

Exploring self-directed AI literacy through discourse analysis of learning platform webinars

Hery Yanto The
Institut Nalanda

ABSTRACT

Educators have critical roles in keeping up with the growing influence of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the fast-changing world of language education and literary research. One promising approach to connect AI advancements with teaching practices is through self-directed learning facilitated by personal learning networks. However, despite the increasing number of resources like "AI for Educators", many teacher-educators are either unaware of or lack the motivation to take advantage of these opportunities. This study examines how self-learning initiatives can empower educators to enhance their AI literacy. It uses Paul Gee's discourse analysis framework to analyze three recorded webinars from the AI for Educators platform. The analysis focuses on how language and meaning are constructed within these digital learning environments to shape an understanding of AI's roles and values in education. The results indicate that these webinars not only provide accessible entry points for grasping the technical and ethical aspects of AI but also act as a springboard for educators to view AI as a tool for enhancement rather than a threat. The understanding of AI as a new literacy practice is deepened, highlighting its potential to support education in general and specifically foreign language acquisition. This study proposes that encouraging self-directed AI learning through thoughtfully designed, discourse-rich platforms could serve as an effective model for professional development, particularly in disciplines such as literary studies, where critical inquiry, interpretation, and ethical considerations are essential.

Keywords: AI Literacy, discourse analysis, self-directed learning

Article History: Received 20 Jun 2025, Final revision 12 Jul 2025, 11 Sep 2025

Introduction

The educational environment is in a state of transition, adapting to technological advancements such as the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) to enhance teaching practices and student learning experiences (Canonigo, 2024; Fadel et al., 2019; Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). In language education and literary research, educators are grappling with the need to keep pace with these developments, ensuring that the curriculum remains relevant to learners' needs (Hockly, 2023; Mananay, 2024). In response to this challenge, self-paced learning, supported by personal learning networks and AI-driven platforms, has proven to be a promising approach to professional development, particularly when formal training is insufficient for educators (Shalong et al., 2024;

Younas et al., 2025). The availability of open resources, such as the AI for Educators platform, offers a promising avenue to meet educators' professional training needs. However, the key to unlocking this potential lies in educators' recognition of the importance of AI literacy as a career development tool. This realization is crucial for their professional growth and the future of education (Long & Magerko, 2020).

AI literacy involves more than technical skills. It also requires understanding ethical issues, thinking critically, and recognizing the social effects of AI. Many earlier studies (Canonigo, 2024; Owan et al., 2023; Putrayasa et al., 2024; Reiss, 2021) describe these aspects well but do not fully explore the difficulties teachers face when

applying them. Ethical awareness, for instance, is often presented as straightforward. In practice, however, teachers must balance the use of new technology with responsible decision-making, which can be challenging. Similarly, research highlights AI's impact on teaching and fairness (Eden et al., 2024; Harry & Sayudin, 2023; Utami & Karnedi, 2024) but does not always address the real challenges schools encounter in making AI fair and useful for all students. This reveals a gap between understanding AI literacy and implementing it effectively in classrooms. This study examines how self-directed learning can help teachers manage these challenges and use AI thoughtfully and effectively.

Research has examined several roles of AI in education, including language learning, curriculum design, and professional development (Chiu, 2021; Mageira et al., 2022; Wing, 2006). While these studies acknowledge the potential of generative tools like ChatGPT to provide personalized feedback and automate content creation (Fadel et al., 2019; Mageira et al., 2022; Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019), they often do not critically address the limitations and risks associated with their use, such as overreliance or accuracy issues. In the same way, research points to the growing functions of mobile and web applications in supporting self-directed learning and digital literacy (Chiu, 2021; Daulay et al., 2024; Putrayasa et al., 2024; Wing, 2006), but tends to overlook how unequal access to technology and varying learner readiness affect these outcomes. Furthermore, while the importance of combining technical skills with ethical considerations in AI literacy is emphasized (Eden et al., 2024; Floridi et al., 2018; Long & Magerko, 2020), existing studies often fail to explore how such programs can effectively address challenges like algorithmic bias and transparency in real educational settings. This analysis reveals a need for more critical investigation into how AI tools and literacy initiatives can be responsibly integrated to support equitable and meaningful learning experiences.

