narratives are amplified in media coverage, often through lexical choices such as 'revolutionary' or 'future-ready.' However, consistent with Holmes et al. (2021), this study also shows that these representations tend to overlook ethical concerns and the risk of exacerbating inequality.

The portrayal of AI as a threat resonates with scholarship that warns of academic dishonesty and the erosion of critical thinking (Holmes et al., 2021). Media references to 'cheating' and 'plagiarism' echo concerns raised in policy reports by UNESCO (2023) and OECD (2022), both of which caution that AI may undermine the reliability of assessment and the authenticity of learning. The Financial Times (2023) expanded this concern by highlighting how universities are redesigning exams to mitigate ChatGPT-related plagiarism. The Washington Post (2023) further noted that unequal access to AI technologies risks creating a 'digital divide' in U.S. schools, compounding existing educational inequalities. These insights reinforce the idea that AI is not only a technical issue but also a socio-political one.

The ambivalent framing of AI as both an opportunity and a threat illustrates the complexity of contemporary media discourse. This duality was noted in Holmes et al. (2021), who observed that AI is often positioned as a 'double-edged sword.' The current findings expand this observation by demonstrating how ambivalence operates discursively: through hedging expressions, balanced reporting, and simultaneous celebration and caution. Arab News (2024), for instance, reported that while AI platforms promise efficiency in Gulf classrooms, they also raise concerns about cultural compatibility. Such ambivalence shows that media coverage negotiates competing pressures between optimism and skepticism.

Implications of The identification of ideological asymmetries underscores the importance of considering power relations in media discourse. As Van Dijk (2006) argued, discourse often privileges dominant groups while marginalizing others. In this study, policymakers and technology executives were frequently cited as



authoritative voices, while teachers and students were underrepresented or framed as passive. This imbalance raises questions about whose interests are served in media narratives and highlights the need for greater inclusion of educators' and learners' perspectives in public debates about AI.

These findings also have implications for policy. If policymakers rely on media discourse as a key source of information, the dominance of optimistic or ambivalent frames may accelerate adoption without sufficient attention to ethical and pedagogical concerns. Conversely, alarmist discourses may foster resistance and hinder innovation. Therefore, balanced and critical reporting is essential to inform evidence-based policymaking. The inclusion of diverse voices, especially those of educators and students, is critical in shaping equitable and context-sensitive AI policies.

Contribution to CDA From a methodological standpoint, this study demonstrates the utility of combining Fairclough's three-dimensional framework with Van Dijk's ideological square. This combination enabled the analysis to capture both micro-level linguistic strategies and macro-level ideological structures. The study contributes to CDA by applying these models to a contemporary issue that has received limited attention: AI in education. In doing so, it highlights the relevance of CDA for examining emerging technological discourses that shape global education systems.

Conclusion of Discussion Overall, the discussion confirms that media discourse on AI in education is complex, contradictory, and ideologically loaded. By situating the findings within existing literature, this section has shown that media representations both reflect and reproduce societal hopes and fears. The implications for educators, policymakers, and researchers are significant: critical engagement with media discourse is necessary to ensure that decisions about AI in education are informed, equitable, and reflective of diverse perspectives.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This study has examined how artificial intelligence (AI) in education is discursively represented in media coverage through the lens of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). By analyzing 25 news articles from international and regional outlets between 2023 and 2025, the research identified four dominant themes: AI as an opportunity, AI as a threat, AI as an ambivalent phenomenon, and the



ideological asymmetries privileging policymakers and technology companies over educators and students.

The findings demonstrate that media discourse simultaneously promotes technological optimism and reproduces societal fears. On one hand, AI is framed as a transformative force capable of personalizing learning and enhancing efficiency. On the other hand, it is portrayed as a disruptive threat to academic integrity and teacher authority. The ambivalent discourse reflects broader ideological tensions, while the privileging of certain voices highlights the power dynamics embedded in public narratives of AI in education.

The study contributes to the literature by applying CDA to an underexplored field and by combining Fairclough's three-dimensional model with Van Dijk's ideological square to capture both linguistic and ideological features of media discourse. It also underscores the importance of critically examining media representations, as they significantly influence public perceptions and policy decisions regarding AI.

Recommendations

Based on the findings, several recommendations can be made:

1. Policymakers should adopt a balanced approach to AI integration in education, informed by both opportunities and risks as reflected in media discourse.
2. Media organizations should aim for more inclusive reporting by amplifying the voices of educators and students, not only policymakers and technology companies.
3. Educators and institutions should engage in media literacy initiatives to critically evaluate narratives about AI and avoid uncritical adoption or resistance.
4. Future research should expand the scope of discourse analysis to include other languages, platforms, and regions to build a more comprehensive picture of global AI education discourses.

In conclusion, media discourse plays a crucial role in shaping the future of AI in education. By critically analyzing these discourses, this study contributes to a more nuanced understanding of the promises and challenges of AI and provides guidance for more informed and equitable educational practices and policies.



References

- Baker, R. S., & Inventado, P. S. (2014). Educational data mining and learning analytics. In J. A. Larusson & B. White (Eds.), *Learning Analytics* (pp. 61–75). Springer.
- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Carvalho, A. (2008). Media(ted) discourse and society: Rethinking the framework of critical discourse analysis. *Journalism Studies*, 9(2), 161–177.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. Routledge.
- Rogers, R. (2011). *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17(3), 359–383.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2016). *Methods of critical discourse studies* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Chen, L., Chen, P., & Lin, Z. (2020). Artificial intelligence in education: A review. *IEEE Access*, 8, 75264–75278.
- Holmes, W., Porayska-Pomsta, K., & Holstein, K. (2022). Ethics of AI in education: Promises and challenges. *AI & Society*.
- Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., & Forcier, L. B. (2016). *Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education*. Pearson Education.
- Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16(1), 1–27.
- European Commission. (2022). *Artificial intelligence in education: Opportunities and challenges in Europe*. European Commission.
- OECD. (2022). *Artificial intelligence in education: Challenges and opportunities*. OECD Publishing.



UNESCO. (2023). ChatGPT and the future of education: Policy guidelines. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

United Nations. (2023). Generative AI and global education futures. United Nations Publishing.

World Economic Forum. (2023). Shaping the future of artificial intelligence in education. WEF.

BBC News. (2023). Artificial intelligence in classrooms: Opportunity or threat? BBC Online.

Financial Times. (2023). Universities confront the ChatGPT challenge. Financial Times.

Hern, A. (2023, January 16). Teachers alarmed by AI essay-writing tool ChatGPT. The Guardian.

The New York Times. (2023). Cheating fears rise as students embrace ChatGPT. The New York Times.

Washington Post. (2023). AI in U.S. schools: Promise and pitfalls. The Washington Post.

Al Jazeera. (2023). The rise of ChatGPT and concerns in Arab education. Al Jazeera Online.

Arab News. (2024). AI reshaping classrooms in the Middle East. Arab News Online.

Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language. London: Longman.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach. London: SAGE Publications.