

JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATION, LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

The Teacherless Classroom: Public Discourses on Artificial Intelligence Replacing Teachers in Thai- and English-Language Social Media Contexts

Udomsak Sirita^{1*}, Richard Watson Todd¹

¹School of Liberal Arts, King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi, Bangkok, Thailand

*Corresponding author: udomsak.sirita@gmail.com; ORCID iD: 0000-0001-9140-5633

ABSTRACT

The replacement of teachers by artificial intelligence (AI) has become a critical issue in education. While previous research has focused on educators' and students' attitudes and perceptions, this study examines public discourse surrounding teacherless classrooms by analysing 122 Thai-language and 286 English-language comments posted in response to news about the UK's first "teacherless" classroom, a term used in media coverage. This study employs a three-stage approach consisting of sentiment analysis, corpus-assisted thematic analysis, and critical discourse analysis. The results show that "AI Replacing Teachers" was the most discussed theme, while the overall sentiment was predominantly negative, reflecting fears about the loss of human roles in education. Negative discourse was constructed around three main themes, namely "Lack of Humanity and Ethics in AI Teaching," "Fears of Dystopia," and "Job Loss and Unemployment." The themes reveal a dichotomy between "human" and "non-human," which can be interpreted in relation to van Dijk's (1998) Ideological Square. While Thai- and English-language comments shared similar concerns, Thai discourse in this dataset was distinctively constructed through cultural notions of spirit and soul, highlighting moral and spiritual values in education. In contrast, English-language comments tended to normalise AI by comparing it to homeschooling, media labs, and online learning tools. The comparison highlights both shared concerns and specific differences. These findings contribute to research on AI in education by demonstrating how public responses to teacherless classrooms are shaped by specific ideologies of humanity, morality, labour, and educational authority.

Keywords: discourse, teacherless classroom, AI in education, sentiment analysis, corpus-assisted thematic analysis

Received: 6 January 2026, **Accepted:** 28 May 2026, **Published:** 30 July 2026

1.0 Introduction

The use of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) in classrooms has generated discussions and debates in educational contexts. More broadly, AI in education has emerged as a critical issue for educators, institutions, and national education systems. The public has also expressed concerns about its adoption for teaching and learning. On 31 August 2024, Sky News, a British news broadcaster and organisation, released a report titled “School introduces UK’s first ‘teacherless’ classroom using artificial intelligence” on YouTube (Sky News, 2024) and on its official website (Carroll, 2024). The report featured David Game College, a private institution in London, which introduced the United Kingdom’s first “teacherless” classroom, using AI to deliver lessons without traditional classroom teachers. However, the term “teacherless,” as used in media coverage, could be misleading. Although traditional teachers were absent, the classroom was supervised by three “learning coaches.” These coaches were responsible for monitoring student behaviour, providing support, and teaching subjects in which AI systems are currently less effective, such as art and sex education. The report subsequently sparked discussions among social media users. In Thailand, Thai News Network (TNN), a Thai news channel, also reported on the story through its TNN Tech Reports segment, using footage from Sky News. This Thai-language news report was published in September on TNN’s official YouTube channel (TNN, 2024) and Facebook page (TNN Tech, 2024). Similar to the discussions on Sky News’ original YouTube video, Thai Facebook users debated the advantages and disadvantages of replacing teachers with AI. While the news about the “teacherless classroom” originated in the UK, it is noteworthy that the idea of AI displacing human teachers has generated attention beyond the UK context, particularly in Thailand, where these conversations reflect the complexities of long-standing local educational concerns and challenges.

Most studies of discourses on AI in education derive their data from journal articles, surveys, or interviews with students and educators (e.g., Giannakos et al., 2025; Kim et al., 2025; Wang et al., 2025; Blahopoulou & Ortiz-Bonnin, 2025). This study takes a different approach by examining how discourses on AI in education are linguistically constructed in public online discussions. Specifically, it analyses Thai-language comments on a TNN Tech post as the primary dataset, treating them as expressions of Thai users’ perspectives, alongside English-language comments on a Sky News report, which serves as a broader cross-contextual dataset. Because some Sky News commenters position themselves outside the UK context and compare the case with educational conditions in their own countries, the English-language dataset can be understood as reflecting both insider perspectives, such as those of UK-based commenters, and outsider perspectives from international commenters. Through this comparative lens, this study aims to examine how Thai social media users conceptualise AI and teachers within educational contexts, and how these perceptions differ discursively from broader English-language public responses to AI in education.

2.0 Literature Review

2.1 Uses of Generative Artificial Intelligence in Education

There has been a substantial increase in the use of GenAI in education. Its applications span teaching and learning contexts. GenAI can improve teacher productivity at the instructional level by assisting in lesson design, the creation of instructional materials, lesson evaluation and assessment of students’ learning, and communication with stakeholders (Giannakos et al., 2025). Teachers also use GenAI to create slides, worksheets, reading passages, and draft communications with parents. GenAI can reduce routine workloads and create more time for pedagogical reflection. From the learners’ perspective, GenAI is an intelligent assistant that supports their academic work. In secondary and higher education, students use it to brainstorm, draft, and proofread essays, summarise readings, and analyse data (Blahopoulou & Ortiz-Bonnin, 2025). Researchers have cautioned that these affordances come with risks. Overreliance on AI may lead to a decline in originality and critical thinking (Barrett & Pack, 2023). Therefore, researchers have emphasised the role of educators in guiding students toward ethical and reflective use of GenAI as a complement to, rather than a replacement for, human thought (Giannakos et al., 2025). In this sense, teachers are expected to balance the pedagogical benefits of GenAI with its professional and ethical risks and serve as ethical guides. At the same time, teachers

may also be affected by issues such as the loss of teacher agency and, ultimately, their possible replacement.