Despite extensive research on AI in education, significant gaps remain in understanding how AI literacy is constructed and communicated within digital learning environments. In particular, the professional

development of educators to become self-sufficient in AI is largely unexplored. Limited attention has been given to how language and meaning are used in educational webinars to shape educators' views of AI's role, risks, and value in teaching and learning. This gap is critical because discourse shapes not only what is taught but also how AI pedagogy is framed, influencing educators' and learners' perceptions and practices. Educators' perceptions strongly affect their willingness and ability to integrate AI technologies into their teaching (Fadel et al., 2019; Veldhuis et al., 2025). Furthermore, discourses surrounding AI are never neutral; they reflect and reproduce existing ideologies, power structures, and institutional norms (J. Gee & M Handford, 2023; J. P. Gee, 2014). Understanding how these discourses operate within professional development is essential, as they influence the attitudes and behaviors educators adopt toward AI integration. Without this critical focus on discourse, efforts to integrate AI risk overlooking the social and ethical dimensions that are vital for responsible and effective AI education.

This study aims to investigate how self-directed learning initiatives, particularly through discourse-rich platforms such as webinars, can empower educators to enhance their AI literacy. By analyzing three recorded webinars from the AI for Educators platform using Paul Gee's discourse analysis framework, the research focuses on how language and meaning are constructed within these digital learning environments to shape educators' understanding of AI's roles, risks, and values in education. The purpose is to explore how these webinars serve not only as accessible entry points for grasping the technical and ethical aspects of AI but also as spaces where educators can develop a more positive and nuanced view of AI as a tool for educational enhancement, especially in fields like language education and literary studies.

Building on this purpose, the study proposes that encouraging self-directed AI learning through thoughtfully designed, discourse-rich platforms can offer an effective model for professional development. This model aims to support educators across disciplines in developing critical inquiry skills, ethical judgment, and collaborative

engagement necessary for responsible AI integration. By focusing on the discursive construction of AI literacy, the study highlights the importance of language and social interaction in shaping how educators perceive and use AI, addressing the complexities and challenges involved in AI

pedagogy. Ultimately, the research seeks to contribute to more responsive and reflective professional development approaches that acknowledge the social, ethical, and practical dimensions of AI in education.

Method

James Paul Gee's (2014) discourse thinking serves as a guide to explore how language and social practices in educational webinars construct and convey meanings related to AI literacy. The interaction between language, identity, and social context, as Gee states, can be instrumental in analyzing social practices. In relation to this research, webinar

recordings provide insight into the interaction between language, identity, and the social context of the AI skills that educators need to master. This mastery of AI skills has the potential to transform education, as educators can utilize their knowledge to inspire and motivate their students.

Table 1. The Synthesize of Gee’s Framework of Discourse Analysis

Stepping	Information	Indicator for Analysis
Identifying the context of the discourse	Determine the background behind social and cultural webinar.	Background education, audience, and goals of the webinar.
Examining the language used	Analyze terminology, structure sentences, and devices rhetoric.	Word choice, grammatical patterns, and technical terms.
Analyzing the Meaning that exists	Investigate how term is related, framed and interpreted.	Contextual meaning, diverse interpretation by audiences.
Identifying social practices	Research how practices were presented.	Norms, ethical considerations, and initiatives.
Exploring intertextuality	Identify references to text or narrative of the culture.	Reference about ethics, equity, and education.
Evaluating the power of connection	Analyze how language negotiates authority or resistance.	Use language to confirm skills or challenge dominant views.
Connecting with a broader discourse	Connect discourse with values or policy of society.	Examine harmony with policy, values, and social integration.

In educational webinars on AI literacy, educators can study and identify the functions of language used to construct knowledge, influence perceptions, and establish roles among participants. The choice of words, sentence structures, and how speakers interact with their audiences are specific aspects of the linguistics of webinars that can be examined for their pedagogical functions. The credibility of the hosting institution and the speakers in the webinar and the best practices they share reflect broader institutional norms and social practices surrounding AI in education.

Discourse analysis, informed by Gee’s ideas, can reveal how AI literacy is framed for educators, how it is positioned within educational narratives, and what identities or roles are promoted or contested through this framing.

