HUMAN-CENTERED EDUCATION AND AI: A CDA OF THE WISE 2025 OPENING CEREMONY

Pham Khanh Linh[12]✉

[1] University of Languages & International Studies, Vietnam National University, Hanoi, Vietnam

[2]International School, Vietnam National University, Hanoi, Vietnam

✉ linhphamkhanh@vnu.edu.vn

Abstract:

This qualitative case study examines human-centered education in the English rendition of the WISE 2025 Opening Ceremony through Fairclough's three-dimensional critical discourse analysis (CDA). Close reading of the working transcript considers speeches, an artist's spoken contribution, and an interview, with the master of ceremonies' framing retained as context. Four patterns emerge: education as a right and moral undertaking; AI as threat, reflection, and augmentation; human responsibility for technological direction; and learning through questions and mistakes. Speakers affirm human values while differing over AI's benefits, delegated judgment, and learning processes. Institutional framing connects their positions while leaving access, accountability, and control unresolved. The study identifies human-centered education as a shared but contested normative reference. Its conclusions concern one event; a targeted comparison of published Arabic and English texts identifies translation-sensitive wording, while audio-based bilingual verification remains incomplete, and policy implementation, audience reception, and pedagogical effectiveness require further evidence.

Key words: critical discourse analysis; Fairclough's three-dimensional model; artificial intelligence in education; human agency; translation mediation; WISE 2025

GIÁO DỤC LẤY CON NGƯỜI LÀM TRUNG TÂM VÀ AI: CDA KHAI MẠC WISE 2025

Tóm tắt:

Nghiên cứu định tính vận dụng khung CDA ba chiều của Fairclough để khảo sát giáo dục lấy con người làm trung tâm qua bản tiếng Anh của lễ khai mạc WISE 2025. Phân tích bản chép lời sơ bộ gồm các phát biểu và phỏng vấn, đồng thời xét lời dẫn. Bốn mẫu hình gồm: giáo dục như quyền và trách nhiệm đạo đức; AI như đe dọa, phản chiếu và tăng cường trí tuệ; trách nhiệm định hướng công nghệ; học qua câu hỏi và sai lầm. Các diễn giả cùng đề cao con người nhưng khác nhau về lợi ích AI và quyền phán đoán. Định khung thể chế kết nối các quan điểm, để ngỏ tiếp cận và kiểm soát. Kết luận giới hạn ở một sự kiện; đối chiếu văn bản tiếng Ả

Rập và tiếng Anh cho thấy khác biệt cần lưu ý; vẫn cần xác minh âm thanh và kiểm tra song ngữ và thêm bằng chứng về chính sách, tiếp nhận, hiệu quả sư phạm.

Từ khóa: phân tích diễn ngôn phê phán; trí tuệ nhân tạo trong giáo dục; giáo dục lấy con người làm trung tâm; các viễn cảnh tương lai của giáo dục; WISE 2025

1. Introduction

Generative artificial intelligence has reopened questions about education's purposes. Systems that generate explanations, written responses, and feedback invite decisions about what learners should undertake themselves, which judgments educators should retain, and whose priorities shape educational technologies. UNESCO places these decisions within the ethical and pedagogical assessment of AI, rather than assuming that technical capability establishes educational value (Miao & Holmes, 2023).

Public discussions also define desirable futures and the actors authorized to shape them. Claims that AI democratizes intelligence, supports creativity, or transforms learning contain assumptions about knowledge and power. Williamson and Eynon (2020) connect AI in education to historical, political, and commercial conditions. Their perspective supports examining how institutional language presents particular technological directions as reasonable, necessary, or desirable.

The WISE 2025 Opening Ceremony offers a bounded setting for this inquiry. The twelfth World Innovation Summit for Education took place on 24–25 November 2025 in Doha under the theme "Humanity.io: Human Values at the Heart of Education" (Qatar News Agency, 2025). Qatar Foundation's coverage similarly foregrounded human values (Qatar Foundation, 2025). The opening combined leadership addresses, an artistic contribution, a technology keynote, and an interview with a novelist and educator. This sequence placed different forms of expertise within a common institutional frame.

In the supplied transcript, education is an inalienable right, values guide scientific progress, and AI appears as potential domination, a reflection of human intentions, and augmented intelligence. Questioning and mistakes are presented as central to learning. These positions share a concern for human priority but differ over how it should govern technological engagement.

Using Fairclough's (1992, 2003) CDA framework, this study examines those differences through the English-language rendition of the ceremony, including interpreted passages. Two research questions guide the analysis:

1. How is human-centered education constructed through representations of AI, human agency, and educational values in the WISE 2025 Opening Ceremony?
2. What convergences and tensions emerge across speakers' constructions of the relationship between AI and education?

The contribution is a contextual account of how a shared theme connects distinct technological expectations. It also distinguishes the affirmation of human agency from the specification of powers through which people can exercise it. Conclusions concern the organization and content of public discourse, rather than policy change or teaching outcomes.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

2.1 AI and the purposes of education

Biesta (2009) distinguishes qualification, socialization, and subjectification: acquiring knowledge and capacities, participating in social traditions, and developing as a subject capable of acting. This distinction challenges the reduction of educational quality to measurable performance. It enables this study to ask whether AI is evaluated through successful outputs, educational relationships, or independent judgment.