2.2 Attitudes and Perceptions Concerning Using GenAI in Education

In education, there is a growing body of research investigating attitudes toward AI, often pointing to a complicated mixture of hope and fear among students, teachers, and other higher education stakeholders (Elmholdt et al., 2025). Most studies focus on specific stakeholder groups, such as students and teachers, and are situated in particular fields, such as health sciences (e.g., Angkurawaranon et al., 2024). Previous studies have also examined attitudes towards and perceptions of GenAI use. Ravšelj et al. (2025) conducted a survey involving more than 23,000 higher education students from 109 countries and found generally positive attitudes toward ChatGPT during its early release phase. Educators' and students' perceptions of GenAI differed and were often shaped by cultural, demographic, and disciplinary factors. For example, students from higher-income regions and those in STEM fields showed more pragmatic orientations and were more aware of the limitations of AI. An analysis of Twitter discourse showed that educators were more likely than the general public to express emotions ranging from excitement and joy to apprehension. Their responses to GenAI in classrooms reflected broader discussions about ethics, workload, and pedagogical change (Lampropoulos et al., 2025).

Although most studies emphasise positive attitudes towards GenAI and perceptions of its use, a growing number of studies have focused on concerns and negative emotions, such as anxiety. Li and Huang (2020) explored the specific dimensions of AI anxiety using the integrated fear acquisition model and data from a questionnaire survey. Their findings identified that AI anxiety consists of eight distinct factors: privacy violation, biased behaviour, job replacement, learning difficulties, existential risks, ethical violations, artificial consciousness, and lack of transparency. Similarly, Kim et al. (2025) examined the psychological factors underlying AI anxiety through a conceptual and analytical review and found that AI anxiety stems partly from the technology's ability to perform cognitive tasks and make decisions autonomously, which may threaten highly skilled jobs. The main triggers include fear of job replacement, uncontrolled AI growth, privacy violations, AI-generated misinformation, and algorithmic bias. Negative perceptions of GenAI and anxiety about its use may also be shaped by wider AI discourses circulating in education. Bearman et al. (2023) reviewed articles from leading higher education journals containing the term "artificial intelligence" to analyse how AI was represented. They found that the articles often provided unclear definitions of AI and ambiguous implications for its role in higher education. The recurrent dualisms of utopia versus dystopia and human versus machine were identified in this literature: one view presents AI as a positive transformation and an unavoidable force to which institutions must urgently adapt, whereas another presents it as a tool that shifts authority away from human teachers to corporations.

2.3 AI in the Thai Education Context

In Thailand, positive attitudes towards and perceptions of the use of GenAI in education may be shaped by system-level challenges and expectations that AI can help address these problems. The Thai education sector faces multiple challenges, including unequal access to quality learning, an excessive emphasis on rote memorisation, and a shortage of skilled teachers, especially in rural settings (Watson Todd, 2014; Pholphirul et al., 2023). Approximately two-thirds of students' grades in Thai schools are determined by tests, and multiple-choice questions are prevalent. In addition, workload pressures and national examinations have led many teachers to rely on standardised tests (Watson Todd et al., 2021). This partly explains why the majority of Thai high school students attend tutorial schools, with the expectation that tutorial classes will improve their academic performance, especially in preparation for standardised examinations. Tutorial schools are also perceived as providing a more student-centred learning style that is often perceived as lacking in public schools (Jones & Rhein, 2018). This trend is especially evident in English language education, where the exam-driven culture pushes students toward tutorial schools for test preparation rather than genuine language acquisition (Saengboon, 2019). In response to these challenges, AI has great potential to revolutionise conventional tutoring, as it can provide personalised, scalable, and economical ways to learn. In theory, AI could provide real-time

feedback, adaptive learning pathways aligned with students' progress, and wider access to learning support. If successfully implemented, it might also reduce reliance on expensive private tutoring.

2.4 Social Media as Venues of Public Discourses

Research on public discourse surrounding AI in education, especially in the Thai context, remains limited. Methodologically, surveys and interviews are commonly used as data collection instruments in quantitative and qualitative studies of AI in education, respectively (e.g., Angkurawaranon et al., 2024; Sanmuang et al., 2024; Waluyo & Kusumastuti, 2024). However, recent research has increasingly drawn on social media and other online data to examine social attitudes as expressed in public discourse. For example, Rangsarittikun et al. (2025) analysed reader responses to articles published in *The Guardian* and *The Daily Mail* about an AI-generated artwork. It showed that political ideology did not significantly influence attitudes towards AI art. Moreover, large-scale analyses of Twitter (X) data following ChatGPT's release showed that education was the most prominent topic across more than 16 million posts. Early discussions focused primarily on productivity and accessibility before later shifting towards plagiarism and misinformation (Fütterer et al., 2023). Similarly, Mogavi et al. (2024) reported that productivity, efficiency, and ethics dominated social-media discourse on GenAI in education. Nevertheless, recurring concerns centred on authenticity and creativity. These studies suggest that social media can serve as a useful indicator of public sentiment, reflecting both optimistic and anxious views of the pedagogical transformation associated with AI.

However, there are both benefits and drawbacks to using social media to investigate broad social attitudes compared to traditional surveys and interviews. Traditional surveys are more systematic tools in terms of representativeness, precision, and standardised structures, while social media offers large-scale, real-time, cost-efficient access to public perceptions but raises methodological challenges (Dong & Lian, 2021; Reveilhac et al., 2022). Although social media sentiment correlates with broader attitudes, it is not fully representative (Scarborough, 2018). Other drawbacks of social media data include sampling bias, platform dependency, platform-specific bias, unclear sampling frames, and validity concerns (e.g., Tufekci, 2014; Huai et al., 2023). Nevertheless, it should be noted that this study prioritises social media data as a source for exploring sensitive and emerging topics, where traditional survey respondents and interviewees might hide their true feelings due to social desirability bias (Reveilhac et al., 2022).