Gee’s concept of primary and secondary discourses is also relevant to this analysis. Primary discourses, formed through early life experiences within family and community contexts, are the foundation of an individual’s identity. In contrast, secondary

discourses are acquired through engagement with formal institutions such as schools and professional communities. The educators who participated in the AI literacy webinar bring primary discourses shaped by their personal experiences with technology. At the same time, their engagement with AI as an educational

tool reflects the influence of secondary discourses shaped by institutional expectations and professional development initiatives. These dual influences provide a valuable lens for understanding the tensions or synergies that may emerge as educators interpret and respond to AI-related content.

Table 2. Aspects of the Gee’s Framework Selected for this Research

Aspect	Information	The purpose of analysis
The use of language	Focus on specific terminology, sentence structures, and patterns of the discourse.	Disclosing the understanding of conceptual thinking about AI, identifying technical terms, and distinguishing between the terms used by experts and the public.
Representation of meaning	Research shows how AI-related terms gain meaning from context of the presentation and discussion.	Understanding how speakers frame AI literacy in different educational environments and how the context forms the explanation and acceptance.
Social practice	Investigate embedded norms, values, and expectations in discourse.	Revealing how AI is positioned as a skill, a need, or attention and how the position reflects the practices in education.

The framework developed by Gee is particularly effective in capturing the layered complexity of meaning-making in discourse, especially when new technologies are introduced into educational settings. Through this lens, this study reveals how AI is discussed not only as a technical tool but also as a sociocultural phenomenon related to the evolving role of teachers, ethical issues, and the formation of professional identities. By analyzing the discourse of these webinars, this study sheds light on how educators perceive AI. It is possible that educators view AI as an enhancement to educational practice or, conversely, as a disruptive or threatening force. Importantly, this analysis will identify how these perceptions influence their readiness and willingness to integrate AI into their pedagogical approaches, highlighting the significant role educators play in shaping the future of AI in education.

This study applies the Gee’s framework as the primary tool for analyzing the data sources (look at table 1). Due to the broad scope of discourse research and the limited space for presenting findings, the data were limited to three webinar recordings. These webinars were chosen because they are

the most recent sessions from 2025, ensuring the analysis reflects the latest technological advancements. Although additional webinars exist, selecting three allowed for a focused and manageable study within the available presentation space. Each webinar lasted about one hour and covered various topics related to AI in education. Transcripts provided on the AI for Educators platform further supported the analysis by facilitating detailed examination of the discourse according to Gee’s framework.

Regarding ethical considerations, these webinars are publicly accessible resources intended for professional development, and no personal or private information was collected or analyzed. Transparency about the use of publicly available data was maintained to uphold research integrity and credibility. Ethical guidelines for using public digital content in research were followed to respect the original context and the presenters and participants involved.

While Gee’s framework offers extensive analytical possibilities, the scope of this pilot study and the space limitations of this conference paper necessitate a more focused approach. This practical approach

ensures a thorough analysis of three main aspects that are particularly useful for exploring AI literacy in the context of self-paced learning environments such as webinars. These aspects are summarized in Table 2.

By looking into these three analytical aspects, researchers can conduct a targeted yet in-depth examination of how AI literacy is

constructed, negotiated, and communicated in professional learning environments. This approach balances analytical depth with practical relevance, providing insights for educators and policymakers on designing professional development that more effectively supports critical engagement with AI in education.

Results and Discussion

The analysis of the three webinars revealed that various perspectives emerged and influenced one another regarding AI literacy and its impact on education. These perspectives can be distinguished based on the views of different social roles, namely educators, parents, and educational institutions. Each social role understands the meaning and application of AI in other contexts, reflecting their specific roles in

relation to students. The three webinars, *AI in Education: What Parents & Caregivers Should Know*, *Integrating AI for Deeper Math Learning*, and *Building AI Literacy in Your School or District*, each highlighted different thematic focus. Still, all emphasized the need for inclusive, critical, and ethical AI education. Table 3 summarizes the focus, insights for educators, and applications for students from each webinar.

