CommLine, Vol 11, No. 2, July 2026. Page 143-159
ISSN 2963-8615 (Online)

Framing of Artificial Intelligence Discourse in Indonesia Education: An Analysis of Republika.id and Detik.com

Eyora Jasmine Nan Kinasih
University of Indonesia
*email: eyora.jasmine@ui.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study examines how Republika.id and Detik.com frame the adaptation of artificial intelligence in education across different editorial and policy contexts. It analyzes six opinion columns: three published by Republika.id in 2023, before the announcement of the national AI curriculum, and three published by Detik.com in 2025, after the announcement. Entman's four framing functions (define problems, diagnose causes, make moral judgement, and treatment recommendation) were used for textual analysis, while Fairclough's three-dimensional critical discourse analysis provided the interpretive framework of text, discursive practice, and social practice. The analysis finds that Republika.id constructs a value-threat frame, expressed through humanistic concerns by emphasizing the need for teachers and individual AI users to remain mindful of the goal of educational development through AI. Detik.com presents a policy and implementation frame. The latter situates AI within an existing crisis in education quality, disputes over authority in academic knowledge production, and unequal infrastructure between urban schools and those in 3T (frontier, outermost, and disadvantaged) areas. The clearest contrast concerns proposed solutions, responsibility shifts from educators and academics in the 2023 corpus to the government in the 2025 corpus. A key difference lies in the recommended solutions, where the locus of responsibility shifts from educators (2023 data) to the government (2025 data). Both media outlets also demonstrate the exercise of discursive authority through institutional affiliations and column labels. Other findings reflect a contextual comparison between media perspectives and publication periods. One finding regarding the textual dimension is the emergence of spiritual vocabulary in Detik.com articles; this indicates that the discursive construction of spiritual values within Indonesian educational discourse may operate beyond the editorial boundaries of a single media institution. Ultimately, these findings reflect a contextual comparison between media perspectives and publication periods. The study underscores the importance of equitable infrastructure and the ethical capacity of educators in the integration of AI into the education sector.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, framing Entman, critical discourse analysis Fairclough, opinion columns, AI in education.

INTRODUCTION

In 2025, the Indonesian government announced that programming (coding) and Artificial Intelligence (AI) would be introduced into the school curriculum starting in the 2025/2026 academic year, covering grades five of elementary school through high school. Coding and AI subjects are offered as elective subjects to train students to think systematically, logically, but their implementation is restricted to schools with adequate facilities (Rizqa,

2025). The use of AI is also aimed at universities, until May 2025, Pelita Harapan University became the first university in Indonesia to inaugurate a Faculty of AI, and universities more broadly responded by establishing AI based study programmes (Antara, 2025; UPH, 2025). However, due to the implementation of this policy, not all schools have the same level of readiness. Data from the Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education (Kemendikdasmen) reveals that in 2024, only 70-80% of Indonesian schools had access to electricity and the internet. Specifically, internet access was available to 77.47% of primary schools, compared to 88.25% of senior high schools and 91.32% of vocational schools, with public schools lagging behind private ones (Alfathi, 2025). Furthermore, 2025 Kemendikdasmen data indicates that 10,692 schools in frontier, outermost, and disadvantaged (3T) regions lack internet access for educational purposes (Saputro, 2025). In Indonesia's efforts to realize quality education, infrastructure and facilities are essential for creating a conducive learning environment, one that supports the achievement of learning objectives while keeping pace with technological advancements (Balqis et al., 2023).

The urgency of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has shifted from a purely technical topic to concern in education. Rather than being a distant future development, AI is an active reality that directly shapes classrooms, curricula, and everyday pedagogical practices (Long & Magerko, 2020). An online survey of 1,501 Indonesian students aged 15–21 by Tirto.id and Jakpat revealed that 86.21% used AI at least once a month to complete school or university assignments (Hartanto & Rohmah, 2024), while the Association of Indonesian Internet Service Providers (APJII) reported that AI use for education rose from 21.84% to 43.98% between 2024 and 2025. This surge has raised critical concerns regarding AI literacy and data security (Aranditio, 2025). In response, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology has published Guidelines for the Use of Generative AI in Higher Education. The guidelines acknowledge and warn of the risks of plagiarism, overreliance that erodes creativity and critical thinking skills. Reliance on AI, the guidelines warns, risks shifting the focus of education from the process of shaping mindsets to a mere focus on outcomes (Melisa et al., 2025; Musthafa, 2024). Consequently, as policy outpaces implementation capacity alongside infrastructure gaps, the gap leaves open question that discursive as much as technical, who is expected to take responsibility for adapting education to AI?