Social media, specifically Facebook, has emerged as a site of important public discourse (Humprecht et al., 2020). In Thailand, Facebook users spend an average of 2.31 hours per day on social media platforms, ranking 17th worldwide. Thailand also has the ninth-largest Facebook advertising audience with 49 million Facebook users (Leesa-Nguansuk, 2024). Unlike traditional one-way media, Facebook allows users to share content related to their beliefs, values, and political opinions. Prior research has used Facebook comments as data to examine a wide range of topics, including grassroots self-defence movements (Sierra, 2021) and public reactions to conflict-related news (Onoja et al., 2022). These studies demonstrate how online comments can reveal underlying ideologies and collective identities.

This study aims to examine Thai social media discourse surrounding the “teacherless classroom” in AI-related educational news. In this study, Thai-language comments from TNN Tech's Facebook post serve as the primary corpus, and this corpus is compared with English-language comments from the original Sky News YouTube video, which serve as a benchmark corpus. It also investigates how Thai social media users linguistically construct representations of AI, teachers, and education, and how these constructions align with or diverge from broader English-language responses, using van Dijk's (1998) Ideological Square within a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) framework. In doing so, the study seeks to understand how English-language social media discourse is localised and recontextualised within Thailand's digital public sphere. The study is guided by the following research questions:

- 1) What are the dominant sentiments expressed in comments by Thai social media users on news reports about teacherless classrooms?
- 2) What themes emerge from Thai social media users' comments in response to news reports about teacherless classrooms, as identified through corpus-assisted thematic analysis??

- 3) How do these sentiments and themes compare with English-language comments posted in response to the original English-language news report, and what differences can be observed?
- 4) Through critical discourse analysis, how are AI and human teachers discursively constructed in the Thai and English-language datasets, and what do these constructions reveal about public perceptions of AI in education?

3.0 Methods

3.1 Data Collection

The data for this study include two related datasets: (1) 162 Thai comments posted in response to the news about the “teacherless classroom” on the official Facebook page of TNN Tech (TNN Tech, 2024) and (2) 303 English-language comments from the original Sky News YouTube video on the same topic (Sky News, 2024). Facebook was chosen for the Thai dataset because it is one of the most widely used social media sites in Thailand and serves as a major public platform on which digital conversations around technology and education emerge. The TNN Tech post, which adapted the Sky News report for Thai audiences, attracted the highest number of user comments among Thai news outlets, making it an appropriate site to observe local ideological constructions. The Sky News YouTube comments were treated as the original English-language discourse surrounding the report. They were used to compare Thai users’ discursive constructions with those expressed by English-language commenters, consistent with CDA’s notions of interdiscursivity and context (van Dijk, 1998). However, it should be noted that the use of two different platforms may also frame the issue differently.

The comments from Facebook were manually collected, while those from YouTube were collected by using Apify’s YouTube Comments Scraper (Apify, 2025) in October 2025. Comments and replies that were unrelated to AI, written in languages other than Thai or English, or duplicated by the same user were excluded. Short expressions and fragments were also considered within their conversational contexts to determine whether they should be included. After filtering, 122 Thai-language Facebook comments and 286 English-language YouTube comments were included in the analysis. As a first step towards maintaining textual consistency between the two corpora, non-linguistic components, such as emojis, URLs, and hashtags, were removed before the data were processed using corpus-analysis software. Emojis and hashtags were still retained in the original comments for manual sentiment, thematic, and critical discourse analysis.

For the Thai-language data, additional preprocessing was required because of the absence of spaces between words in written Thai. The cleaned data were therefore segmented into words so that they could be analysed using corpus-analysis tools. Because existing open-source Thai word segmentation tools may not consistently handle informal social media text with sufficient accuracy, ChatGPT (OpenAI, 2024) was used as a preprocessing tool to segment the Thai-language comments into individual words. The segmented output was subsequently checked by a Thai-speaking researcher, and segmentation errors involving compound words and misspelt forms were corrected manually where necessary. The final segmented dataset was then converted into Excel and text file formats for subsequent analysis. Thai-language quotations used to illustrate the findings were translated into English by a Thai researcher and checked by a native English-speaking researcher.

3.2 Methodological Reflexivity

It should be noted that the datasets used in this study have certain limitations. First, 122 Thai-language comments form a relatively small dataset and therefore should not be taken as representative of Thai public opinion more broadly. Moreover, Facebook users may not be representative of the general public. The English-language data also require cautious interpretation, as YouTube comments may reflect platform-specific discourse rather than broader international opinion. Since the data are drawn from social media platforms, namely YouTube and Facebook, the findings should be understood as reflecting platform-based discursive practices. Accordingly, the analysis does not claim to represent national or international attitudes as a whole but examines how particular groups of social media users discursively responded to the “teacherless classroom.”

3.3 Unit of Analysis

Most Thai-language and English-language comments in this study are short phrases, single clauses, or incomplete sentences. As a result, each comment was treated in this study as a unit of analysis. Comments were viewed as discrete expressions of users' stances, regardless of length or grammatical completeness. This approach helped maintain analytical consistency across the two languages. It also allowed for a meaningful examination of users' perspectives and ideological orientations, even when these were expressed through fragmented or elliptical constructions typical of social media discourse. However, when comments were unclear due to being dependent on earlier comments, the surrounding conversational context was considered to clarify their meaning.