Table 3. The Summary of Webinars

Webinar No & Title	Speakers	Key Points	AI Literacy and Insights for Educator	Application For Learning
1. AI in Education: What Parents & Caregivers Should Know	Amanda Bickerstaff, the Founder and CEO of AI for Education Jason B. Allen, the National Partnership Director for the National Parents Union	Discusses how AI literacy varies among stakeholders' interests. Educators frame AI as a learning tool, while parents focus on ethical concerns. Emphasizes digital equity and issues of access affecting AI adoption. Advocates for collaborative AI literacy beyond formal education.	AI literacy requires understanding context to ensure diverse perspectives are included in AI education. Overcoming misunderstandings about AI capabilities is essential for structuring learning.	Introduce students to critical AI literacy through interactive discussion about common AI misunderstandings. Use case studies to highlight ethical and accessibility issues raised in the webinar.
2. Integrating AI for Deeper Math Learning	Amanda Bickerstaff, the Founder and CEO of AI for Education Jun Li, a director on the math team	Explores the role of AI in breaking down complex problems while warning about cognitive overload. Highlights AI model tendencies toward misinformation and	AI literacy is a critical skill for evaluating AI-generated responses and preventing blind trust. Ethical and pedagogical	Guide students in using AI tools for productive struggle, encouraging critical engagement rather than reliance on AI-generated solutions, demonstrate AI tools

	at Student Achievement Partners	stresses the need for structured AI adoption. Features custom AI tools like Khanmigo and Desmos to improve math learning outcomes.	approaches should frame AI as a complement to human reasoning.	during direct instruction in mathematics.
	Jasmine Costello, a Product Manager at Student Achievement Partners			
	Mandy DePriest, a Curriculum & Content Developer at AI for Education			
3. Building AI Literacy in Your School or District	Amanda Bickerstaff, the Founder and CEO of AI for Education	Advocates AI literacy as a collaborative, lifelong learning process involving students, educators, and parents.	AI literacy alone is insufficient without collaboration among stakeholders.	Embed AI literacy into existing digital literacy curricula to ensure all students receive foundational AI education.
	Corey Layne Crouch, a former high school English teacher, school principal, and edtech executive	Emphasizes ethical AI adoption to mitigate misinformation and calls for institutional AI policies. Proposes integrated AI literacy plans for educators, highlighting interdisciplinary training and effort.	Emphasizes interdisciplinary, transparent, and ethical approaches. Schools must implement structured AI training for both students and staff.	Promote parental involvement to bridge learning between classroom and home.
	Mandy DePriest, Curriculum & Content Developer at AI for Education			

While the focus of each webinar varied, the comparative analysis revealed several commonalities in understanding the topic. The first webinar emphasized self-directed learning and highlighted the role of sociocultural context and access in shaping individuals' understanding of AI. Educators were positioned as facilitators who must balance technical knowledge with ethical norms, while parents were portrayed as important partners. Their involvement was shown to be crucial, particularly in embodying

issues of equity and responsibility, which were underscored as urgent and necessary in AI education.

The second webinar, which delved into the application of AI in mathematics education, underscored the importance of caution when using AI tools. It was noted that these tools, if not used with care, can diminish students' cognitive engagement. The speakers cautioned against over-reliance on generative AI. They also emphasized the crucial role of educators in providing guided experiences

that foster critical thinking and problem-solving skills, thereby ensuring the responsible use of AI in education.

The discussion in the third webinar examined the functions and applications of AI across a broader range of areas. It emphasized AI literacy as an educational goal that should be embedded in the curriculum and supported by institutional regulations. The discussion highlighted clarity, ethical considerations, and

prompt action as essential components of successful AI implementation. Additionally, the webinar advocated professional development and active participation from all relevant stakeholders in formulating AI policies and teaching methods. It was emphasized that not only do educators and schools need to monitor the use of AI, but that parents and community members also play an equally important role.