Earlier reviews identified assessment, prediction, adaptive systems, and tutoring as prominent AI applications, alongside limited attention to educators, pedagogical theory, and critical ethics (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). Celik et al. (2022) emphasize teachers' expertise in planning, teaching, assessment, and professional learning. Both reviews precede the widespread use of contemporary generative AI; they provide historical context rather than a description of every current application.

Experimental evidence also requires differentiation. Kestin et al. (2025), studying 194 undergraduates in two physics lessons, reported greater short-term learning gains with a specifically designed AI tutor than with comparison active-learning classes. Bastani et al. (2025), studying nearly 1,000 mathematics students in Türkiye, found that unrestricted GPT assistance improved practice performance but was associated with grades approximately 17% lower on a subsequent unaided examination; pedagogical safeguards substantially reduced this harm. These results concern particular designs and contexts. They demonstrate why assisted performance cannot automatically establish retained learning.

Miao and Holmes (2023) situate generative AI within human agency, inclusion, equity, and linguistic and cultural diversity. Together, these accounts inform analysis of how speakers distinguish access to information and efficient completion from the development of understanding and judgment.

2.2 Human-centered education and human agency

Human-centered education is defined here as an orientation that evaluates technology through human dignity, development, and well-being. UNESCO's ethical recommendation grounds AI evaluation in human rights and dignity and addresses human oversight (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], 2021). In education, this requires asking whose interests a system serves and which learning relationships it supports.

Human agency concerns forming purposes, choosing, judging, acting, and taking responsibility. Bandura (2001) identifies intentionality, forethought, self-reactiveness, and self-reflectiveness, distinguishing personal, proxy, and collective agency. The OECD similarly connects student agency to goals, reflection, responsible action, and co-agency with teachers, families, and communities (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2019).

Agency therefore includes questioning objectives, rather than merely operating a system. It also depends on relationships and material conditions: responsibility for ethical use does not itself give a teacher control over procurement or model training. Table 1 translates these concepts into interpretive indicators. They are analytical prompts, not a validated scale of actual control.

Table 1

Indicators of Human-Centered Education and Agency

Concern	Textual indicators	Analytical question
Dignity and rights	Rights, freedom, humanity	Who is entitled to education, and why?
Human development	Judgment, creativity, questions, mistakes	Are outputs or developing capacities prioritized?
Direction	Decide, choose, shape, govern	Who determines goals?
Responsibility	Ethics; must, should, have to	Who is accountable for which actions?
Collective agency	We, our, partners, communities	Are participants' roles differentiated?
Conditions of agency	Access, ownership, institutions, platforms	What enables or constrains action?

2.3 Discourse, ideology, and educational futures

For Fairclough (2003), discourse represents social relations and is implicated in power. Ideological significance emerges when particular assumptions or interests acquire the status of common sense. Analysis must establish how this occurs in language and context, rather than presume that every evaluation is deceptive or all speakers share a coordinated ideology.

Van Leeuwen's (2007) account of legitimation identifies authorization, moral evaluation, rationalization, and mythopoesis. These provide supplementary resources for examining appeals to institutional leadership, expertise, ethical purpose, and morally consequential stories. They do not constitute a separate coding framework applied mechanically to every passage.

Existing research identifies competing educational visions. Bearman et al. (2023), reviewing literature available before the current generative AI boom, discuss an imperative to respond to AI and changes in educational authority. Linderoth et al. (2024) identify competing sociotechnical imaginaries in policy guidelines, including transformation and surveillance. Presenting technological change as unavoidable thus does not establish agreement about its desirable direction.

This study extends those concerns to the connections among genres within one opening ceremony. It examines how shared moral language accommodates different expectations about capability, judgment, and responsibility. Educational futures are approached as statements of what could, should, or will happen. Warnings, promises, qualifications, and invitations to act reveal how speakers allocate certainty and choice. The contribution is event-specific, without claiming that human-centered AI or these participants have never been studied.

2.4 Fairclough's three-dimensional CDA framework

Fairclough's (1992) three-dimensional model treats each discourse event simultaneously as text, discursive practice, and social practice. The relationship is dialectical: institutional and social conditions shape language use, while discourse can reproduce or contest those conditions. The three dimensions therefore provide connected analytical perspectives rather than separate themes or a causal sequence from a linguistic feature to a social outcome. Fairclough (2003) supplies further resources for analyzing representation, genre, intertextuality, and difference.

The text dimension examines how meanings are organized through vocabulary, evaluation, metaphor, modality, pronouns, and the allocation of actions to participants. Modality concerns degrees of certainty, possibility, and obligation; action allocation concerns who is represented as acting, deciding, benefiting, or receiving action. These features support claims about the English text, including its interpreted passages, rather than automatically establishing the Arabic speaker's original lexical or grammatical choices.

Discursive practice concerns the production, distribution, and consumption of texts. Here, the observable evidence includes speaker roles, ceremonial sequencing, introductions, interview exchanges, and the circulation of an English recording. Intertextuality concerns the incorporation of other voices or texts, as when an artist reports an AI response; interdiscursivity concerns the combination of discourses and genres, including rights-based institutional speech, technological forecasting, artistic testimony, and educational reflection. Interpretation is part of this mediation. The recording does not disclose all production decisions or demonstrate how audiences understood the event.