3.4 Data Analysis

The data analysis was divided into three main stages: (1) sentiment analysis to examine overall sentiment towards AI in education, (2) corpus-assisted thematic analysis to identify emerging discursive patterns and ideological themes, and (3) critical discourse analysis (CDA) to examine how ideologies surrounding AI in education were discursively constructed.

3.4.1 Sentiment Analysis

The first phase involved conducting sentiment analysis to examine emotions and opinions expressed in Thai-language comments. Sentiment analysis is used to analyse textual data in order to ascertain the emotional tenor of the message, which may be classified as positive, negative, or neutral. The analysis is commonly used to evaluate public perceptions of products, organisations, or social issues, as well as the sentiment in news media discourse (Wang et al., 2023; Wanniarachchi et al., 2023). To address the limited availability of Thai-language sentiment-analysis tools, we also experimented with GenAI-based sentiment analysis alongside manual coding. We expected that comparing automated outputs with human labels would demonstrate how much GenAI could identify the implicit or sarcastic meanings in culturally embedded comments. These two approaches can enhance the validation of sentiment categories and evaluate the potential and limitations of GenAI for discourse-focused research.

Four automated sentiment analysis tools and models, namely S-SENSE, ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude, were tested to cross-validate outputs. S-SENSE (Social Sensing) is a Thai-language sentiment analysis tool developed by the National Electronics and Computer Technology Center (NECTEC). In addition, manual evaluation was used as the benchmark for comparison. The sentiment categories in this study were positive, negative, and neutral, following the categories used by the automated sentiment analysis tool S-SENSE. Positive sentiment was defined as support for or favourable attitudes toward AI, and negative sentiment was defined as opposition or unfavourable perceptions. Neutral sentiment referred to a balanced stance that acknowledged both AI and teachers, or an unclear attitude. To align with automated tools, it should be noted that the "neutral" category may include balanced, mixed, and unclear comments. For manual coding, the first author, who is competent in both Thai and English, carefully read each comment and assigned it a sentiment category based on the criteria described above. To validate the manual coding process, 50 randomly selected comments were evaluated by a second coder to assess inter-rater reliability. Comparing the second coder's codes with those assigned by the first author yielded a Cohen's Kappa value of 0.668, indicating substantial agreement between the two raters.

For the GenAI tools, the same prompt, "Assign sentiments to the following statements (positive, negative, or neutral)," was used for each tool and was followed by each individual comment to be classified. The results of the sentiment analysis from both the manual and AI evaluations were recorded in Excel files for further descriptive statistical analysis. Among the GenAI tools, Claude produced sentiment distributions that were most similar to the manual judgements as indicated by the following Cohen's Kappa values: S-SENSE, 0.278; ChatGPT GPT-4o, 0.507; Gemini 1.5, 0.547; and Claude 3.5 Sonnet, 0.662. In particular, Claude was the only model that achieved substantial agreement with human judgements and had the highest inter-rater reliability (Cohen's Kappa = 0.662). It should be noted that the benchmarking analysis was conducted only on the Thai dataset, which was considered more challenging for GenAI tools, as these tools were originally developed primarily for English-language processing. As a result, sentiment classifications from Claude (Anthropic, 2024) and the

manual evaluation were used to analyse both the Thai-language and English-language datasets to ensure methodological consistency across datasets.

However, sentiment analysis has limitations, including difficulties related to contextual polarity, lexicon coverage, and domain adaptation (Muhammad et al., 2016). To address these limitations, this study integrates sentiment analysis with thematic analysis to obtain deeper and more context-sensitive interpretations of the textual data.

3.4.2 Corpus-assisted Thematic Analysis

Thematic analysis involves identifying, analysing, and reporting patterns within qualitative data (Kordzadeh & Young, 2018). It can be conducted inductively, allowing themes to emerge from the data (Lowe-Calverley & Grieve, 2018) or deductively, guided by predetermined themes based on existing theories or frameworks (Karlsen & Scott, 2019).

Although sentiment analysis offered an overview of attitudes towards GenAI in education, it did not provide the linguistic and ideological depth needed to explain how these attitudes were expressed and constructed. To address this limitation, a corpus-assisted thematic analysis combining corpus linguistics and thematic analysis was employed in this study to examine meanings across datasets. AntConc 4.3.1 (Anthony, 2024) was used to identify statistically significant keywords in the Thai- and English-language comments relative to their reference corpora, the Thai National Corpus 3.0 developed by Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn University and the British National Corpus (BNC Consortium, 2007). In corpus analysis, keywords were identified using log-likelihood and effect size (Dice coefficient) statistics to assess their frequency and distinctiveness. Following Pojanapunya and Watson Todd (2018), log-likelihood was used to indicate the “aboutness” of the text, while effect size highlighted critical aspects. Due to the significant size difference between the target and reference corpora, z-scores without outliers ($z > 3$) were employed to identify an appropriate cutoff point for log-likelihood without subjective consideration. For keywords ranked by effect size, using z-scores with outlier exclusion to determine the cutoff point may not be appropriate. Another method, the Top-N approach, might introduce some level of researcher subjectivity when identifying the N value. Consequently, we decided to apply the cutoff of keywords ranked by log-likelihood as the N value for determining the appropriate cutoff for the keyword list ranked by the Dice coefficient as a measure of effect size.