Table 4. Discourse of the Webinars

Aspect	Webinar 1	Webinar 2	Webinar 3
The use of language	A mix of formal and informal tones; terminology is often used but sometimes unclear. Example: "AI literacy is [the] base for everyone, including parents."	Highly technical and domain-specific language, especially related to AI's role in mathematics. Example: "[Worrying] big [is] [the] risk [of] divert[ing] [the] cognitive burden from student to [the] tool."	Structured and inclusive language, presenting AI literacy as a necessary life skill. Example: "AI literacy must be started [with young] children."
Representation of meaning	AI literacy is framed as a tool for independent learning, varying based on the audience's perspective (educators vs. parents). Example: "Literacy and AI access are highly correlated with income [and social status]."	Focuses on AI's role in academic teaching, especially mathematics. Example: "Learning must confirm [students'] identity and encourage reasoning and solving [problems]."	AI literacy is described as an ongoing process requiring collaboration among educators, parents, and students. Example: "AI literacy is not only about [computing] skills, but also digital and media literacy."
Social practice	AI literacy is presented as essential for modern learning, with emphasis varying by community needs. Example: "Parents want to be involved in AI decisions, but they need more [information]."	Advocates a cautious approach to AI adoption, stressing critical engagement with AI tools. Example: "Blind trust [in] AI devices can cause error[s]; students must develop [the] ability to evaluate [AI-generated output] in a critical way."	AI literacy is depicted as an evolving challenge within institutions, emphasizing ethical AI adoption. Example: "Everything looks real now; we must verify before [we] share."

The analysis of the perspectives represented by various social roles in society, as presented in this webinar, will be more comprehensive when combined with the findings from the webinar's transcription using the discourse analysis indicators proposed by James Paul Gee. Utilizing these indicators can help this study illustrate how language shapes the understanding of the essential functions of AI, how meaning is positioned within specific contexts, and how social activities related to AI are reinforced or debated.

The first recording reveals a discussion atmosphere in which terms such as “generative AI” and “data privacy” are frequently mentioned, although their explanations are sometimes inconsistent. The speakers’ use of these terms suggests an emphasis on issues of access and the ambiguity surrounding terminology in AI. Educators highlight the importance of understanding AI as a social issue, focusing on the digital access gap that hinders the equitable application of AI. The presentations and discussions in this webinar demonstrate the growing need for collaboration between parents and educators, with the understanding that AI is viewed as a shared responsibility rather than a private concern.

In the second webinar, speakers used technical and specific terms to discuss the application of AI in math instruction. They raised concerns about “cognitive disengagement,” which refers to students becoming overly dependent on AI and failing to develop their problem-solving skills. Considering this context, the speakers presented AI as a supportive addition rather than a replacement for human thought. The language conveyed a sense of cautious optimism, acknowledging the possibilities of AI while emphasizing the importance of structured guidance and critical participation.

The third webinar provided a broader perspective on the role of institutions, positioning AI literacy as a foundational skill that spans multiple disciplines. Speakers employed inclusive language, calling for ethical safeguards, curriculum integration, and early exposure to AI education. The importance of social practices was underscored through themes of community responsibility

and institutional policy development. AI was not just a tool; it was recognized as a significant part of a larger cultural shift that necessitates collaboration between schools and families to create shared educational responses.

Table 4 presents a summary of comparative analysis, demonstrating that despite differences in discussions about AI literacy based on educational focus, there is a shared understanding: AI literacy must extend beyond technical skills to include critical thinking, ethical awareness, and institutional alignment. Whether addressing individual misconceptions, instructional practices, or district-wide implementation, a common theme emerged across all three discussions: the importance of preparing students for a future in which AI, a significant player in knowledge production, communication, and decision-making, is a crucial aspect of their education.

The analysis of three webinars on AI literacy provides essential insights into the complexity and evolution of discussions surrounding AI in education. Across various contexts, from self-paced learning to structured mathematics instruction and institutional development, AI literacy emerges as a multidimensional construct encompassing technical, ethical, social, and pedagogical aspects. To contextualize these findings within existing scholarship, the analysis draws on concepts from digital literacy (Putrayasa et al., 2024), media literacy (Koltay, 2011), computational thinking (Wing, 2006), and critical AI literacy (Eden et al., 2024; Long & Magerko, 2020). Overall, this framework clarifies how AI is understood and taught and how education systems can support responsible, inclusive, and practical applications of AI in learning.