In terms of structural conditions, government initiatives offer one response. The Vice President of Indonesia has promoted AI literacy through school and university visits, including a seminar at SMAN 66 Jakarta where he emphasized that those who do not use AI will lose

competitiveness (UPH, 2025). However, online media do not simply relay technological developments, they serve as arenas where the meaning of AI is actively contested (Maulida, 2025; Octavianto et al., 2024). Media coverage of AI in Indonesia generally falls into two frames: one driven by optimism regarding the opportunities for technological advancement, and the other focused on ethical concerns (Adinugroho, 2025). Within Indonesian media discourse, this transition is framed around policy, ethics, and the critical thinking skills required for future generations.

Online opinion columns play a strategic role in shaping this public discourse. Written by academics and practitioners leveraging institutional authority, these columns carry symbolic power in defining problem spaces and assigning responsibility. Online media opinion can be an arena where the significance of AI's presence in education is negotiated. This study selects two media with different editorial characters and temporal contexts. Republika.id is based on Islamic values and community empowerment, with a distinctive normative-ethical perspective, while Detik.com is an urban media that focused on practical relevance. The three Republika.id columns were published in 2023, prior to the AI and coding subject was announced, and the three Detik.com columns in 2025, after the announcement. This distinction provides an opportunity to examine how framing relates to shifts in the policy landscape.

This study explores the framing of AI discourse in education and evaluates attitudes toward the adoption by analyzing text construction, production, and distribution within their sociopolitical context (Entman, 1993). Discourse analysis is used as a substantive analytical tool to examine the three layers text, production, and distribution simultaneously, since texts cannot be understood apart from the discursive and social practices that generate discourse (Fairclough, 1992).

The significance of this study lies in expanding the research on media framing in Indonesia to the intersection of AI, education, and opinion writing. In a previous study, researchers used a computational content analysis approach based on topic modelling, drawing on framing theory and the Social Construction of Technology (SCOT). The study found that AI coverage in Indonesian online media is generally dominated by positive and neutral narratives that emphasize the potential for innovation, work efficiency, and economic growth. However, there is also a particular focus on ethical issues, privacy, and concerns about potential layoffs (Octavianto et al., 2024). Another study, research combining Fairclough's critical discourse analysis with Entman's framing has established a strong methodological but has focused on news texts (Astriyani et al., 2025). Research on opinion columns as a genre

does exist, including studies that compare framing of opinion columns with that of editorials and front-page news stories within the same media outlet to track the flow of framing across genres (Taglo et al., 2023). However, that study did not compare opinion columns on AI in education across various Indonesian media outlets or during different policy periods. This study fills a gap by using Entman's framing theory and Fairclough's critical discourse analysis to examine six opinion columns from Republika.id (2023) and Detik.com (2025). The contribution of this study is to provide an in-depth analysis of how AI in education is framed in opinion columns and to compare these framings across two media channels and two policy contexts. This study identifies differences among these cases rather than separating the impact of policy changes from the specific editorial characteristics of each media outlet.

This study addresses two questions. First, how do opinion columns in Republika.id (2023) and Detik.com (2025) frame Artificial Intelligence (AI) in context of education, specifically in terms of how they define the problems, diagnose causes, offer moral judgements, and recommend solutions, particularly regarding which actors are held responsible? Second, how do these framing patterns differ between the two online media and time periods, and how can these differences be interpreted through the dimensions of text, discursive practices, and social practices in Fairclough's critical discourse analysis?

LITERATURE REVIEW

This study is based on two mutually reinforcing theories. The first is Robert N. Entman's framing analysis, used as the method that operationalises that analysis. The second is Norman Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), which is used as substantive text analysis.

Robert N. Entman's Framing

Entman's framing analysis provides the operational framework for this analysis. Framing analysis examines media texts to identify the construction of reality frames through selection and salience (Entman, 2007). Selection is the process of choosing specific aspects of perceived reality, while salience involves identifying aspects that appear more significant, meaningful, or memorable in communication texts. Entman's (1993) framing model operates through four interrelated elements of analysis: (1) Define Problems, which refers to how the media identifies and defines an event or issue as a specific problem worthy of public attention; (2) Diagnose Causes, identifying the actors, policies, or conditions considered to be the source of the problem; (3) Make Moral Judgement, evaluating the causative agents and impacts

presented in the text based on standards of values, ethics, and norms; (4) Treatment Recommendation, suggesting solutions, actions, or policies to address the problem and projecting their potential impacts (Entman, 1993). In the Indonesian tradition of media analysis, these elements are read through the discursive strategies by which frames are made salient, repetition, the use of graphics, labelling, association with cultural symbols, generalisation, and simplification (Eriyanto, 2002).