Social practice concerns the institutional and wider social relations within which the event operates. The analysis asks how educational authority, technological ownership, access, and accountability are represented and legitimized. Ideology refers here to representations that can sustain or contest unequal power relations, rather than a synonym for a speaker's opinion. Human agency is consequently examined through both attributed responsibility and the material or institutional capacities needed to act. Claims about actual governance, effects, or reception require evidence beyond the ceremony.

The analysis connects these dimensions by tracing a linguistic choice to its communicative setting and then to the social relationship it represents. For example, an obligation expressed through an inclusive pronoun can assign shared responsibility at the textual level; a leadership address authorizes that appeal at the level of discursive practice; the social-practice question is whether the appeal differentiates the powers of learners, educators, platform owners, and states. These connections make the critical argument explicit without treating discourse as proof of implementation.

Table 2

Application of Fairclough's Framework

Dimension	Application	Evidential boundary
Text	Evaluation, metaphor, modality, pronouns, action allocation	Direct English or interpreted English wording; source-language attribution requires bilingual verification
Discursive practice	Genres, speaker roles, introductions, quotations, transitions, interpretation	Production intentions and audience meanings are not directly observed
Social practice	Educational authority, ownership, rights, responsibility, access, futures	Represented relationships; implementation requires additional evidence

The framework distinguishes assigned responsibility from the capacity to exercise it. An inclusive "we" can construct shared duty while leaving actors' powers unspecified. Genre also matters: keynotes permit extended assertions, whereas interviews offer opportunities to qualify a premise. Interpretation mediates the language available for analysis, so comparisons cannot assume identical communicative conditions or direct access to original Arabic choices.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research design

This qualitative single-case study uses CDA to analyze the English-language WISE 2025 Opening Ceremony. Its boundaries support detailed contextual examination (Baxter & Jack, 2008). The units are speaker contributions and excerpts constructing education, AI, and agency; comparison occurs within the event.

The present findings derive from repeated close reading of the supplied working transcript. AntConc is proposed for subsequent frequency and concordance checks. Such procedures can identify recurrence, contextual variation, and overlooked passages through iterative engagement with CDA (Baker et al., 2008). They remain aids to qualitative interpretation. Word counts alone do not create a mixed-methods design,

which requires methodological integration (Fetters et al., 2013). No AntConc output or quantitative result is reported here.

3.2 Setting and data selection

The ceremony took place on 24 November 2025 at the Qatar National Convention Centre in Doha (Qatar News Agency, 2025). Its recording appears on WISE Channel as *Opening ceremony [EN] - WISE 12* (WISE Channel, n.d.); the upload date has not been independently confirmed. Selection was purposive: the opening connects institutional priorities with different forms of expertise under an explicit human-values theme.

Official coverage identifies the minister as Lolwah bint Rashid Al Khater and the artist as Faia Younan (*Her Highness opens WISE 12 Summit*, n.d.). These correct inconsistent labels in the supplied transcript and still require recording-level confirmation. MC and interviewer turns retain functional labels pending verified attribution.

Table 3

Data Selection

Contribution	Language status	Treatment
Sheikha Moza bint Nasser	Arabic address, English rendition	Primary material
Lolwah bint Rashid Al Khater	Arabic address, English rendition	Primary material
Faia Younan's spoken contribution	English rendition; source language to verify	Primary material
Mo Gawdat	Direct English keynote	Primary material
Laila Lalami and interviewer	Direct English interview	Questions, answers, interjections included
MC	Language status to verify by segment	Contextual framing and transitions
Song, musical demonstration, awards montage	Performance and promotional genres	Marked separately; excluded from primary verbal analysis

Contributions are read in event sequence. The artist's description of music is analyzed as an account of AI capability; sound quality and the outcomes of advertised projects are not assessed.

3.3 Transcription and translation

The working transcript lacks verified timecodes. Internal identifiers E01–E40 link discussion to the excerpt register in Appendix A; they are not video timestamps. Full audio comparison remains outstanding.

Transcription involves representational choices (Bucholtz, 2000). Verification will check speaker changes, add timestamps, identify uncertainty, and document substantive corrections. Transcription errors must be distinguished from claims actually made by speakers; technical assertions will not be silently rewritten to make them scientifically accurate. An annotated master transcript and a corpus copy without editorial metadata are proposed. Treatment of case, punctuation, repetitions, and hesitations must be recorded before counting words.

The analytical object is the ceremony's English rendition. Leadership addresses are interpreted from Arabic, whereas Gawdat's keynote and Lalami's interview are directly in English. Translation introduces epistemological and representational decisions (Temple & Young, 2004), so lexical analysis of interpreted passages concerns the available English wording. Original Arabic choices and interpreters' contributions require bilingual checking.

