Comprehensive Journal of Science
Volume (11), Issue (41), (JUNE, 2026)
ISSN: 3014-6266

مجلة العلوم الشاملة
المجلد (11) العدد 41 يونيو 2026
ردمد: 3014-6266

The Double- Edge Sword:
A Critical Discourse Analysis of UNESCO's framing of AI in Education (2025-2026)

Sahar M. Alimrani
English Department- Applied Linguistics
Janzour Academy for Postgraduate Studies
250100668
okshsahar@gmail.com

تاريخ الاستلام:2026/05/04 –تاريخ المراجعة:2026/05/27– تاريخ القبول: 2026/06/06– تاريخ للنشر: 2026 /06/14

Abstract

This study utilizes Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to explore UNESCO's 2025-2026 publications, with a focus on the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in global education. It investigates how AI is framed as both an opportunity and a challenge for educators. The findings reveal a discourse characterized by value-laden language, expressions of obligation, and contrasting binaries. AI is portrayed as a tool to enhance educational access but also as a potential threat that exacerbates inequality, undermines human agency, and raises ethical concerns. The study highlights the indispensable role of teachers, emphasizing their moral and intellectual authority over AI systems. It also discusses UNESCO's efforts to promote a universal governance framework, advocating for a human-centered and socially responsible approach to integrating AI.

الملخص:

تستخدم هذه الدراسة تحليل الخطاب النقدي لاستكشاف منشورات اليونسكو للفترة 2025–2026، مع التركيز على دمج الذكاء الاصطناعي في التعليم العالمي. وتبحث في كيفية تصوير الذكاء الاصطناعي كفرصة وتحدٍّ للمعلمين. تكشف النتائج عن خطاب يتسم بلغة ذات دلالات قيمية، وتعبيرات عن الالتزام، وثنائيات متناقضة. يُصوَّر الذكاء الاصطناعي كأداة لتحسين فرص الوصول إلى التعليم، ولكنه يُصوَّر أيضًا كتهديد محتمل يُفاقم عدم المساواة، ويُقوِّض دور الإنسان، ويُثير مخاوف أخلاقية. تُسلِّط الدراسة الضوء على الدور المحوري للمعلمين، مؤكدةً على سلطتهم الأخلاقية والفكرية على أنظمة الذكاء الاصطناعي. كما تُناقش جهود اليونسكو لتعزيز إطار حوكمة عالمي، داعيةً إلى نهجٍ يركز على الإنسان ويتسم بالمسؤولية الاجتماعية في دمج الذكاء الاصطناعي .

1. Introduction

With the rapid advancement of technology, Artificial Intelligence (AI) has become a pivotal topic in education, serving as a transformative force to enhance teaching, learning, and assessment practices. Despite its benefits, AI also introduces challenges related to equity, ethics, and human agency. UNESCO has consistently emphasized that while AI can support educational progress, its implementation must adhere to principles of inclusion, fairness, and clear ethical guidelines (UNESCO, 2025) .

This topic holds significance not only due to UNESCO's engagement with AI but also

because of the policies it advocates regarding technological integration. UNESCO views AI as a double-edged sword: on the one hand, it is an incredible tool for innovation and growth; on the other, it poses substantial ethical concerns. UNESCO's educational messages portray AI as a transformative element in education while emphasizing that it should not overshadow or replace the essential social and human aspects of learning (UNESCO, 2026). This paper seeks to explore the balance that UNESCO's discourse aims to achieve between the benefits and risks of AI in education. Additionally, it examines the underlying ideologies shaping UNESCO's stance on integrating AI into education.

To investigate this balance, the study employs Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model to critically analyze how UNESCO frames AI within its educational narrative, particularly through various articles. The research addresses key questions: How does UNESCO represent AI in education? What opportunities and risks does it emphasize? And what values or assumptions are embedded within its language?