The Three Dimensions of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) Norman Fairclough

Fairclough's CDA reveals a three-dimensional model in which text constitutes the micro-level, consisting of linguistic units that can be formally analyzed; discursive practice constitutes the meso-level, encompassing the production, distribution, and consumption of texts; and social practice constitutes the macro-level, encompassing institutional and social contexts. These three dimensions are interpreted simultaneously, as a correlation between text and discursive practice that produces discourse. Language can represent social practice, and Fairclough's work in *Language and Power* (1989) as well as his writings on media discourse reject the view that media texts are neutral with respect to reality (Fairclough, 1989; Fairclough, 1992). Texts are constructed products that can represent and reproduce power relations, and the process of text production itself is shaped by social structures. Thus, in this study, CDA analyzes social power within the relationship between knowledge, educators, and students, a relationship that is now under pressure due to the presence of AI.

RESEARCH METHOD

In this research, the researchers used qualitative research approach with Entman's framing as a media text analysis, with Fairclough's CDA as the theory used to interpret the findings. A qualitative approach is used to understand social issues (Creswell, 2013). The data source for this research are six opinion columns published by two national online media platforms, this analysis focuses on three corpus from Republika.id and three corpus from Detik.com. The selection of Republika.id for 2023 was not a strategic decision to magnify contrast. As far as the researcher's search could establish, opinion columns on AI in education in that outlet are available only for the 2023 period, so Detik.com was selected to cover the post-policy period. The significant differences in temporal context and editorial identity provide an opportunity to examine the periods before and after the dissemination of AI in educational settings.

Data collection was conducted in two stages. The first stage involved locating and downloading six opinion articles from both platforms. Access to the opinion section of Republika.id, which requires a subscription, was obtained by subscribing and downloading the articles digitally; meanwhile, articles from Detik.com were openly accessible via a title-based search. The second stage involved a close reading of each text. Each article was read at least three times in succession: the first reading to grasp the overall content and arguments; the second reading focused on identifying text segments relevant to each of Entman's framing elements; and the third reading to verify the alignment between the selected segments and each indicator. This process of repeated reading aims to ensure that interpretations are grounded in the text rather than in the researcher's initial assumptions (Miles et al., 2014).

The corpus was selected based on the following criteria: (1) the texts were published in opinion columns that included the author's name, either as a name along with an institutional affiliation or as a name along with a column label; (2) the main theme was artificial intelligence (AI) as it relates to education, learning, or the role of educators; and (3) the texts were available in full and accessible.

Analysis instruments on this research used a coding sheet compiled on the basis of Entman's four framing elements. Coding sheet helps researcher systematically identify the four elements of framing with filling out: (1) identifying text segments relevant to each element; (2) identifying and describing texts that illustrate how that element functions; (3) noting text quotations; (4) assessing the intensity of emphasis as material for cross-text synthesis. The framing elements identified across the six articles are interpreted within the framework of Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), specifically across three dimensions: text, discursive practice, and social practice. Regarding the textual dimension, the interpretation focuses on recurring lexical patterns and rhetorical framing strategies found throughout the corpus. At the level of discursive practice, the analysis examines how the authors' selection of content and the media outlets' placement of articles within specific sections reflect the construction of discursive authority.

Table 1 Corpus Identity

Code	Article Title	Writer	Date	Source
AR1	Eduagen dan Otoritas Pendidik	Ibnu Hamad (Chair of the UI Curriculum and Education Policy Study Institute)	25 January 2023	Republika.id
AR2	Kecerdasan Buatan di Kampus, Mau ke	Fathul Wahid (Lecturer in the Department of Informatics and Rector of UII)	23 November 2023	Republika.id

	Mana?			
AR3	Artificial Intelligence Menggantikan Peran Guru?	Rohmatulloh (MPI Univ Masters Lecturer. Islam An Nur)	15 May 2023	Republika.id
AD1	AI, Guru, dan Masa Depan Pendidikan	Pormadi Simbolon (Education and Culture Observer; Catholic Community Guidance Officer, Regional Office of the Ministry of Religious Affairs, Banten Province)	3 July 2025	Detik.com
AD2	Artificial Intelligence dan Pendidikan Berkesadaran	Aceng Hidayat (Dean of the IPB Vocational School)	22 December 2025	Detik.com
AD3	Pendidikan dalam Genggaman AI?	Rahfit Syahputra (Teacher at SMAN 1 Rokan IV Koto)	24 June 2025	Detik.com

Source: Research's Data, 2026

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The research findings will present three articles from Republika.id published before the AI awareness campaign, followed by three articles from Detik.com for comparison. The first article in the Republika.id corpus, AR1 expressed his opinion by creating the neologism "eduagen" which is an abbreviation for "education by artificial intelligence" as a novel concept regarding AI in education that has never existed before. The author's act of academic conceptualization simultaneously frames the issue of AI "infiltrating" education as an existential threat to formal educational institutions. The word "infiltrating" carries a negative connotation, implying the presence of a force entering without permission, and this framing differs from neutral or optimistic approaches to AI.