A targeted documentary comparison undertaken for this revision located official Arabic and English written versions of Sheikha Moza's opening address (Her Highness' speech at the WISE 12 opening, n.d.-a, n.d.-b). These provide parallel reference texts, not a verified transcript of the delivered speech or its simultaneous interpretation. E01 differs from the official English text, which uses 'indisputable' rather than 'indispensable'. The analysis therefore retains the rights claim but withdraws the inference of necessity based on that disputed adjective. The Arabic passage also frames the right as not open to dispute. In E06, the published Arabic refers to technological servitude, whereas the working English includes a web metaphor; the dependency reading remains provisional, but the web image cannot be assigned to the Arabic original. In E07, the Arabic and published English use a singular tree, whereas the working transcript has a plural form. The moral-cultivation interpretation does not depend on number. These checks identify translation-sensitive features; they do not certify the fidelity of all interpreted contributions.

Translation reliability requires an excerpt-level audit against the recording. For each interpreted passage, the audit should retain the Arabic audio and timestamp, a source-language transcription, a close English gloss, the audible English interpretation, any official published version, and an explanation of differences. A competent Arabic–English bilingual reviewer should compare meaning and rhetorical function, with disagreements recorded rather than erased. This procedure has not been completed in the supplied materials; no independent bilingual validation or back-translation is claimed.

The comparison should prioritize negation, modality, pronoun reference, actor allocation, metaphor, and culturally specific expressions because these carry the present

CDA claims. Differences should be classified as transcription error, interpreting variation, published-text variation, or unresolved uncertainty. An English back-translation alone would not recover the original wording or independently validate the interpretation. Where an analytical claim depends on an unresolved feature, it should be qualified, revised, or excluded. Faia Younan's and the MC's language status also needs confirmation by segment before source-language attribution.

Consequently, interpreted and direct-English contributions are compared at the level of the publicly available English representation. The current study does not establish that all observed lexical differences are differences between the original speakers. Translation is also an object of discursive-practice analysis because it shapes which voices and rhetorical choices reach the English-language audience.

3.4 Analytical procedure

Close reading first identified candidate passages concerning educational value, AI, agency, and learning. Comparison considered both repeated commitments and qualifications. Completion requires five linked stages:

1. Verify and read the full transcript, noting patterns, contradictions, and counterexamples.
2. Use AntConc to inspect relevant vocabulary and contexts, recording software version, searches, tokenization, and settings.
3. Code AI representations, agency, educational values, and learning processes; allow multiple and revised codes.
4. Examine evaluation, metaphor, modality, pronouns, and action allocation, including plausible alternative readings.
5. Compare speakers and relate textual choices to genre, positioning, and educational and technological power.

Initial searches will include AI, artificial intelligence, human, humanity, values, ethics, learn, learning, education, and responsibility. Contextual reading must follow concordances, and additional expressions must remain eligible. Contribution length and genre will qualify comparisons; raw frequency cannot directly measure ideological commitment.

Table 4

Planned Coding Record

Field	Purpose
Speaker and contribution	Locate role and genre
Verified timestamp	Link to recording; outstanding
Excerpt and context	Preserve evidence and qualifications

Field	Purpose
Linguistic features	Identify wording and action allocation
Analytical codes	Record relevant concepts
Interpretation	Explain the evidential connection
Alternative reading	Retain a plausible competing interpretation
Language and version status	Record direct speech or interpretation, source versions, discrepancies, and verification status

The human-values theme may predispose the researcher to find coherence. Counterexamples and alternative readings will therefore be included systematically. Appendix A is an excerpt register, not a completed coding matrix. No intercoder reliability, participant validation, or completed corpus audit is claimed.

4. Findings

4.1 Education as a right and a moral undertaking

In the working English rendition, Moza presents education as an inalienable right (E01). The wording discrepancy documented in Section 3.3 precludes interpreting the disputed adjective as evidence of necessity. Her rejection of education as 'a commodity,' 'a privilege,' or 'a favor' (E02) uses repeated negative coordination to exclude market exchange, selective access, and personal generosity from education's declared basis. 'Should' gives the English rendition normative force; attribution of this exact modality to the Arabic original awaits audio-based bilingual verification.

This rights account also invites innovation. WISE is "a space to rouse our minds and ignite our thinking" (E03), with active verbs presenting intellectual engagement as a purpose. The proposed quality index integrates academic models with socio-cultural values (E04), widening the stated criteria of educational quality without establishing subsequent implementation.

Weapons described as "a rotten fruit from the trees of knowledge" (E07) make destructive applications a corruption of knowledge's developmental potential. The metaphor links scientific achievement to moral cultivation. The closing demand for science that "serves humanity," "liberates us," and "does not enslave us" (E10) judges progress through its relationship to freedom.

Other contributions support human priority through different grounds. The MC's question about linking values, ethics, and principles to education (E33) sets the moral agenda. The minister's "Humans are the beginning and the end" (E11) positions people as both the origin and purpose of development. Lalami's insistence that feedback is "literally our job" (E27) attaches responsibility to a specific educational relationship.

These statements converge around ethical purpose while retaining different emphases on entitlement, development, and professional obligation.

4.2 AI as threat, reflection, and augmentation

Moza's "abdication of our intelligence" (E05) presents AI-related delegation as relinquishing an authority humans should retain. "Digital servitude" (E06) connects dependency with lost freedom. The surrounding passage names applications and those who design and control them, making the threat social as well as technological. "Perhaps" marks a possible future, while transformation from "a feared curse to a welcomed blessing" (E40) preserves beneficial engagement through ethical intervention. The dependency interpretation concerns the available English rendition; the web image in E06 and exact metaphorical choices in E05 must not be attributed to the Arabic original without verification.