Using critical discourse analysis (CDA) as its primary methodological approach, this study examines UNESCO's texts as a corpus. CDA is particularly effective as it uncovers how policy language constructs problems, advocates specific solutions, and reflects broader power dynamics and ideological perspectives within the realm of educational policy.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

2.1 Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) emerged in the early 19th century as a field of study aimed at investigating the intricate relationships between language, ideology, and power. According to Gee (2005), CDA examines how language—both spoken and written—functions to construct and sustain social power and cultural identities. Discourse not only reflects social practices but also actively shapes them. The approach incorporates various theoretical concepts that enable researchers to analyze how texts represent reality, influence audiences, and reveal underlying assumptions, ideologies, and hidden meanings. This multidisciplinary framework draws on diverse intellectual traditions for its development.

One of CDA's foundational influences is Halliday's systemic functional linguistics (1994), which views language as a social system designed to create meaning and fulfill various societal functions. Additionally, Foucauldian discourse theory has significantly shaped the field by emphasizing the connections among discourse, power, and knowledge. Foucault highlighted how institutional discourses govern what is socially acceptable to think, say, and consider as reality within distinct historical contexts (2010). Fairclough further underscores that dominant social groups maintain control not simply through coercion but also by shaping ideologies, values, and beliefs so that their dominance appears natural and universally accepted. Many linguists argue that discourse and social structure are deeply intertwined, with discourse not only mirroring social arrangements but also reshaping, legitimizing, and perpetuating them.

As a result, CDA focuses on examining discourse in connection to historical norms, social conventions, and institutional dynamics. It situates linguistic analysis within broader political, historical, ideological, and cultural frameworks. Among the key contributors to understanding the value-laden nature of language in institutional texts is Van Dijk (2010), who explains that language often both reinforces and challenges social power and ideology through deliberate

choices of vocabulary. This idea plays a central role in the analysis presented later in this study (see section 4.2).

This research primarily builds on the work of Norman Fairclough, whose contributions are particularly suited to the analysis of institutional and policy-related texts. According to Fairclough (2010), meaningful social critique requires a careful examination of grammar, vocabulary, and rhetorical structures in everyday language use. What sets Fairclough's approach apart is its strong commitment to detailed textual analysis, unlike other frameworks that tend to prioritize abstract sociological interpretations while overlooking linguistic intricacies .

Furthermore, Fairclough's methodology extends beyond mere textual analysis. It incorporates a comprehensive three-dimensional model of discourse, which serves as a robust framework for understanding the interplay between language and its social context. This model provides an integrated perspective on text production, dissemination, and interpretation by linking three interconnected dimensions: text, discursive practice, and sociocultural practice. It enables researchers to study how language constructs reality, uncovers implicit assumptions and ideological underpinnings, and sways audiences. Through this lens, a wealth of analytical principles can be applied to explore how texts operate within broader societal frameworks and reveal their broader implications .

Table (1): The Three Dimensional Models of Fairclough Applied to Study AI in Education

Dimensions	Analytical Focus	Application to AI in Education
Micro Text	Grammar, vocabulary, modality and lexicalization	Analyzing how specific information is prioritized or excluded, and how the choice of vocabulary (lexis) categorizes actors and events to favor specific perspectives selection.
Discursive Practice	Production and consumption of the text	Studying of how discourse is produced and consumed by the audience.
Social Practice (Macro)	Wider ideology and power	Examining how dominant groups maintain hegemony through "common-sense" linguistic choices

The table illustrates how critical discourse analysis approaches language as a form of social practice. Its primary objective is to uncover the underlying connections between language, power dynamics, and ideology within texts. The micro-text dimension focuses on key linguistic elements such as grammar, vocabulary, and modality to analyze the structural choices and rhetorical devices utilized in the texts. The Discursive Practice dimension explores how UNESCO produces and disseminates these texts, examining both their creation and the varying interpretations of audiences. Finally, the Social Practice dimension links discourse to broader social ideologies and power structures, highlighting how dominant groups sustain their influence and how AI perpetuates pre-existing inequalities.