In diagnosing the cause, the root of the problem is linked to the intrinsic nature of AI as a facilitator of academic shortcuts. Responsibility is not attributed to policies, institutions, or users, but rather to the technology itself, making this framework technology centered. The moral standard applied is the *summum bonum*, attached to the highest good of education, which involves the cultivation of ethical attitudes and character. This explicit reference to Islamic-humanistic value leads to the judgement that AI is morally incapable of replacing educators because it lacks the dimension of human exemplarity.

The practice of using Artificial Intelligence (AI) in academic activities is viewed as a systemic moral threat. The solution centers on revitalizing the teaching profession shifting from merely being instructors to becoming educators of values with teachers and professors as the primary actors. The government is not identified as a primary actor, and the recommendations are of normative-professional nature, with an emphasis on ethical

competencies. Thus, AR1 establishes a dominant framework that can be described as "revitalization threat" that AI is positioned as an existential threat that requires a response in the form of strengthening educators' moral capacity.

AR2 presents AI not as a technology, but as a way for universities to adopt AI superficially without ethical and pedagogical reflection. It offers a framework for analyzing the issue that shifts the focus from the technology to the actors adopting it, using the term "(pseudo)legitimization" to refer to institutional performativity. The definition of the problem is illustrated by the development of AI technology on campus, which is carried out for the sake of reputation and praise rather than tangible impact. The opinion piece diagnoses the problem regarding the use of AI, it creates opportunities for students to use AI to avoid intellectual work and threatens the integrity of lecturers who are unaware of the AI-generated results in students' work. The statement "*as long as you don't get caught, it's okay*" is described as a form of normalization of systemic moral violations, and the article also notes that, as users, campus residents have been made to overlook the negative impacts due to the convenience of AI-powered services.

The moral standards highlighted are intellectual honesty and the integrity of academic institutions ethical frameworks, to avoid deeply ambiguous practices (ignorance regarding the negative impacts of AI). The opinion piece strongly criticizes the normalization of academic work performed by AI as a degradation of academic values. The proposed solutions are institutional in nature: universities are required to establish an ethical framework for the use of AI, and the implementation of AI must be based on normative awareness, not pressure from trends. The article also imposes a moral obligation on AI development giants to protect society from dangers related to national security and education.

Unlike AR1 and AR2, AR3 begins by discussing external and global threats rather than internal and local ones, this opinion piece opens with a global context regarding concerns about artificial intelligence (AI) from various countries including the United States of America. Globally, AI products have a moral obligation to protect society from threats to national security and education. In analyzing the root causes, the problem lies not with AI itself, but rather with the role of educators or teachers, who must innovate and adapt to avoid being replaced by AI products. Teaching must be built on the foundation of exemplary noble character as a human strength that AI cannot replicate, and Islamic values are explicitly stated in the closing sentence, "*Wallahu a'lam*" (God knows best) which links the moral standards in this article to Islamic values as a normative reference. The recommended solution is multi-

stakeholder and ecosystem-based and is the most inclusive among the three Republika.id articles; innovation cannot be achieved by teachers alone, and the involvement of all parties, especially the government is necessary to facilitate policies and programs aimed at enhancing teachers' professional competencies. AR3 is built on a framework dominated by global issues, with locally tailored solutions, and relies on individual teacher innovation.

Taken together, the three Republika.id articles display a cohesive framing orientation. In the define problems element, the corpus frames AI as a threat to the existence of educational institutions, to the integrity of campus institutions, and to the sustainability of the teaching profession. In the element of making moral judgements, the strongest moral standards are always rooted in Islamic values and humanism, *summum bonum*, noble morals, exemplary behaviour, and the closing "*Wallahu a'lam*" and the corpus consistently uses vocabulary rooted in Islamic values and traditions. In the treatment recommendation element, Republika places educators and the academic community as the main actors in the solution the government appears only as a supporting actor in AR3. This pattern can be understood as a response to the context of 2023, in the absence of official government policy on AI, the proposed solutions are directed at educators, thereby positioning teachers as agents of institutional change.

The Detik.com corpus presents a more diverse framing. Article AD1 employs layered framing, beginning with the premise that the crisis in the quality of Indonesian education existed before the emergence AI. AI was introduced into a system that was already problematic, rather than AI itself creating the issues, representing a more complex and contextual framing compared to Republika, which initiated its discussion by positioning AI as the source of the problem. Two causes are identified: AI evolving faster than the readiness of the educational ecosystem, and a lack of adaptive policies to protect students.