Faia narrates a movement from AI as "an enemy" (E13) to a mirror of "our needs," inputs, questions, and training (E14). Repeated human actions make outputs appear responsive to human initiative. Yet "our awareness, our wisdom, and our final decisions" should remain human (E15). The treasure-filled ship without a sail or compass, attributed to AI (E16), supplies inspiration for human composition. Her account therefore combines machine contribution with retained judgment; it does not independently establish the output's origin or artistic quality.

Gawdat describes AI as "the ultimate equalizer" (E18), using electrical plugs to present intelligence as available through connection. His assertion of "the same exact access" (E19) universalizes opportunity despite acknowledging concentrated platform power (E20). The contrast between AI being "overhyped" and "underhyped" (E21), together with claims of irreversible change (E22), strengthens this optimistic account. The claim to "borrow 70 to 80 IQ points" (E24) quantifies the imagined benefit. It is a rhetorical claim, not a demonstrated psychometric increase.

Lalami's fictional predictive-policing scenario (E31) instead foregrounds classification, confinement, and ethical consequences. It functions as a thought experiment, not evidence of an existing institution. Her judgment that it is "a little bit too early" to determine AI's artistic direction (E37) qualifies the interviewer's premise. Threat, reflection, and augmentation thus coexist, differing over the source of risk, scale of benefit, and conditions of human-centered use.

4.3 Assigning human agency and responsibility

Moza's call to "boldly engage" and "craft solutions, proposing our own vision of education" (E08) assigns humans an active role in shaping change. "Must" expresses obligation; "our own" asserts direction. Questions about who controls education and governs knowledge, and for what purpose (E09), make authority an explicit issue without specifying a complete institutional allocation. These lexical observations describe the

English rendition and remain conditional when interpreted as properties of the original Arabic address.

The minister's description of educators as "partners rather than just receivers of knowledge" (E12) challenges passive participation. Partnership implies contribution, but the address does not establish accompanying decision rights over strategy, procurement, or platform design. Faia similarly retains final judgment through the inclusive "our" (E15), while combining asking, feeding, and training within one account of human influence. These activities can involve unequal powers.

Gawdat's "raising Superman" analogy makes ethical education the difference between protection and harm. The family teaches the powerful newcomer "to protect and serve" (E25); AI becomes "our artificially intelligent children" (E26). This personalizes a complex system as a dependent shaped through care. It gives humans an ethical role but leaves "family" open to educators, communities, states, and developers without differentiating their authority.

Lalami locates responsibility more concretely in feedback (E27), protecting opportunities to make mistakes (E29), and teaching students how to use chatbots for inquiry (E30). Agency is distributed between educators establishing conditions and learners undertaking intellectual work. Across speakers, active verbs, possessives, and obligation construct shared responsibility. They do not consistently identify who can control which technological decisions. Declared agency therefore exceeds the specificity of the powers described.

4.4 Redefining learning through questions and error

Gawdat distinguishes educational means from purpose: "education is a technology. Learning is the objective" (E17). This allows arrangements to change while keeping learning as their criterion. "Teach our children to ask deep questions and debate with openness" (E23) assigns educators an instructional role and learners an active position.

His proposed exchange among AI systems makes inquiry recursive. "What is wrong about this?" and "What's missing?" (E36) turn an answer into material for further examination. The practice supports his augmentation narrative, but the speech does not establish whether students can assess disagreement, recognize shared errors, or maintain independent judgment.

Lalami values "the pleasure of finding the question, the pleasure of being wrong" (E28). Repetition connects inquiry and error to a worthwhile experience. Her claim that learning requires mistakes leads to an obligation to preserve them (E29). Distinguishing chatbot use "to do research" from use "to get answers" (E30) prioritizes investigation over immediate completion. This is her normative account, rather than evidence that all answer-producing uses hinder learning or all research-labeled uses help it.

Storytelling, placed “at the heart of empathy and moral clarity” (E39), extends learning into interpretation and ethical reflection. The interviewer’s suggestion that AI might be taught to make mistakes (E32) redirects attention from learners’ development to a machine feature. The brief exchange does not show Lalami accepting that equivalence. Gawdat and Lalami consequently converge on questioning while differing over the role of assistance: one emphasizes expanded intelligence, the other the intellectual work learners must retain.

4.5 Connecting text discursive practice and social practice

At the textual level, the extracts organize rights, technological benefit, and responsibility through evaluations, metaphors, obligations, and participant roles. At the level of discursive practice, institutional addresses, an artistic account, a keynote, and an interview make different kinds of authority available within a shared ceremonial sequence. At the level of social practice, their convergence on human priority leaves unequal control over educational and technological decisions only partly specified. The critical finding lies in this relationship: a broadly inclusive account of responsibility can accommodate distinct positions while leaving the distribution of effective power unresolved. Interpretation further mediates this relationship for the English audience; it limits source-language attribution even where the thematic comparison remains plausible.

5. Discussion

5.1 Convergence without a single vision of AI

The common commitment is normative: technology should serve human values and educational purposes. Its practical meaning differs. Moza foregrounds rights and freedom; the minister stresses development and participation; Faia emphasizes creative engagement and judgment; Gawdat projects augmentation and AI’s ethical formation; Lalami protects authorship, relationships, and inquiry.