Table 1

Sizes of Target Corpora and Reference Corpora

Dataset		Corpora	Type Count	Token Count
1	Target	Thai-language Facebook comments	609	2,148
	Reference	Thai National Corpus 3.0	109,893	34,171,630
2	Target	English-language YouTube comments	1,699	5,753
	Reference	British National Corpus	337,596	90,350,013

Subsequently, the keyword lists ranked by log-likelihood and effect size were compared to identify overlapping concepts. These keywords were then refined into themes. Non-thematic items and function words were also excluded. Finally, collocations and concordance lines were examined to determine the meanings of the keywords in context, as keywords alone may be ambiguous. The Thai-language themes were therefore developed inductively through corpus analysis and subsequently applied deductively to the English dataset. To validate the manual coding process, 50 randomly selected comments from each dataset were independently coded by a second coder to calculate inter-rater reliability.

3.4.3 Critical Discourse Analysis and van Dijk's Ideological Square

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is concerned with how language reflects and helps construct power relations, ideology, and inequality. Fairclough (2013) defines CDA as a form of critical social research that investigates how discourse in contemporary capitalist societies reproduces, legitimises, or challenges social wrongs. Among the various traditions of CDA, van Dijk's socio-cognitive framework is influential and relevant to this study. The approach focuses on mental models (beliefs, knowledge, and ideologies) that mediate between discourse and social structures (van Dijk, 1998, 2009). One of his major contributions is the "Ideological Square," which views ideology as grounded in cognitive polarisation between "Us" (the in-group) and "Them" (the out-group). This polarisation can be realised through four macro-strategies:

- a. emphasising positive information about "Us,"
- b. emphasising negative information about "Them,"
- c. de-emphasising negative information about "Us," and
- d. de-emphasising positive information about "Them."

These strategies constitute a meta-strategy of positive self-presentation and negative other presentation, which shapes group identities and ideological boundaries (van Dijk, 1998, 2008). These discursive strategies can operate across linguistic levels, from lexical choice and syntax to rhetoric and text organisation (van Dijk, 1998).

In the context of this study, the Ideological Square provides a useful lens for examining how differences between "human" and "non-human" actors are linguistically constructed and ideologically maintained. In this study, the "Us" group refers to human actors, especially teachers, while the "Them" group refers to non-human actors, especially GenAI. The Ideological Square may be realised through contrasting representations of teachers and GenAI. Positive information may be emphasised through references to human qualities such as spirituality, empathy, morality, creativity, and emotional understanding. In the Thai context, one distinctive human quality attributed to teachers is "จิตวิญญาณความเป็นครู" or "the spirit of being a teacher." In developing a professional teacher spirituality scale for Thai teachers, Ongardwanich and Uppamaiathichai (2024) found that professional teacher spirituality consists of four essential elements: love and trust in the teaching career, acting as a model for learning, serving as a role model of a good teacher, and demonstrating sympathy and care for students.

Emphasising negative information about "Them" may be realised through representing GenAI as lacking human qualities. Such representations may be linked to AI anxiety, including fear of job loss, moral panic, and the belief that uncontrolled AI could lead to social collapse or dystopian futures. These concerns resonate with digital humanism, which foregrounds human agency, ethical judgement, democratic values, and the social value of human relationships in the digital age (Nida-Rümelin & Weidenfeld, 2022). This intellectual and political movement includes components such as the defence of agency against machine-like treatment, the maintenance of human control over automation, and the integration of ethics into technological design (Coeckelbergh, 2024). At the same time, negative information about "Us," such as human teachers' biases, limited availability, or inconsistent teaching quality, may be de-emphasised in order to maintain the positive representation of human teachers. Conversely, positive information about "Them," such as GenAI's reliability, scalability, cost-effectiveness, and efficiency, may also be downplayed when AI is constructed as a threat. However, when AI is portrayed positively as more reliable, cost-effective, and efficient than human teachers, this may challenge the human/non-human binary and align with neoliberal logics of efficiency, productivity, and cost-effectiveness in education (e.g., Ball, 2016; Brathwaite, 2016).

4.0 Results

This section presents the main findings of the study. First, as part of the quantitative analysis, sentiment and keyword analyses were conducted. These results then informed the thematic analysis, which provided the basis for qualitative interpretation within a CDA framework.

4.1 Sentiment Analysis

The sentiment analysis results indicate that both Claude, the GenAI tool, and the human evaluators identified more negative than positive sentiment in both Thai- and English-language comments (Table 2). Manual assessment consistently detected a greater degree of emotional polarity and assigned higher proportions of positive and negative labels. In contrast, GenAI classified more comments as neutral. Among the AI tools tested, Claude produced the sentiment distributions closest to human judgement but labelled more comments as neutral than the human evaluators did. This finding highlights the complexity of human interpretation, which can capture nuanced emotional cues that AI tools may overlook.

Negative sentiment predominated in both datasets. In manual evaluation, English-language commenters showed greater consensus in their responses to the “teacherless classroom” concept. However, sentiment in Thai-language comments was more evenly distributed, highlighting mixed concerns and uncertainty among Thai commenters. Nevertheless, positive sentiment remained less frequent than negative sentiment across both datasets and coding approaches. The high proportion of negative sentiment may suggest AI anxiety, especially when AI is understood as a tool that will replace, rather than support, teachers. The more mixed distribution of Thai-language comments may suggest a negotiation between technological optimism and fear of the loss of human authority in education. In this sense, sentiment analysis provides an initial indication that commenters’ reactions in the two contexts are shaped not only by perceived usefulness but also by deeper assumptions about teaching, human agency, and the social value of education.