The moral standards advocated center on humanism and the concept of true education that maintains empathy, values, and emotions. The text asserts that AI cannot replace the human touch, and that teacher–student relationships, peer interactions, and learning experiences involving empathy, values, and emotions remain at core of genuine education. The language is more rhetorical and emotional than in the three Republika articles, reflecting the character of urban media, and the rhetorical question at the end invites readers to reflect on their own position. A balanced framing is demonstrated by highlighting the benefits of AI personalisation before criticising the risks of its infiltration. Furthermore the diagnosis and proposed solutions differ from the Republika pattern, the primary actors in this solution are the

government and educational institutions, rather than individual teachers, with policies required to protect student rights, regulate the ethical use of AI, and provide mechanisms to safeguard academic integrity. This difference is consistent with the context of 2025, in which government policy has become the primary relevance of discourse. AD1 establishes a dominant frame centered on the education crisis and government regulation.

AD2 presents a framing of AI that is not only depicted as a threat to the role of higher education institutions but is also considered to have taken over the learning process, research, and publication, areas that were previously the domain of scientists, and is considered capable of replacing the role of lecturers. The root cause is fundamental: the development of generative AI alters the relationship between technology and knowledge production, and the framing employed reflects a perspective of technological determinism. The moral standards emphasized center on dimensions of sentiment and spiritual wisdom. Beyond physical and intellectual aspects, education requires emotional development to cultivate wise and moral individuals; conversely, education lacking emotional development yields individuals who are incompetent and lack noble character.

The proposed solution is a mindfulness-based approach. AD2 advocates for a transformation of inner consciousness as a response to the threat of AI, positioning the self-reflecting educator as the agent of this solution; the article concludes by asserting that, with such awareness, there is no need to fear AI. AD2 constructs a dominant narrative regarding the usurpation of authority over knowledge production, a challenge addressed not through regulation, but through individual consciousness. The emergence of spiritual vocabulary on the Detik.com platform is a notable finding. It suggests that the discursive formation surrounding spiritual and ethical values within Indonesian educational discourse is robust enough to transcend media editorial boundaries.

The researchers consider the next article, AD3 to be the most contextually relevant in the corpus. It addresses the government's AI and coding curriculum by critiquing the gap between policy optimism and infrastructural reality. The issue is defined as a clash between government policy optimism and implementation realities, specifically, the disparity in school facilities and infrastructure across Indonesia. Two structural causes are identified: infrastructure disparities between urban schools and those in 3T (frontier, outermost, and underdeveloped) regions, and ambitious policies lacking an adequate implementation foundation. This represents the most structurally oriented framing of causes within the corpus, locating the problem not in AI technology or individual teachers, but in the inequitable

distribution of resources. The moral standards invoked are social justice and academic honesty; AI policies that overlook disparities are deemed unfair to students in underserved areas. This social justice dimension is absent from the other articles, making AD3 the only one to explicitly frame the AI issue within the context of regional inequality. The proposed solutions are structural in nature, emphasizing equitable digital infrastructure as a prerequisite for a meaningful AI curriculum and prioritizing the improvement of physical school facilities alongside other human resource aspects, with the government identified as the primary actor. AD3 establishes a dominant frame that contrasts policy optimism with inequality. Table 2 summarizes the comparison of dominant framing patterns across the six analyzed articles.

Table 2. Comparison of Dominant Framing Patterns Across the Corpus

Code	Problem definition	Diagnosis of causes	Moral judgement	Treatment
AR1	AI as an existential threat to educational institutions	AI's intrinsic nature as a facilitator of academic shortcuts	*Summum bonum,* exemplary behaviour; Islamic-humanistic values	Revitalisation of the ethical competence of teachers and lecturers
AR2	Adoption of AI for the sake of image, "(pseudo)legitimacy"	Campus adopts AI for image, absence of ethical corridors	Intellectual honesty, academic integrity	Institutional ethical corridors
AR3	AI threatens the sustainability of the teaching profession	Teachers fail to adapt and innovate	Noble morals, Islamic values ("*Wallahu'alam*")	Ecosystemic, multi-actor innovation
AD1	Pre-existing crisis in education quality, AI as a new variable	Ecosystem readiness, absence of adaptive policy	Humanism, empathy as the core of true education	Government regulation, student protection
AD2	AI seizes authority over academic knowledge production	Generative AI shifts knowledge production	Emotional processing, spiritual wisdom	Mindfulness, individual awareness
AD3	Gap between policy and reality, infrastructure inequality between cities and 3T areas	Infrastructure inequality, ambitious policy without implementation basis	Social justice, academic honesty	Government as primary actor, equitable infrastructure

Source: Researcher's findings (2026)

Comparing the two corpora, the Detik.com corpus reflects the diversity of columnist backgrounds and conditions in the 2025 post-policy-intervention period, in which AI-education discourse has become more specialised and diversified. In the define problems element, Republika.id consistently places AI or the adopting actors as the source of the problem, while the Detik.com corpus displays more diverse framing, the pre-existing educational crisis, the struggle for knowledge authority, and the policy-infrastructure gap. The most significant difference appears in the treatment recommendation element, where all three Detik.com articles place the government as the primary actor, both as a regulator and as

responsible for infrastructure equalisation. In AD2 the actor remains the individual educator, but on grounds of awareness rather than professional competence. The movement of the solution actor from educators to the government is consistent with a change in socio-political conditions in 2023, without an official AI policy, the discourse mode was one of professional community response, whereas in 2025, after the state produced concrete policies, the discourse operates in a mode of producing concerns that demand direct implementation expectations from the state. Given the inherent link between publishing media and time period, these differences are reported as contextual contrasts, not as definitive impacts of the policy change.