These positions resist classification as straightforward support or opposition. Moza’s warning leaves room for benefit, Faia’s engagement retains final decisions, Gawdat’s optimism requires ethical direction, and Lalami’s caution permits research-oriented chatbot use. Agreement about a principle does not settle acceptable delegation or equitable access.

Questioning illustrates this distinction. For Gawdat, it enables access to expanded intelligence and debate among systems. For Lalami, it protects learning from immediate answers. Shared vocabulary supports different relationships between assistance and intellectual work. This finding complements research on AI’s imperative of response and competing educational imaginaries (Bearman et al., 2023; Linderoth et al., 2024).

Common moral language can sustain dialogue while leaving disagreements unresolved. The ceremony connects priorities without negotiating a shared threshold for delegation or identifying whose judgment prevails. Human-centeredness becomes a

reference point whose operational meaning remains contested, rather than a settled program of application.

5.2 Institutional framing and speaker authority

Formal titles, introductions, and expressions of gratitude position institutional leadership as an authoritative orientation. The MC connects Moza's vision with learning and innovation; Gawdat praises that vision and returns to it when developing his argument. These connections bring institutional and technological authority into alignment.

Gawdat also invokes proximity to laboratories and technology organizations. His former Google X role and "If you know what I know" (E22) establish an insider position. Technical anecdotes, numbers, and confidence lend urgency to the account. They do not independently validate capability claims; the analysis concerns how credibility is constructed and how unequal access to relevant knowledge affects the opportunity to question it.

Lalami draws authority from authorship and teaching. Her account of copyrighted work used without consent (E38) gives her a personal stake, while feedback and error connect that stake to professional responsibility. Interview questions guide the discussion but allow her to qualify a premise, as her caution about the arts demonstrates (E37).

The MC's question about surrendering emotions and values (E34) links the artistic segment to the keynote. The closing inclusion of "every idea," "every conversation," and "every narrative" (E35) gathers distinct voices into a common future. Fairclough's (2003) treatment of difference helps explain this continuity. It shows how the program accommodates multiple positions, without proving audience agreement, mutual endorsement, or an intention to suppress disagreement.

5.3 Power and the limits of human control

Calling humans responsible leaves a central question: which humans control which decisions? Students prompting a chatbot, teachers selecting tasks, universities procuring services, developers training models, and states regulating use occupy unequal positions. An inclusive "we" can obscure these differences.

Faia's mirror connects outputs to human input while combining prompting and training. A user can ask a question without choosing training data or model objectives. The metaphor makes creative interaction intelligible but leaves infrastructural control underdeveloped. Conversely, Moza's references to designers and controllers and Lalami's account of training on creative work make power explicit. The ceremony therefore cannot be read as uniformly presenting AI as a neutral tool.

Gawdat acknowledges concentrated ownership but offers open-source systems and local models as grounds for equal access. This provides a technological answer to an institutional problem. Access to a model, the capacity to evaluate it, and authority over its development remain different conditions. The claim of "same exact access" (E19)

compresses distinctions concerning infrastructure, capability, language, and inclusion addressed by Miao and Holmes (2023).

The Superman family similarly leaves unspecified who sets objectives, whose values count, and how interests are negotiated. Teachers may model ethical judgment without controlling commercial training. Bandura's (2001) personal, proxy, and collective agency helps separate these forms of influence. UNESCO's (2021) lifecycle account of oversight and accountability further supports differentiating responsibility across design, procurement, use, and governance. The finding is a limit of this discourse: strongly asserted responsibility is only partly matched by an account of the powers needed to exercise it.

5.4 Educational implications

The findings suggest questions for practice, not evidence of effective teaching methods. First, the emphasis on inquiry supports considering objectives for formulating, justifying, and revising questions. Moving answers between systems may offer perspectives, but educational value depends on learners' evaluation of them.

Second, ethical judgment requires discussing delegation: why educators retain feedback responsibilities, when assistance serves learning, and who answers for effects on others. Celik et al. (2022) support attention to pedagogical expertise. Institutional time, support, access, and procurement arrangements affect whether teachers can exercise that judgment.

Third, Lalami's authorship account raises questions about consent, source acknowledgment, and identifying AI assistance. For language education, these connect the interpretation of sources and development of a written voice to ownership and responsibility. They are educational implications, not legal findings about specific training practices.

Finally, error invites attention to learning processes: drafts, explained revisions, identified mistakes, and reflection on changed understanding. Biesta (2009) supports considering their purposes beyond measurable performance. Bastani et al. (2025) and Kestin et al. (2025) demonstrate why design and assessment conditions matter when interpreting AI-assisted results. Classroom and institutional studies must test which proposed practices support learning, under what conditions, and for whom.

6. Limitations

The study concerns one ceremony and a finite, purposively selected group of speakers. It cannot represent international education or establish a 2023-2025 shift. Direct English speech and interpreted Arabic addresses also offer different access to speakers' wording; original-language comparisons require bilingual evidence. The targeted comparison of Moza's published Arabic and English texts identifies specific differences but cannot establish equivalence with the delivered address or validate the minister's interpretation. Cross-speaker contrasts may partly reflect differences in language

mediation. Claims about source-language modality, metaphors, or pronoun choices are therefore restricted pending an audio-based bilingual audit.