AI literacy is often perceived as technical skills required to engage with AI systems. However, the findings suggest that discussions during the webinars extended far beyond mere technical understanding. They included critical reflections on AI’s role in society, the necessity to manage misinformation and algorithmic bias, and the ethical implications of using AI in education. This broad conceptualization supports recent

arguments in the literature that AI literacy should be redefined as a multidimensional construct. For instance, Putrayasa et al. (2024) propose digital literacy as a blend of technical, cognitive, and socio-emotional dimensions, a framework that can readily be applied to AI literacy. Similarly, Long and Magerko (2020) argue that AI literacy encompasses an understanding of how AI systems function and the ability to critique their social impacts and limitations.

The presentations and discussions from the first webinar, which focused on understanding AI in self-paced learning, revealed differing perspectives among stakeholders. Educators generally viewed AI as a tool to enhance learning, while parents expressed more concern about ethical issues such as surveillance and misinformation. These differences highlight the necessity for varied approaches to AI education that consider different groups' values, experiences, and concerns (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). Additionally, the webinar underscored the importance of digital equity and access, which are frequently identified in research as significant challenges to integrating technology (Anisti et al., 2023; Cai et al., 2025). The speakers noted that socioeconomic conditions influence how families are exposed to AI tools, shaping their understanding and perceptions. This concern aligns with research on the digital divide, indicating that AI literacy initiatives must address structural inequalities to be effective.

The second webinar discussed the application of AI in mathematics instruction, demonstrating how AI can enhance problem-solving and critical thinking. Speakers warned about the dangers of "cognitive disengagement," where students may become overly dependent on AI technology and neglect developing their thinking skills. The speakers' warning aligns with Eden's et al. (2024) call for critical AI literacy, which emphasizes the need for students to question AI-generated information rather than accept it uncritically. Gee's (2014) discourse analysis framework, utilized in this study, is crucial in explaining how language shapes norms and expectations. Most importantly, it clarifies how AI is perceived as a tool rather than a substitute for human thought. In this regard,

computational thinking (Wing, 2006) remains relevant; however, it must be expanded to encompass the application of algorithmic logic and the ability to question and understand the context of the results derived from that logic.

The third webinar adopted a broader, institution-based perspective, viewing AI literacy as a collaborative, lifelong learning journey. Speakers advocated structured professional development, policy adjustments, and school-based initiatives integrating AI literacy into everyday educational activities. This strategy aligns with research by Eden and colleagues (2024), who assert that ongoing education in AI requires coordination across multiple levels of curriculum, policy, and teacher training. Moreover, the webinar introduced the notion that AI literacy should begin at an early age. This idea reinforces Chiu (2021) calls to introduce K-12 level AI concepts to prepare students for future careers and foster ethical awareness and responsible engagement from a young age.

Social and ethical considerations were a significant focus across all three webinars, particularly concerning misinformation, bias, and digital safety. Speakers repeatedly emphasized the importance of equipping students with the skills to recognize deepfakes, authenticate sources, and understand how AI systems can exacerbate social injustices. This emphasis is supported by research from Floridi et al. (2018), who highlight the moral responsibilities of developing and using AI, especially in education, where power dynamics can influence learning outcomes and shape future generations. In this context, AI literacy cannot be separated from digital citizenship, media literacy, and social justice.

Gee's (2014) framework facilitates exploring how AI literacy is constructed as part of social practice. His distinction between the language used and broader ideologies and social patterns allows for examining how AI literacy is interpreted in different educational settings. The webinar focused on mathematics instruction, "productive struggle", and "cognitive disengagement" suggest disciplinary norms emphasizing persistence and independent thinking. Conversely, in the institutional webinar, "shared responsibility" and "structured training" reflect an

organizational discourse prioritizing policy, collaboration, and accountability across the institution. This shift in discourse illustrates that AI literacy is not merely a fixed body of knowledge but a series of negotiated meanings that vary across contexts.

This research supports a holistic approach to AI literacy, encompassing technical skills, ethical reasoning, and contextual awareness. This perspective aligns with Pangrazio et al. (2020) observation that successful digital literacy education should extend beyond mere access and usage. Furthermore, Koltay (2011) argues that media literacy is essential for understanding how information is created, transformed, and accessed in the digital age. Educators and students who are knowledgeable about AI should know how to use AI tools and understand their implications, question their results, and adapt their usage to fit different social and educational environments.