2.2 Discourses on AI in Education

The discussion surrounding the use of AI in education reveals both its advantages and challenges. UNESCO characterizes AI as a powerful catalyst for transforming education, highlighting its potential to personalize learning and improve accessibility, ultimately enhancing educational outcomes. On the other hand, concerns include issues such as inequality, privacy violations, and ethical complications (UNESCO, 2021). Holmes, in 2019, cautioned that AI could significantly affect students' autonomy and critical thinking abilities. This ongoing discourse underscores the complex dilemmas involved, focusing attention on the need for effective governance and the responsible application of AI technology in education.

2.3 Teachers as Moral/Epistemic Authorities:

Teachers hold a vital role in the educational process, serving as foundational and indispensable figures (UNESCO, 2021). According to UNESCO, artificial intelligence (AI) should function as a tool to support and assist teachers rather than replace them. Teachers remain pivotal as moral and trusted authorities, fostering critical thinking among students. As highlighted by Selwyn in 2019, while AI can enhance teaching practices, it cannot substitute the human judgment and emotional insight that educators bring to their work.

2.4 Theoretical Framework

This paper primarily adopts Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as its theoretical framework to examine language as a component of social practice, with a particular emphasis on how power, ideology, and social inequality are embedded and perpetuated through discourse (Fairclough, 1995). The study is guided by Fairclough's three-dimensional model, which encompasses the textual level (linguistic features), discursive practice (processes of production and consumption), and social practice (dynamics of ideology and power).

This framework provides a structured approach to analyzing how language shapes social realities and legitimizes institutional authority. Furthermore, the research explores key concepts such as framing, lexical choice, modality (e.g., terms like "must" and "should"), and binary oppositions (e.g., "opportunity vs. threat") to investigate the representation of AI in education within UNESCO's discourse.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research design

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is rooted in interpretive epistemology, which posits that knowledge is constructed through power-laden social and institutional relations rather than being purely discovered. Unlike methodologies that depend on neutral and objective observations to convey meaning, critical analysis asserts that language and discourse are inherently non-neutral and play a key role in shaping meaning. Discourse operates as a form of social practice, reinforcing power structures, normalizing specific versions of reality as common sense, and legitimizing ideological perspectives. This foundational framework makes CDA particularly effective for examining how global institutions like UNESCO shape, promote, and normalize concepts such as "human-centered AI" within education policy.

CDA serves as a qualitative research method aimed at exploring the interplay between language, power, and ideology in social contexts. It offers a deeply analytic approach to understanding how discourse constructs specific interpretations of AI's role in education. Its

selection as a method is justified by its capacity to demonstrate how language not only reflects but also influences public perception and social realities. This study adopts a qualitative inquiry design to uncover the deeper structures of meaning, rather than focusing on quantifying observable patterns. Specifically, it investigates the implicit assumptions embedded within UNESCO's discourse, the roles it ascribes to teachers, learners, and policymakers, as well as the ways in which it shapes, constrains, or regulates spaces for resistance, critique, and alternative viewpoints.

Under the qualitative framework, the study draws extensively from traditions in policy discourse analysis and institutional text analysis. These approaches challenge the notion of policy documents as neutral technical artifacts; instead, they emphasize their role in constructing the very social realities they claim to describe (Ball, 1993; Bacchi, 2009). It is important to recognize that CDA itself is not a neutral method. As Fairclough (1992) argues, CDA is inherently aligned with critiquing domination and exploring avenues for social transformation and emancipation. This study, therefore, adopts a clearly critical stance grounded in commitments to educational justice, teacher autonomy, and the democratic regulation of technology—eschewing the supposedly neutral or objective viewpoints often taken in traditional models (Lather, 1991).

As a researcher deeply engaged with critical and applied linguistics, I approach this analysis from a standpoint that views education as an arena of ideological struggle. This perspective shapes both the selection of the corpus and the interpretive framework applied in this study. Furthermore, I consciously acknowledge that the analytical choices made here are intended to highlight—and challenge—the power asymmetries underlying policy discourse, rather than perpetuating them.