Opening ceremonies affirm priorities and invite participation rather than negotiate detailed policies. Thematic continuity cannot establish policy consensus, and an absent implementation detail does not prove the institution lacks it elsewhere. Spoken analysis also leaves music, images, gestures, staging, and audience reactions unexplored.

The transcript remains provisional. Audio verification, timestamps, a complete coding record, and AntConc checks are outstanding, limiting quotation accuracy and systematic assessment of recurrence. Excerpt identifiers support traceability but do not substitute for those procedures.

Finally, the material does not demonstrate audience persuasion, subsequent policy change, or pedagogical effectiveness. Speakers' capability claims remain objects of analysis, not independently verified scientific findings. Reception studies, policy comparison, and classroom evaluation are necessary to investigate these outcomes.

7. Conclusion

Answering the first research question, the ceremony constructs human-centered education through rights, the moral evaluation of progress, retained judgment, and protection of inquiry. Evaluation, metaphor, modality, pronouns, and active verbs connect these commitments to AI as threat, reflection, and augmentation.

Answering the second, speakers converge on human values while differing over delegation, benefit, and control. Questioning connects an expansive account of augmented intelligence with a concern to preserve learners' intellectual work. Institutional introductions, speaker authority, transitions, and closure give these positions continuity without eliminating their differences.

The contribution is a contextual explanation of human-centered education as an authoritative but contested reference point. It distinguishes assigning responsibility in language from specifying actors' capacities to act. The evidence does not establish a new policy doctrine or historical ideological shift.

Before final submission, the evidence record requires completion of audio and timestamp verification and the bilingual checks specified in Section 3.3. The present revision strengthens the conceptual framework and reports a limited documentary comparison; it does not present those outstanding procedures as completed. Subsequent research could compare other events and genres, examine multimodal performance and audience reception, and investigate how public commitments relate to institutional decisions and learning.

References

Baker, P., Gabrielatos, C., KhosraviNik, M., Krzyżanowski, M., McEnery, T., & Wodak, R. (2008). A useful methodological synergy? Combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics to examine discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press. *Discourse & Society, 19*(3), 273–306. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926508088962

Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*, 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.1

Bastani, H., Bastani, O., Sungu, A., Ge, H., Kabakcı, Ö., & Mariman, R. (2025). Generative AI without guardrails can harm learning: Evidence from high school mathematics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 122*(26), Article e2422633122. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2422633122

Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report, 13*(4), 544–559. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2008.1573

Bearman, M., Ryan, J., & Ajjawi, R. (2023). Discourses of artificial intelligence in higher education: A critical literature review. *Higher Education, 86*(2), 369–385. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00937-2

Biesta, G. (2009). Good education in an age of measurement: On the need to reconnect with the question of purpose in education. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 21*(1), 33–46. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9064-9

Bucholtz, M. (2000). The politics of transcription. *Journal of Pragmatics, 32*(10), 1439–1465. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00094-6

Celik, I., Dindar, M., Muukkonen, H., & Järvelä, S. (2022). The promises and challenges of artificial intelligence for teachers: A systematic review of research. *TechTrends, 66*(4), 616–630. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-022-00715-y

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Routledge.

Fetters, M. D., Curry, L. A., & Creswell, J. W. (2013). Achieving integration in mixed methods designs—Principles and practices. *Health Services Research, 48*(6, Part 2), 2134–2156. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12117

Her Highness opens WISE 12 Summit. (n.d.). Her Highness Sheikha Moza bint Nasser. https://www.mozabintnasser.qa/en-gb/news/her-highness-opens-wise-12-summit

Her Highness' speech at the WISE 12 opening. (n.d.-a). Her Highness Sheikha Moza bint Nasser. [Official Arabic text]. https://www.mozabintnasser.qa/ar/speeches/her-highness-speech-wise-12-opening

Her Highness' speech at the WISE 12 opening. (n.d.-b). Her Highness Sheikha Moza bint Nasser. [Official English text]. https://www.mozabintnasser.qa/en-gb/speeches/her-highness-speech-wise-12-opening

Kestin, G., Miller, K., Klales, A., Milbourne, T., & Ponti, G. (2025). AI tutoring outperforms in-class active learning: An RCT introducing a novel research-based design in an authentic educational setting. *Scientific Reports, 15*, Article 17458. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-97652-6

Linderoth, C., Hultén, M., & Stenliden, L. (2024). Competing visions of artificial intelligence in education-A heuristic analysis on sociotechnical imaginaries and problematizations in policy guidelines. *Policy Futures in Education, 22*(8), 1662–1678. https://doi.org/10.1177/14782103241228900

Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO. https://doi.org/10.54675/EWZM9535

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). *Student agency for 2030*. https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/about/projects/edu/education-2040/concept-notes/Student_Agency_for_2030_concept_note.pdf

Qatar Foundation. (2025, November 27). *Her Highness Sheikha Moza bint Nasser opens WISE 12 Summit with a call for human values to be at the heart of education*. https://iam.qf.qa/stories/her-highness-sheikha-moza-bint-nasser-opens-wise-12-summit-with-a-call-for