Conclusion

The results of this study emphasize the importance of AI literacy in today's educational landscape and highlight the value of self-directed learning and discussion-rich digital platforms as tools for professional development. By applying the discourse analysis framework developed by James Paul Gee, this study reveals how language and social practices shape educators' perspectives on AI and how these perspectives are formed, negotiated, and disseminated in the context of professional development. This approach goes beyond mere technical understanding, illuminating AI literacy as a multifaceted construct encompassing technical skills, ethical awareness, and critical analysis of AI technologies and their impacts.

Institutions must prioritize AI literacy as a core skill rather than treating it as an ancillary competency, especially as AI advances continue to influence various educational fields. AI literacy must be an integral part of curriculum design and educators' training. In this study, the use of discourse analysis provides a powerful lens for understanding how language not only reflects but also shapes educators' thinking about AI and the role they believe it plays in its implementation.

The exploration of AI literacy, based on the findings from three webinars and supported by a theoretical review, reveals that AI literacy is complex, multifaceted, and contextual. To be AI literate, individuals must be familiar with AI technologies, engage in ethical reflection and critical thinking and seek institutional support. Educators and researchers can better understand how AI literacy is applied and experience in practice by employing frameworks such as digital literacy, media literacy, and discourse analysis. Future research should explore how AI literacy can be effectively integrated into teacher education, curriculum design, and school policies to ensure that all students are prepared not only to use AI tools but also to do so with knowledge, responsibility, and empowerment.

Based on the research findings, several recommendations can be made to enhance AI literacy in education. Institutions should design and implement regular AI literacy programs that combine technical skills development with ongoing ethical and critical thinking. These programs, by their regularity, play a crucial role in fostering a culture of critical inquiry and responsible use of AI, empowering the educational community to be proactive in their AI literacy. The programs must incorporate diverse perspectives from stakeholders, particularly teachers, students, and parents, and explicitly address challenges related to digital equity and access. Opportunities for professional development should strategically leverage discussion-based environments, such as webinars, online forums, and collaborative platforms. Activities in these settings can support reflective practice, peer-to-peer conversations, and shared knowledge building, further enhancing the culture of critical inquiry and responsible use of AI.

Education leaders and policymakers must develop clear, transparent guidelines for integrating AI into the classroom. These guidelines should encompass principles related to data privacy, appropriate human judgment, and the importance of critically

evaluating AI-generated content. Policies must also account for the rapid pace of change in AI technology and encourage educators and institutions to respond flexibly and adaptively. Additionally, it is crucial to establish effective mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating AI literacy initiatives to ensure they remain

Acknowledgement

I sincerely thank the AI for Educators Platform for providing exceptional webinars. Their

relevant, effective, and aligned with broader educational goals. Institutions that cultivate a mindset of continuous learning and adaptability will be better equipped to address the challenges and opportunities presented by AI.

resources greatly enhanced my self-directed learning and professional development.