Reading through Fairclough's three dimensions, the corpus reveals a systematic difference in lexical patterns. Republika.id's 2023 corpus builds a value-threat framing with Islamic-humanistic vocabulary *summum bonum*, noble morals, exemplary behaviour, "*Wallahu'alam*", ethical corridors, and this lexical choice is an interdiscursive act that embeds AI discourse into the discursive formation of Islamic values, so that readers conditioned by that formation will more easily accept the framing of AI as a threat. Detik.com's 2025 corpus displays a different lexical pattern: the human touch, empathy, objective reality, inequality of means, and adaptive policy, vocabulary rooted in secular humanism and public policy, with the cultivation of feeling and wise moral character in AD2. One finding in the text dimension is particularly notable, the emergence of spiritual vocabulary in AD2 suggests that the discursive formation of spiritual values in Indonesian educational discourse may operate beyond a single media institution's editorial boundary. This finding is consistent with research on the lexical choices of Indonesian media that likewise found a shift in the framing of English language education policy from facilitative local discourse towards mandatory national discourse (Astriyani et al., 2025).

Regarding the dimension of discursive practice, the patterns of author selection across the two media outlets reveal productive differences. Republika.id features authors who possess legitimacy and an Islamic perspective such as the Head of LKKP UI, the Rector of UII, and lecturers in master's programs at Islamic institutions, thereby establishing that the authoritative voices on AI in education are academics with specific institutional affiliations (Hamad, 2023; Rohmatulloh, 2023; Wahid, 2023). Opinion writers for Detik.com come from diverse backgrounds, and their views explicitly do not represent the outlet's editorial stance; nevertheless, these writers still possess the authority to address the issue of AI in education (Hidayat, 2025; Simbolon, 2025; Syahputra, 2025). The interpretation of these authors' profiles aligns with the dimension of discursive practice identified by Fairclough as a central aspect of

institutional discourse production whereby the decision of who is granted a platform to speak is a matter of power rather than merely a technical editorial choice (Entman, 1993). It should be emphasized that this dimension is inferred from the texts rather than directly observed, as no interviews were conducted with editorial staff, the analysis presented here focuses on the construction of discursive authority evident in the published texts, rather than the editorial processes that produced them. The neologism *eduagen* in AR1 most clearly illustrates the interaction between the textual and discursive dimensions, as such a lexical act reflects not only linguistic creativity but also a claim to academic authority, specifically the power to define the phenomenon and frame it in a particular way (Hamad, 2023).

In the dimension of social practice, the difference in framing between Republika.id 2023 and Detik.com 2025 is consistent with changing socio-political conditions. In 2023, without official government policy on AI in the curriculum, media discourse operated in a mode of professional and community response, in 2025, after the state produced concrete policies, the discourse shifted to negotiations with the reality of policies that have changed, and the most consistent difference occurs in the treatment recommendation element, from educators and the academic community as the main actors in the solution towards the government as the primary actor. This finding has a direct parallel with the shift in the framing of English language education policy in Indonesia, in which the same methodological combination produced a shift from facilitative to mandatory discourse (Astriyani et al., 2025).

Compared with research that found the dominance of framing AI as an economic opportunity in news texts (Octavianto et al., 2024), the six opinion articles in this study, across two media with different editorial characters and two different temporal contexts, display critical and vigilant framing, none of which is purely optimistic about AI. This difference can be explained by two factors. First, with regard to the genre of opinion texts, they are generally more evaluative than news texts; second, academic opinion texts have greater evaluative autonomy. Systematic framing in news texts tends to follow the policy agenda, whereas academic opinion texts have greater autonomy in evaluating it. This comparison is indicative rather than conclusive, because the news corpus it is set against comes from a different study with a different design and period. The finding also addresses the gap left by corpus-based studies of AI narratives (Octavianto et al., 2024) by showing that academic opinion texts in online media are a productive corpus that is often neglected in studies of media framing in Indonesia. At the same time, the study's limitations qualify the claim: with three articles per outlet, the consistency of the value-threat pattern in Republika.id may be an artefact of the

small corpus as much as a genuine feature of the outlet, and deviant-case analysis was not possible at this scale.

CONCLUSION

This study combined Entman's framing analysis with Fairclough's three-dimensional critical discourse analysis to examine six opinion articles on AI adaptation in Indonesian education: three from Republika.id (2023) and three from Detik.com (2025). The findings show that AI is not framed through a single, stable discourse, rather its meaning varies with editorial context and the policy landscape.