Qatar News Agency. (2025, November 24). *Her Highness attends opening of WISE 12*. https://qna.org.qa/en/news/news-details?date=24%2F11%2F2025&id=her-highness-attends-opening-of-wise-12

Temple, B., & Young, A. (2004). Qualitative research and translation dilemmas. *Qualitative Research, 4*(2), 161–178. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794104044430

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2021). *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence*. https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/recommendation-ethics-artificial-intelligence

van Leeuwen, T. (2007). Legitimation in discourse and communication. *Discourse & Communication, 1*(1), 91–112. https://doi.org/10.1177/1750481307071986

Williamson, B., & Eynon, R. (2020). Historical threads, missing links, and future directions in AI in education. *Learning, Media and Technology, 45*(3), 223–235. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1798995

WISE Channel. (n.d.). *Opening ceremony [EN] - WISE 12* [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2o_ptZCMq_Y

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*, Article 39. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0

Appendix A. Working-transcript excerpt register

The register identifies passages discussed in the manuscript. Quotations reproduce the supplied working English transcript of the WISE Channel recording; punctuation is treated as part of the written rendition. Speaker identities follow the corrections described in Section 3.2. All entries await audio verification and verified timestamps. They constitute a selected evidence register, not the completed coding matrix or a measure of thematic frequency. E36 contains two separate queries within Gawdat's illustration.

Table A1

Excerpt Identifiers and Working Quotations

ID	Speaker or role	Working quotation
E01	Sheikha Moza	"indispensable and inalienable right"
E02	Sheikha Moza	"Education should not be treated as a commodity, nor as a privilege, nor as a favor granted from one person to another."
E03	Sheikha Moza	"a space to rouse our minds and ignite our thinking"
E04	Sheikha Moza	"It integrates academic models with key socio-cultural values that form the foundation of the educational experience."
E05	Sheikha Moza	"an abdication of our intelligence in favor of artificial intelligence"
E06	Sheikha Moza	"humans lose their freedoms and are entangled in a web of digital servitude"
E07	Sheikha Moza	"a rotten fruit from the trees of knowledge"
E08	Sheikha Moza	"we must boldly engage with them and craft solutions, proposing our own vision of education"
E09	Sheikha Moza	"who controls the educational process in today's day and age, and who governs the flow of knowledge, and for what purpose"
E10	Sheikha Moza	"a science that serves humanity, a science that liberates us and does not enslave us"
E11	Minister	"Humans are the beginning and the end."
E12	Minister	"makes educators partners rather than just receivers of knowledge"
E13	Faia Younan	"I thought that artificial intelligence was an enemy."
E14	Faia Younan	"It is only a reflection of our needs and what we feed it with, and what we ask from it, and how we train it as well."
E15	Faia Younan	"our awareness, our wisdom, and our final decisions—all of these should stay with us."
E16	Faia Younan, reporting an AI response	"Like a ship full of treasure lost at sea without a sail and without a compass."
E17	Mo Gawdat	"education is a technology. Learning is the objective."
E18	Mo Gawdat	"the ultimate equalizer"
E19	Mo Gawdat	"we have the same exact access to AI like everyone else"
E20	Mo Gawdat	"a concentration of power happening with artificial intelligence in the hands of those who own the platform"
E21	Mo Gawdat	"People think that AI is overhyped. I can only tell you it is underhyped."
E22	Mo Gawdat	"If you know what I know, you understand that this world has changed beyond repair, beyond any turning back."
E23	Mo Gawdat	"Teach our children to ask deep questions and debate with openness."
E24	Mo Gawdat	"I believe that I today can borrow 70 to 80 IQ points more every time I plug into my machines."
E25	Mo Gawdat	"What made Superman is the family that adopted him, that taught him to protect and serve."
E26	Mo Gawdat	"teach our artificially intelligent children so that they become part of our family and they help us build a better world"
E27	Laila Lalami	"which is literally our job, like it is our job to give feedback to students"

ID	Speaker or role	Working quotation
E28	Laila Lalami	“the pleasure of finding the question, the pleasure of being wrong”
E29	Laila Lalami	“I think it's impossible to learn without making mistakes. And we have to preserve the ability to make mistakes.”
E30	Laila Lalami	“we have to teach students to use the chatbots to do research, not to use the chatbot to get answers”
E31	Laila Lalami	“questions about predictive policing, how AI can be used to predict future crimes”
E32	Interviewer	“Maybe one day they'll teach AI to make mistakes as well.”
E33	MC	“Values, ethics, principles. Why do we always link them to education?”
E34	MC	“do we surrender our emotions and our values to the machine?”
E35	MC	“every idea shared today, every conversation, every narrative”
E36	Mo Gawdat	“What is wrong about this?” / “What's missing?”
E37	Laila Lalami	“I think we're still at the beginning of this age, and I think it's a little bit too early to tell what direction it's going to take in terms of the arts.”
E38	Laila Lalami	“taking work that was copyrighted and using it without consent in order to train its chatbot”
E39	Laila Lalami	“storytelling is at the heart of empathy and moral clarity”
E40	Sheikha Moza	“from a feared curse to a welcomed blessing”