Table 2

Comparison of Sentiment Analysis Between Two Methods

Sentiment	TNN Tech (Thai-language Comments)				Sky News (English-language Comments)			
	Claude		Manual		Claude		Manual	
Positive	38	(31.15%)	45	(36.89%)	79	(27.62%)	86	(30.07%)
Neutral	36	(29.51%)	23	(18.85%)	101	(35.31%)	55	(19.23%)
Negative	48	(39.34%)	54	(44.26%)	106	(37.06%)	145	(50.70%)

4.2 Keyword Analysis

Sentiment analysis can provide an understanding of attitudes at the surface level, but it may lack insight into the reasons behind these attitudes. To address this limitation, we also conducted a corpus-assisted thematic analysis to explore deeper meanings and validate the findings of sentiment analysis. For the Thai-language dataset, 17 significant keywords ranked by log-likelihood are shown in Table 3, and 19 keywords ranked by effect size are shown in Table 4. The difference in the number of keywords in the two lists is due to two or more keywords having the same rank based on the effect size evaluation. A comparison of the two lists shows considerable overlap, with the majority of keywords appearing in both lists. Notably, content words such as “เรียน” (learn/study) and “แทน” (replace) only appear in the log-likelihood ranking, while “สุดยอด” (excellent/awesome/great) and “robot” only appear in the effect size ranking. Together, the two lists enabled the analysis to capture highly frequent indicators and overly characteristic but less frequent words. This approach can provide an overview of the dataset.

Across both the Thai- and English-language datasets, the keyword lists also suggest a binary opposition between AI and humans. For example, the Thai-language keyword “มนุษย์” (human) frequently co-occurs with semantically related keywords such as “นักเรียน” (students) and “ครู” (teachers). Additionally, some Thai-language keywords, such as “ตกงาน” (unemployed), “แทน” (replace), and “แย่ง” (take away or snatch), clearly imply a theme of unemployment and anxiety about future job displacement. In contrast,

broader terms such as “AI,” “เอไอ” (AI), “robot,” and “ประเทศไทย” (Thailand) appear across multiple contexts and are therefore less useful for identifying specific themes.

Similarly, English-language keywords, including “teachers,” “learning,” “teaching,” and “students,” emphasise education as the core topic of discussion. Moreover, terms such as “AI,” “teacherless,” “replace,” and “human(s)” reflect an underlying dichotomy of AI versus humans. However, the English-language keywords (see Tables 5 and 6) were also broad and largely overlapped with those in the Thai dataset. In comparison, Thai keywords such as “ตกงาน” (unemployed) and “จิตวิญญาณ” (spirit or soul), which do not appear in the English keyword lists above the cut-off point, are more explicit and therefore more useful for identifying themes. Although the keyword “จิตวิญญาณ” occurs only five times in the Thai-language dataset, it is distinct and useful for identifying a theme. The semantically related word “soul” occurs only once in the English data, and it is used to describe students, not teachers or AI. The closest semantically related keyword in the English dataset is “interpersonal”, as shown in collocations such as “interpersonal experience” and “interpersonal interactions.” However, the term does not transparently convey the broader Thai concept, which encompasses elements of spirit, mind, and soul. Moreover, the keyword “จิตวิญญาณ” (spirit or soul) also occurs in expressions associated with human qualities, such as “จิตวิญญาณความเป็นคนดี” (spirit of being a good person) and “จิตวิญญาณเกี่ยวกับจริยธรรมและมนุษยธรรม” (spirit related to ethics and humanity). Since the primary research aim concerns how Thai public discourse constructs meanings and expresses attitudes toward AI in education, the Thai-language corpus provides the most contextually grounded and culturally authentic evidence for theme identification.

In the Thai-language data, function words related to language style, such as “ครับ” (a polite particle used by males) and “ไหม” (an informal question particle meaning “right?” or “isn’t it?”), were excluded from thematic analysis because they lack direct thematic content. The remaining keywords were further analysed using concordance lines and collocations to identify potential themes because some keywords required contextual analysis to determine their meanings. By examining keyword relationships and contextual patterns, four primary themes were identified, as discussed in the following section.

Table 3

Keywords Ranked by Log-likelihood (Thai-language Comments)

Type	Meaning	Rank	F	LL
ai	AI	1	77	1363.21
ไม่มี	don’t have, there isn’t	2	11	212.90
ครู	teacher	3	35	191.81
มนุษย์	human	4	37	186.68
ครับ	polite particle used by males	5	36	161.51
น่าจะ	should be, probably	6	8	148.55
เอไอ	AI (in Thai language)	7	11	139.19
สอน	teach	8	24	124.22
จิตวิญญาณ	spirit, soul	9	5	96.76
เรียน	study, learn	10	24	94.54
ไม่ได้	cannot, could not	11	6	90.99

Type	Meaning	Rank	F	LL
ตกงาน	lose job, become unemployed	12	9	86.45
ไม่ใช่	no, not	13	5	81.60
อนาคต	future	14	13	69.73
นักเรียน	student	15	13	62.45
แทน	replace	16	15	59.67
ประเทศไทย	Thailand	17	3	58.05

Table 4

Keywords Ranked by Effect Size (Thai-language Comments)

Type	Meaning	Rank	F	Effect Size
ai	AI	1	77	0.068
ไม่มี	don't have, there isn't	2	11	0.01
เอไอ	AI (in Thai language)	2	11	0.01
น่าจะ	should be, probably	4	8	0.007
ตกงาน	lose job, become unemployed	4	9	0.007
ไม่ได้	cannot, could not	6	6	0.006
จิตวิญญาณ	spirit, soul	7	5	0.005
ไม่ใช่	no, not	7	5	0.005
ครู	teacher	9	35	0.004
มนุษย์	human	9	37	0.004
สอน	teach	9	24	0.004
สุดยอด	excellent, awesome, great	9	6	0.004
ครับ	polite particle used by males	13	36	0.003
อนาคต	future	13	13	0.003
นักเรียน	student	13	13	0.003
ประเทศไทย	Thailand	13	3	0.003
robot	robot	13	3	0.003
ป่าว	question particle (informal), used to ask "right?" or "isn't it?"	13	3	0.003
แย่ง	to steal, snatch, or take away	13	5	0.003