3.2 Corpus and data collection

The primary analytical corpus was developed using a meticulously designed purposive sampling process (Patton, 2002), in which the selected texts were chosen based on their institutional significance, temporal specificity, and sufficient relevance to enable detailed analysis. In qualitative and critical research, purposive sampling is particularly suitable because the priority is not statistical representativeness but rather theoretical depth and interpretive richness. For this study, five key texts were selected to form the corpus, serving as the foundation for examining how AI is conceptualized at a universal level. The use of these authoritative sources ensures a focused and cohesive analysis, facilitating an in-depth exploration of the nuanced ways in which AI is discursively constructed.

No.	Document	Genre	Date
1	AI and the Future of Education: Disruptions, Dilemmas and Directions	Edited report	Sep 2025
2	AI and Education: Protecting the Rights of Learners	Policy report	Sep 2025
3	Digital Learning Week 2025: Official Communique and Proceedings	Proceedings	Sep 2025
4	"Teachers Cannot Be Coded"	Campaign texts	2025
5	Futures Dialogue Summary: AI and the Futures of Education	Dialogue record	Oct 2025

The study's corpus has been deliberately designed to encompass a diverse range of institutional genres, including edited reports, policy frameworks, advocacy campaigns, event communiqués, and dialogue summaries. This approach is employed because each genre serves distinct discursive functions, shaping how they engage and position their readers. For instance, a policy framework relies on the authority of technical expertise, an advocacy campaign leverages moral persuasion and emotional appeal, while a dialogue summary facilitates the establishment of institutional consensus. By examining multiple genres within a single study, the research aims to offer a more comprehensive understanding of UNESCO's discourse across its broader institutional practices.

The decision to focus on the 2025–2026 period is justified by the exceptionally concentrated level of UNESCO activity on AI and education during this time. Highlights include Digital Learning Week, the release of two major publications, the "Teachers Cannot Be Coded" campaign, the introduction of AI competency frameworks, and the Futures Dialogue. These events collectively define a unique discursive moment characterized by heightened output and a focus on institutional self-definition, making this period particularly significant for critical analysis.

To contextualize these findings, the study incorporates a supplementary set of scholarly responses to UNESCO's messaging on AI and education. This includes contributions from academic discourse analysis and critical studies in education technology. While this secondary corpus is not subjected to the same systematic coding as the primary dataset, it serves as an interpretive framework, linking insights from the primary texts to broader academic debates in the field.

3.3 Data analysis procedure

The data analysis process, utilizing the CDA method, meticulously examined selected UNESCO texts through a structured approach. The analysis was conducted in three stages. Initially, close reading was employed to detect recurring linguistic patterns, such as evaluative language (including adjectives, adverbs, and metaphors), high modality expressions, and binary oppositions. In the second stage, passages were thematically coded based on

Fairclough's three dimensions: textual, discursive, and social-ideology. In the final stage, coded excerpts were analyzed concerning UNESCO's positioning within the broader context of global AI governance discourse. This approach effectively portrays AI as a social force that should be governed by ethics, human dignity, and educational responsibility, rather than being viewed as a neutral technology.

4. Findings / Analysis

4.1 Two opposed perspectives: opportunity vs risk

A recurring feature in AI-related discourse is the framing of two opposing perspectives: opportunity and risk. This duality emerges through narratives that portray AI both as a valuable asset and a potential hazard, emphasizing that while the technology can bring significant advantages, it also risks causing considerable harm if not properly managed. On one hand, positive terms such as "innovation," "support," and "improve outcomes" highlight AI's potential to expand access, boost efficiency, assist learners, and enhance productivity. On the other hand, expressions like "dilemma," "disruptions arise," and "risk" point to its capacity to exacerbate inequality, simplify complex learning experiences, diminish human judgment, or compromise trust (UNESCO 2025).

This nuanced framework underscores the notion that technological advancements rarely fall neatly into binary categories of good or bad. Instead, these contrasting viewpoints reveal an underlying ideological tension between techno-optimism—which champions innovation as synonymous with progress—and more cautious approaches that emphasize social implications, regulatory measures, and ethical boundaries. The discussion also places significant emphasis on the role of human regulation as an essential balancing force in navigating AI's complexities.