The Republika.id articles locate the problem primarily in AI itself or in the actors adopting it, including concerns about academic shortcuts, the role of teachers, and the integrity of educational institutions. Their explanations emphasize AI's potential to disrupt educational practice and the need for educators to innovate. By contrast, Detik.com articles frame AI in relation to problems that precede its adoption: the broader education crisis, struggles over authority in academic knowledge production, and gaps between policy and infrastructure. Causes thus range from AI's perceived capacity to facilitate shortcuts and insufficient teacher adaptation to changes in knowledge production and unequal access to resources.

The outlets also differ in moral evaluation and proposed responses. Republika.id's moral standards draw on Islamic-humanistic values, while Detik.com foregrounds humanism, social justice, academic honesty, and spiritual wisdom. Recommendations in the Republika.id corpus emphasize revitalising the teaching profession and establishing institutional ethical guidance. Detik.com calls for government regulation, individual mindfulness, and more equitable digital infrastructure. Across the corpus, problem definition and moral evaluation are the most prominent framing elements, recommendations are less extensive but appear in every article.

Two findings are especially significant. First, the primary actor responsible for solutions shifts from educators and the academic community in the 2023 articles to government in the 2025 articles. This suggests that public and academic discourse increasingly expects the state to implement policy and address practical conditions, including unequal infrastructure and educators' ethical capacity. Second, spiritual vocabulary appears in the Detik.com corpus. This may suggest that spiritual and ethical values circulate beyond a single outlet's editorial boundaries, although this interpretation remains a hypothesis rather than a demonstrated conclusion. The analysis of discursive practice also indicates different constructions of authority. Republika.id's authors are affiliated with Islamic institutions, whereas Detik.com

gives space to columnists identified by generic labels (Hamad, 2023; Simbolon, 2025). These patterns show how published texts distribute discursive authority; they do not establish how editorial decisions were made, since the study did not include interviews with media staff.

The study's limitations qualify these findings. Its small corpus three articles per outlet cannot establish whether the identified framing patterns are characteristic of either outlet or more widespread across Indonesian media. Because the outlets and periods differ simultaneously, the comparison cannot attribute framing differences to policy change alone. The analysis was also conducted by a single researcher, without intercoder reliability testing, and Fairclough's framework was applied mainly through thematic interpretation rather than detailed linguistic analysis. Consequently, interpretations, particularly of moral judgements, may be affected by researcher subjectivity.

Future research should broaden the corpus to include media with different editorial orientations, such as business, community-based, and regional outlets, and examine a longer period to map changes in AI-education discourse. Studies could also compare opinion articles with news reports from the same outlets and periods, testing whether genre is associated with systematic framing differences. More detailed linguistic analysis including transitivity, modality, and nominalization, could clarify how texts assign agency and express necessity or certainty. Finally, using multiple independent coders and a transparent coding instrument would strengthen the reliability of framing analysis. These steps would help determine who produces AI discourse in Indonesian media and how it shapes public understandings of AI in education.

Declaration of AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process

During the preparation of this work, the authors used Scopus AI and Gemini Notebook in order to search for journal literature and to assist in identifying key points from journal articles. After using this tool, the author reviewed and edited the content as necessary and assumes full responsibility for the contents of this publication.

REFERENCES

Adinugroho, P. (2025). Analisis Framing Pemberitaan mengenai Kecerdasan Buatan dalam Sektor Pendidikan di Indonesia. *JIPI (Jurnal Ilmiah Penelitian Dan Pembelajaran Informatika)*, *10*(4), 4094–4108. https://doi.org/10.29100/jipi.v10i4.9392

Alfathi, B. R. (2025). *Belum Semua Sekolah Dasar dan Menengah di Indonesia Terakses Internet.* GoodStats. https://data.goodstats.id/statistic/belum-semua-sekolah-dasar-dan-menengah-di-indonesia-terakses-internet-KIQel

Antara. (2025, May 2). Wapres Gibran: Kurikulum AI akan masuk di tahun ajaran baru sekolah. *Antaranews.Com*. https://www.antaranews.com/berita/4808905/wapres-gibran-kurikulum-ai-akan-masuk-di-tahun-ajaran-baru-sekolah

Aranditio, S. (2025, August 14). Penggunaan AI di Indonesia Meningkat, Gen Z Gunakan untuk Belajar. *Kompas.Id*. https://www.kompas.id/artikel/pengguna-ai-di-indonesia-meningkat-kebanyakan-gen-z-untuk-belajar

Astriyani, A. A., Hidayat, D. N. H., & Husna, N. (2025). Framing English Education Policy in Indonesia: A Comparative Critical Discourse Analysis of Media Representation in The Jakarta Post. *IDEAS Journal on Language Teaching and Learning Linguistics and Literature*, *13*(2), 7756–7773. https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v13i2.8553

Balqis, A. A. A., Hariri, H., Rini, R., & Sowiyah. (2023). *Preparation of educational facilities and infrastructure in improving the quality of education towards the society era 5.0.* Conference Proceedings (Vol. 2621, No. 1, 08000. https://doi.org/https://remote-lib.ui.ac.id:2075/10.1063/5.0142582

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among five approaches* (Third). SAGE Publications.

Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, *43*(4), 51–58. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x

Entman, R. M. (2007). Framing bias: Media in the distribution of power. *Journal of Communication*, *57*(1), 163–173. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2006.00336.x

Eriyanto. (2002). *Analisis Framing: Konstruksi, ideologi, dan politik media*. LKiS.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman Inc.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Wiley.

Hamad, I. (2023). *Eduagen dan Otoritas Pendidik*. Republika.Id. https://www.republika.id/posts/36796/eduagen-dan-otoritas-pendidik

Hartanto, A. Y., & Rohmah, F. N. (2024). *Makin Marak Siswa Pakai AI untuk Mengerjakan Tugas*. Tirto.Id. https://tirto.id/penggunaan-ai-di-dunia-pendidikan-makin-marak-dan-merata-gZax

Hidayat, A. (2025). *Artificial intelligence dan pendidikan berkesadaran.*

Long, D., & Magerko, B. (2020). What is AI Literacy? Competencies and Design Considerations. *Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - Proceedings*, *April*. https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376727

Maulida, F. (2025). Framing in AI-Driven Journalism: Analyzing Prabowo Subianto's Representation on TvOne.ai. *Jurnal Audiens*, *6*(3), 519–531. https://doi.org/10.18196/jas.v6i3.652

Melisa, R., Ashadi, A., Triastuti, A., Hidayati, S., Salido, A., Luansi Ero, P. E., Marlini, C., Zefrin, Z., & Al Fuad, Z. (2025). Critical Thinking in the Age of AI: A Systematic Review of AI's Effects on Higher Education. *Educational Process: International Journal*, *14*. https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2025.14.31

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (Third edit). SAGE Publications.

Musthafa, F. A. D. (2024). Penggunaan Artificial Intelligence (AI) dalam Pembelajaran: Fenomena Transformasi Otoritas Pengetahuan di Kalangan Mahasiswa. *Journal of Contemporary Islamic Education (Journal CIE)*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.25217/jcie.v4i1.4386

Octavianto, A. W., Priyonggo, A., & Setianto, Y. P. (2024). Framing The Future: Exploring AI Narratives in Indonesian Online Media Using Topic Modelling. *Jurnal Komunikasi Indonesia*, *13*(2). https://doi.org/10.7454/jkmi.v13i2.1245

Rizqa, H. (2025, June 26). Siap-siap, Coding dan AI Diajarkan untuk SD-SMP-SMA Mulai Tahun

Ajaran Depan. *Republika.Co.Id*. https://news.republika.co.id/berita/sygtsq458/siapsiap-coding-dan-ai-diajarkan-untuk-sdsmpsma-mulai-tahun-ajaran-depan-part2

Rohmatulloh. (2023). *Artificial intelligence menggantikan peran guru?* Republika.Id. https://www.republika.id/posts/40733/artificial-intelligence-menggantikan-peran-guru

Saputro, F. A. (2025). *Program Listrik Masuk Desa Jangkau Sekolah di Daerah Terpencil*. Investortrust.Id. https://investortrust.id/business/74839/program-listrik-masuk-desa-jangkau-sekolah-di-daerah-terpencil

Simbolon, P. (2025). *AI, guru, dan masa depan pendidikan*. Detik.Com. https://news.detik.com/kolom/d-7993748/ai-guru-dan-masa-depan-pendidikan

Syahputra, R. (2025). *Pendidikan dalam Genggaman AI?* Detik.Com. https://news.detik.com/kolom/d-7979245/pendidikan-dalam-genggaman-ai

Taglo, B. A., Moges, M. A., & Skjerdal, T. (2023). Framing of Public Media Input in a Mediated Deliberation Context. *Research Square*, 0–21. https://www.researchsquare.com/article/rs-3300698/v1

Universitas Pelita Harapan. (2025). *Fakultas AI UPH menarik perhatian, menyambut kunjungan Wakil Presiden Republik Indonesia*. UPH EDU. https://www.uph.edu/2025/03/20/fakultas-ai-uph-menarik-perhatian-menyambut-kunjungan-wakil-presiden-republik-indonesia/

Wahid, F. (2023). *Kecerdasan Buatan di Kampus, Mau ke Mana?* Republika.Id. https://www.republika.id/posts/48051/kecerdasan-buatan-di-kampus-mau-ke-mana