Table 5

Keywords Ranked by Log-likelihood (English-language Comments)

Type	Rank	F	LL
ai	1	94	1275.869
teachers	2	74	547.907
learning	3	45	305.148
llms	4	14	270.564
teacher	5	38	248.346
students	6	37	203.954
human	7	39	195.233
teaching	8	30	181.886
youtube	9	6	115.948
teacherless	9	6	115.948
can	11	64	100.575
true	12	5	96.622
student	13	18	95.674

Table 6

Keywords Ranked by Effect Size (English-language Comments)

Type	Rank	F	Effect Size
ai	1	94	0.029
teachers	2	74	0.009
learning	3	45	0.006
llms	4	14	0.005
teacher	4	38	0.005
students	6	37	0.004
teaching	6	30	0.004
human	8	39	0.003
student	8	18	0.003
humans	8	12	0.003
classroom	8	12	0.003
replace	8	13	0.003
youtube	13	6	0.002

The most significant Thai-language keywords relate to unemployment, including “ตกงาน” (unemployed), “แทน” (to replace), and “แย่ง” (to take away). While the discussion began with AI replacing teachers, many comments expanded the conversation to jobs that may be displaced by AI across sectors. Concerns increasingly centred on rising unemployment and economic instability.

In addition, keywords such as “ครู” (teacher), “นักเรียน” (student), “สอน” (teach), and “เรียน” (study, learn) refer to core actors and activities alongside “AI” or “เอไอ” (AI). Collocation analysis of “สอน” (teach) showed patterns such as “สอนได้” (can teach) and “น่าจะสอนได้” (can probably teach), while “น่าจะดี” (probably good) appeared repeatedly. These expressions suggest that some commenters viewed AI as a potentially effective teaching tool.

Another prominent keyword, “จิตวิญญาณ” (spirit or soul), appeared in arguments against AI replacing human teachers. The compound word “จิตวิญญาณ” consists of “จิต” (mind/soul/thought) and “วิญญาณ” (spirit/soul). The word “จิตวิญญาณ” may be understood as “spirituality” and is frequently translated as “spirit” or “soul” in English. It frequently co-occurred with “ไม่มี” (lack of) to emphasise AI’s perceived absence of moral and emotional qualities, as in statements such as “AI has no imagination” or “AI lacks a soul, ethics, and humanity.” Similarly, “ไม่ได้” (cannot) is often collocated with “ครู” (teacher) and “นักเรียน” (student), reinforcing the belief that AI cannot replace human empathy and interaction in education.

The keyword “มนุษย์” (human) often collocated with “สังคม” (society) and “พัง” (collapse) in contrast to “AI” or “เอไอ” (AI). These words suggest fears of societal breakdown from relying too heavily on AI. Similarly, the surrounding contexts of “อนาคต” (future) carried pessimistic connotations by indicating an AI-dominated future that leads to moral or cognitive decline. Together, these patterns show a dominant discourse of anxiety and resistance to the invasion of AI into human and educational domains.

These keywords were central to theme identification. Collocations such as “สอนได้” (can teach) and “น่าจะสอนได้” (can probably teach) suggest conditional acceptance of AI as a teaching tool. However, the prevalence of unemployment-related words suggests that the teacherless classroom became a starting point for wider economic anxiety, in which AI was viewed as a force that may displace human workers beyond the teaching profession. More importantly, the repeated use of “จิตวิญญาณ” (spirit or soul) reveals a cultural and moral understanding of teaching. In these comments, “จิตวิญญาณ” (spirit or soul) does not simply refer to an abstract inner quality but functions as a marker of human distinctiveness, ethical responsibility, emotional connection, and care. At the same time, collocations such as “มนุษย์” (human), “สังคม” (society), and “พัง” (collapse) show that anxieties about AI extend from the classroom to society as a whole, constructing a dystopian imaginary.

4.3 Thematic Analysis

Based on the keyword analysis of the Thai-language dataset, we found that four main themes emerged: (1) AI replacing teachers, (2) fear of dystopia, (3) job loss and unemployment, and (4) the lack of humanity and ethics in AI teaching. During the analysis, minor topics emerged from the data, including infrastructure readiness in Thailand, definitions of AI, humorous comments about AI and politicians, and the idea of replacing politicians with AI. However, these topics were not central to the study’s focus on AI replacing teachers. As a result, any comments that did not fit within the four main themes are categorised under the category “Others.” The final themes used for coding and their definitions are shown in Table 7. During the coding process, some comments contained elements of more than one theme. In such cases, the most prominent topic in each comment was used to determine its thematic category. Assigning a single theme to each comment enabled direct comparison between the thematic and sentiment analyses.

Table 7

Themes and Definitions

Theme	Definition
AI replacing teachers	Comments discussing the idea of AI taking over teaching roles, either in part or entirely, and replacing human teachers in educational settings or agreeing with replacing teachers with AI.
Fears of dystopia	Comments expressing fear or concerns about a future dominated by AI often imagine a world where AI has taken over too much of human life or led to negative societal consequences.
Job loss and unemployment	Comments expressing concern that AI could lead to widespread job loss (excluding teachers), economic impacts, and higher unemployment.
Lack of humanity and ethics in AI teaching	Comments addressing ethical concerns and the absence of human qualities (e.g., empathy, imagination) in AI-driven education. This theme also includes discussions on the necessity of human oversight, particularly in AI-assisted teaching for young students.
Others	Comments that do not fit into the above categories, such as short affective expressions, definitions of AI, and humorous references to AI and politicians.