4.2 Value-laden lexical choices

According to Van Dijk (2010), value-laden lexical choice refers to the intentional use of language in discourse to reproduce or challenge social power and ideology. This involves selecting words that carry evaluative, emotional, or ideological significance, moving beyond mere description. Similarly, Fairclough highlighted that value-laden lexical choices are words imbued with positive or negative connotations, reflecting the speaker's ideological standpoint. For instance, in the context of AI-related discourse, phrases like "ethics are non-negotiable" serve to terminate potential debate, framing the statement as an absolute moral truth rather than a policy preference .

Terms such as "irreplaceable," "support," "replace," "dignity," "trust," and "inequality" are not neutral. Instead, they impose a hierarchy that places human values above technological interests while expressing implicit judgments about what is desirable and beneficial. Conversely, phrases like "flatten" and "erode" convey notions of disaster, harm, reduction, and loss, portraying AI as a possible threat if left unregulated .

From an ideological lens, these lexical choices are significant because they articulate and reinforce the core values underpinning the discourse, such as prioritizing human dignity, justice, containment, and ethical responsibility. Therefore, value-laden vocabulary operates not just as a linguistic element but as a strategic tool that shapes beliefs, privileges particular perspectives, and presents AI in ways that align with broader societal obligations, as emphasized by UNESCO (2025).

4.3 Modality and obligation structures

odality plays a pivotal role in critical discourse analysis as it conveys the speaker's judgment or stance concerning the likelihood, obligation, permission, or possibility of a given statement, as Halliday (1994:75) highlights. It reflects the degree of confidence or necessity behind a claim, making it a crucial element in shaping meaning. In the context of AI-related discussions, modal expressions such as *must*, *should*, *can*, *will*, and *may* are especially significant, as they embody the speaker's perspective—whether signaling certainty, obligation, suggestion, prediction, or potential.

For instance, consider statements like "AI must support educators" or "ethics must come first." The use of *must* here establishes a sense of definitive authority and urgency, leaving little room for debate or alternative interpretations. Such phrasing doesn't merely suggest preferred actions regarding educators and ethics but instead frames them as moral and practical imperatives. Conversely, a phrase like "AI can expand access and support" suggests potentiality rather than certainty. This more moderate modality portrays AI as capable of enhancing educational accessibility while refraining from guaranteeing specific outcomes. Similarly, a statement such as "students may learn less, not more" underscores a possible negative result. The choice of *may* introduces an element of uncertainty, hinting at a plausible but non-guaranteed scenario. This creates a cautious and tentative tone, urging stakeholders to consider potential risks (UNESCO, 2025).

The ideological power of modality lies in its ability to shape perceptions by framing values as urgent or universally essential. High-modality phrases often advocate for a human-centered ideology that prioritizes accountability, inclusion, and ethical responsibility. Simultaneously, modality functions as a tool of influence and control—by presenting a notion as something that must occur, speakers seek to normalize specific social norms and delineate acceptable actions within a discourse.

4.4 Binary and "irreplaceability"

n the framework of critical discourse analysis, Fairclough interprets binary words not merely as linguistic contrasts but as ideological instruments designed to shape power relations and sustain dominance. These binary words organize meaning through opposing pairs like human versus machine or opportunity versus risk. For instance, a UNESCO text illustrates this by stating that the opportunity lies in freeing up time for higher-value teaching, whereas the risk involves a drift toward automation (UNESCO, 2025).

Such oppositional framing is highly strategic, as it reduces complex realities into two easily identifiable yet contradictory dimensions. In this example, the binary pair—opportunity (higher-value, human-centered teaching) versus risk (automation and technology-driven processes)—is far from neutral. The formulation implicitly privileges teaching by assigning higher value through terms such as quality, expertise, and human judgment. In contrast, automation is subtly devalued, evoking notions of mechanical and impersonal processes. This contrast underscores an underlying ideological preference that prioritizes human agency over mechanized systems.

By employing binary oppositions, the discourse lays bare its foundational assumption: human dignity, cultural diversity, and social justice are inherently superior to automation and

unregulated technological innovation. This interplay between language and ideology reflects the power of discourse in shaping perceptions and affirming particular values over others.