References

- Anisti, A., Tambunan, R. M., Sidharta, V., Sampean, S., & Syatir, S. (2023). Family Communication Patterns In The Era Digital Technology. *ARRUS Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(6), 750-756.
<https://doi.org/10.35877/soshum2225>
- Cai, L., Msafiri, M. M., & Kangwa, D. (2025). Exploring the impact of integrating AI tools in higher education using the Zone of Proximal Development. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30(6), 7191-7264.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-13112-0>
- Canonigo, A. M. (2024). Levering AI to enhance students' conceptual understanding and confidence in mathematics. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 40(6), 3215-3229.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.13065>
- Chiu, T. K. F. (2021). A Holistic Approach to the Design of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Education for K-12 Schools. *TechTrends*, 65(5), 796-807.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-021-00637-1>
- Daulay, S. H., Nabila, A., & Nasution, U. A. (2024). The effect of ICT use on the classroom management in language teaching. *Leksika: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra Dan Pengajarannya*, 18(1), 23.
<https://doi.org/10.30595/lks.v18i1.19718>
- Eden, C. A., Chisom, O. N., & Adeniyi, I. S. (2024). Integrating AI in education: Opportunities, challenges, and ethical considerations. *Magna Scientia Advanced Research and Reviews*, 10(2), 006-013.
<https://doi.org/10.30574/msarr.2024.10.2.0039>
- Fadel, C., Holmes, W., & Bialik, M. (2019). *Artificial Intelligence In Education: Promises and Implications for Teaching and Learning*. Independently published.
- Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., Luetge, C., Madelin, R., Pagallo, U., Rossi, F., Schafer, B., Valcke, P., & Vayena, E. (2018). AI4People—An Ethical Framework for a Good AI Society: Opportunities, Risks, Principles, and Recommendations. *Minds and Machines*, 28(4), 689-707.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5>
- Gee, J. & M Handford. (2023). *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (1st ed.). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203809068>
- Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (4. ed). Routledge.
- Harry, A., & Sayudin, S. (2023). Role of AI in Education. *Interdisciplinary Journal and Hummanity (INJURITY)*, 2(3), 260-268.
<https://doi.org/10.58631/injury.v2i3.52>
- Hockly, N. (2023). Artificial Intelligence in English Language Teaching: The Good, the Bad and the Ugly. *RELC Journal*, 54(2), 445-451.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882231168504>
- Koltay, T. (2011). The media and the literacies: Media literacy, information literacy,

- digital literacy. *Media, Culture & Society*, 33(2), 211-221. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443710393382>
- Long, D., & Magerko, B. (2020). What is AI Literacy? Competencies and Design Considerations. *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376727>
- Mageira, K., Pittou, D., Papasalouros, A., Kotis, K., Zangogianni, P., & Daradoumis, A. (2022). Educational AI Chatbots for Content and Language Integrated Learning. *Applied Sciences*, 12(7), 3239. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app12073239>
- Mananay, J. A. (2024). Integrating Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Language Teaching: Effectiveness, Challenges, and Strategies. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 23(9), 361-382. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.23.9.19>
- Owan, V. J., Abang, K. B., Idika, D. O., Etta, E. O., & Bassey, B. A. (2023). Exploring the potential of artificial intelligence tools in educational measurement and assessment. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 19(8), em2307. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ejmste/13428>
- Pangrazio, L., Godhe, A.-L., & Ledesma, A. G. L. (2020). What is digital literacy? A comparative review of publications across three language contexts. *E-Learning and Digital Media*, 17(6), 442-459. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2042753020946291>
- Putrayasa, I. M., Suwindia, I. G., & Ari Winangun, I. M. (2024). Transformasi literasi di era digital: Tantangan dan peluang untuk generasi muda. *Education and Social Sciences Review*, 5(2), 156. <https://doi.org/10.29210/07essr501400>
- Reiss, M. J. (2021). The use of AI in education: Practicalities and ethical considerations. *London Review of Education*, 19(1). <https://doi.org/10.14324/LRE.19.1.05>
- Shalong, W., Yi, Z., Bin, Z., Ganglei, L., Jinyu, Z., Yanwen, Z., Zequn, Z., Lianwen, Y., & Feng, R. (2024). Enhancing self-directed learning with custom GPT AI facilitation among medical students: A randomized controlled trial. *Medical Teacher*, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2024.2413023>
- Utami, S., & Karnedi, K. (2024). Enhancing students' writing paragraphs through Canva Magic AI. *Leksika: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra Dan Pengajarannya*, 18(2), 105. <https://doi.org/10.30595/lks.v18i2.23475>
- Veldhuis, A., Lo, P. Y., Kenny, S., & Antle, A. N. (2025). Critical Artificial Intelligence literacy: A scoping review and framework synthesis. *International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction*, 43, 100708. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcci.2024.100708>
- Wing, J. M. (2006). Computational thinking. *Communications of the ACM*, 49(3), 33-35. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1118178.1118215>
- Younas, M., Abdel Salam El-Dakhs, D., & Jiang, Y. (2025). A Comprehensive Systematic Review of AI-Driven Approaches to Self-Directed Learning. *IEEE Access*, 13, 38387-38403. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2025.3546319>
- Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education - where are the educators? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16(1), 39. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0>