4.5 Equity, digital divide, and governance/ethics

A pivotal topic in AI discussions is the interplay between equality, the digital divide, and governance or ethics. From a critical perspective, AI is not just a technological advancement but also a social issue that has the potential to either mitigate or exacerbate existing inequalities. UNESCO warns that without access to electricity, reliable connectivity, and affordable devices, millions will be excluded from its benefits. Consequently, the digital divide evolves into an AI divide, where disparities in infrastructure, knowledge, and opportunities perpetuate broader patterns of social marginalization.

Simultaneously, governance and ethics emerge as key ideological concerns, shaping whether AI systems are developed and implemented in ways that foster fairness, accountability, and inclusivity. Statements asserting that ethics are non-negotiable or that human rights must take precedence highlight a perspective that prioritizes moral accountability over mere technical advancement. This framing underscores the notion of AI governance as a matter of equity rather than mere efficiency, advocating for stringent regulations to ensure equitable participation and to prevent AI from deepening structural inequalities.

5.1 Interpretation of Findings

The empirical findings highlight how a human-centered approach in AI governance discussions positions educators as key figures in ethical oversight. By leveraging human judgment, UNESCO seeks to mitigate technological risks in classroom pedagogy. This perspective promotes a policy framework where teachers are encouraged to critically evaluate AI-driven decisions. Such an approach aligns with UNESCO's 2025 objectives, which prioritize high ethical standards for equitable education. On a practical level, the findings suggest a recalibration of policy tools toward human-AI collaborative models, granting teachers authority over AI-driven decisions. This, in turn, empowers educators to prevent curriculum homogenization and uphold cultural responsiveness.

5.2 Connections to Literature

The results strongly align with the principles emphasized in the human-centered AI governance literature, which prioritizes core human values such as equity, transparency, and inclusivity. This perspective is prominently reflected in UNESCO’s 2025 guidance on AI in education, which advocates for a governance structure that upholds human rights as a central priority (UNESCO, 2026). However, these findings also highlight concerns about sidelining teachers' professional judgment and emotional intelligence, echoing warnings from Holmes et al. (2022) about the risks of uncritically adopting AI tools that could undermine student agency.

Additionally, a critical analysis of the discourse reveals how the framing of "teacher agency" can shift moral responsibility disproportionately onto individual educators. By emphasizing ethical responsibility solely at the human level, such narratives often obscure the broader influence of collaborative technological interests and overlook the vital role of state-level accountability.

5.3 Teacher Role Implications

The strong emphasis on teacher-centered approaches has significantly impacted the role

of educators. While it positions them as central to the AI transition, it simultaneously places greater pressure on teachers to act as "gatekeepers" of technology (UNESCO, 2025). Consequently, this shift calls for a reimagining of teacher training. Educators must progress beyond basic digital literacy and develop ethics literacy, enabling them to critically evaluate the tools they implement. From a policy perspective, this underscores the importance of reframing teacher professional development as a governance priority. Measures such as tenure protections for AI oversight responsibilities could serve as incentives to enhance motivation.

5.4 Language and Institutional Responsibility

The emphasis on teacher-centered governance reshapes the framework of institutional accountability. By channeling responsibility through linguistic constructs, the concept of "educator stewardship" emerges—describing the expectation that individual teachers take on continuous moral and practical management of AI systems to validate regulatory compliance on a personal level. However, when policy discourse prioritizes individual teacher agency, it risks placing disproportionate responsibilities on educators while enabling institutions to evade the more challenging task of establishing firm boundaries for AI usage. A genuinely human-centered approach, therefore, necessitates that institutions take ownership of the risks associated with AI systems, ensuring that the weight of moral oversight does not fall solely on classroom teachers.

5.5 Limitations and Omissions

Recognizing the impact of adopting a human-centered ethical framework is crucial. While the emphasis on teacher-student relationships is valuable, it risks overshadowing the broader socio-technical systems that shape AI development. This perspective often neglects critical aspects such as the opaque nature of proprietary algorithms, alongside the environmental and economic consequences of large-scale AI infrastructures. By focusing narrowly, important issues related to power, accountability, and control embedded within AI systems may be overlooked. As a result, addressing only human-centered considerations could provide an incomplete response to the complex challenges posed by AI in education.

6. Conclusion

This study explores the shifting dynamics of AI in education, emphasizing the growing consideration of human-centered AI governance and teacher-focused approaches prevalent in policy discussions. The findings reveal that despite enhanced attention to values like equity, transparency, and inclusivity in AI governance, as outlined in UNESCO’s 2025 guidelines on AI in education, the practical implementation often places a significant—and at times uneven—burden on educators themselves.

The research examines how teacher-centered narratives shape their roles and professional development, how governance language influences institutional accountability, and which elements are often overlooked in existing ethical frameworks. It observes that by positioning teachers as central to AI adoption, policy documents inadvertently assign them the role of primary "ethical gatekeepers" for technological integration. This necessitates a transformative approach to teacher training, extending beyond basic digital literacy to include comprehensive "AI ethics literacy," enabling educators to critically assess and ethically utilize AI tools within their teaching methods.

However, while official documents frequently emphasize human rights, the language

employed often reinforces existing power dynamics by assigning moral accountability to individual educators while diminishing the responsibility of large technological corporations. These findings underscore the tension between human-centered governance principles and the practical challenges educators encounter, illustrating how seemingly empowering rhetoric can unintentionally increase the strain on frontline professionals.

In practical terms, the study underscores the pressing demand for well-structured and institutionally supported AI ethics training for educators, along with clearer policy frameworks that distribute responsibility equitably among policymakers, technology developers, and educational institutions. It advocates for governance models that promote shared accountability, ensuring that the responsibility for ethical AI integration does not rest disproportionately on teachers alone.

References

Bacchi, C. (2009). *Analyzing policy: What's the problem represented to be?* Pearson.

Ball, S. J. (1993). *What is policy?* Texts, trajectories and toolboxes. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 13(2), 10–17.

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

Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2005). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). Edward Arnold.

Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2022). *Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning*. Center for Curriculum Redesign.

Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy within the postmodern*. Routledge.

Selwyn, N. (2019). *Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education*. Polity Press.

UNESCO. (2021). Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence. 16 May 2021. https://www.unesco.org/ethics-ai/en

UNESCO. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. 7 September 2023. Available from: https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/guidance-generative-ai-education-and-research

UNISCO. (2025a). AI and Education: Protecting the Rights of Learners {online}. 4 September 2025. Available from: https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/ai-and-education-protecting- rights-learners

UNESCO. (2025b). AI and the future of education. Disruptions, Dilemmas and directions{online}. 25 September 2025. Available from: https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/ai-and-future-education-disruptions-dilemmas-and-directions

UNESCO. (2025c). Artificial intelligence and education: Preserving human agency in a world of automation. Available from: https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/international-day- education-2025-ai-and-education-preserving-human-agency-world-automation

UNESCO. (2025d). Futures Dialogue Summary: AI and the Futures of Education {online}. 22 October 2025. Available from: https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/ai-and-futures-education

UNESCO. (2025e). "Teachers Cannot Be Coded". 26 August 2025. Available from: https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/teachers-cannot-be-coded

UNISCO. (2025f). UNESCO Digital Learning Week 2025 – Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Education {online}. 22 October 2025. Available from: https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/ai-and-futures-education

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

Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: A plea for diversity. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 95–120). SAGE.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2010). Discourse and power. Plgrave Macmillan.

Hadaga, H. M. S. (2026). Exploring Libyan EFL Teachers' Views towards Using Artificial Intelligence Tools in Teaching English Language Translation: A Study at the Department of Translation at the Faculty of Languages within the University of Benghazi. Al-Farooq Journal of Sciences, 2(3), 351-360.

Williamson, B., & Eynon, R. (2020). Historical threads, missing links, and future directions in AI in education. Learning, Media and Technology, 45(3), 223–235.