We also applied four major themes derived from the Thai dataset and the category “Others” to the English-language comments collected from the Sky News comment thread to evaluate the transferability of these themes across linguistic and cultural contexts. Similar to the Thai-language comments, minor topics such as humorous comments about AI and comments linking AI to politicians emerged from the English-language comments. However, they accounted for only a small proportion of the data compared with the four major themes. As a result, these comments, as well as short affective expressions and sarcastic comments that lacked clear stances or were not directly related to AI and education, were coded under the category “Others.” The initial manual coding was conducted by the first author. Both coders, who are competent in both Thai and English, used the same coding criteria and theme definitions across both datasets to ensure consistency. Cohen’s Kappa values were 0.688 and 0.705 for the Thai dataset and English-language dataset, respectively, indicating substantial inter-rater agreement. As a result, we were able to apply all four major themes to the English-language dataset and indicate that the themes are transferable across contexts.

Next, the frequency of comments assigned to each theme was calculated for descriptive statistical analysis. As presented in Table 8, the most frequent theme in both datasets was “AI replacing teachers,” accounting for 31.15 percent of the comments on the TNN Tech post and 47.55 percent of the comments on the Sky News YouTube comment thread. This may indicate that discussions of AI in education are framed primarily through replacement discourse. This echoes public concern about whether AI will or should take over the pedagogical work traditionally associated with human educators. The other main themes, “Lack of humanity and ethics in AI teaching,” “Fears of dystopia,” and “Job loss and unemployment,” showed similar proportions across the two datasets. This similarity suggests shared concerns about the ethical, social, and economic implications of AI in education.

Table 8

Number of Comments and Proportion Based on Themes

Themes	TNN Tech		Sky News	
	Number of comments	Percentage	Number of comments	Percentage
AI replacing teachers	38	31.15	136	47.55
Lack of humanity and ethics in AI teaching	22	18.03	37	12.94
Fears of dystopia	16	13.11	22	7.69
Job loss and unemployment	13	10.66	20	6.99
Others	33	27.05	71	24.83

When analysing the sentiment associated with each theme, the noun phrases used as thematic labels may appear to imply positive or negative sentiment. Yet, a closer examination of the sentiment expressed within each theme shows that some themes are not straightforward or easily interpreted. As shown in Table 9, the theme “AI replacing teachers” contains the highest proportion of positive sentiment in both datasets. This may suggest that many commenters viewed AI as a potentially supportive or complementary tool. By contrast, the themes “Lack of humanity and ethics in AI teaching,” “Fears of dystopia,” and “Job loss and unemployment” were overwhelmingly negative. This reflects commenters’ concerns in both contexts about the ethical and societal impacts of AI integration. These negative themes imply that resistance to AI in education is not limited to its effectiveness and efficiency but extends to deeper anxieties regarding the meaning of teaching, the moral role of teachers, and the future of human labour. The strongly negative sentiment associated with “Lack of humanity and ethics in AI teaching” indicates that commenters viewed education not only as a process of knowledge transmission but also as a moral and ethical practice. Taken together, the thematic findings reveal a tension between AI as a possible solution to educational inefficiency, on the other hand, and as a threat to human agency and the moral foundations of education on the other.

Table 9

Manually Evaluated Sentiments of Comments within Themes

Themes	TNN Tech				Sky News			
	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Dominant Sentiment	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Dominant Sentiment
AI replacing teachers	6	5	27	Positive	43	25	68	Positive
Lack of humanity and ethics in AI teaching	17	4	1	Negative	34	2	1	Negative
Fears of dystopia	16	0	0	Negative	21	1	0	Negative
Job loss and unemployment	11	2	0	Negative	16	3	1	Negative
Others	4	12	17	Positive	31	24	16	Negative

4.4 Critical Discourse Analysis

In this section, van Dijk's four ideological strategies were identified through linguistic features such as lexical choice, modality, and negation. Quoted comments were also examined to analyse lexical items in context, particularly the representation of AI and teachers within the ideological categories of "Us" and "Them." The quoted comments used to support the CDA interpretations are distinguished as follows: this study uses the terms "Thai-language comments" to refer to data from TNN Tech's Facebook post, and "English-language comments" to refer to data from Sky News' YouTube channel, the original English-language source. Due to space limitations, quotations were selected based on their analytical relevance, manageable length, and comprehensibility. Where longer comments were relevant to the analysis, sufficiently informative and comprehensible excerpts were used. It should be acknowledged that the human/non-human binary recurs across all four themes, supporting the relevance of van Dijk's Ideological Square as the theoretical framework. However, each theme mobilises this opposition differently: through legitimacy and competence, morality and spirituality, economic insecurity, and fears of technocratic domination.

4.4.1 AI Replacing Teachers: De-legitimisation of Human Teachers

The discourse surrounding "AI replacing teachers" is not only related to technology and pedagogy but also involves ideological struggles over authority, legitimacy, and the transformation of education. In the Thai context, expressions with modals such as "น่าจะสอนได้" (can probably teach) and "น่าจะดี" (probably good) discursively constructed AI as a competent pedagogical agent. In this sense, these phrases position AI as a credible substitute for human educators. Supporters portray AI as capable of tasks such as designing assessments and evaluating students' learning. From this perspective, the positive construction of AI may reflect the normalisation of technological solutions in education.

Advocates further highlight personalised or individualised learning as a major benefit, implicitly challenging Thailand's one-size-fits-all classrooms. However, in traditional classroom settings, the dominance of assessment, especially multiple-choice testing, has led to negative washback effects. This affects both pedagogy and learning (Watson Todd et al., 2021). For example, a Thai-language comment states:

"ดีมากเลยนะ เพราะมันออกแบบคอร์สแต่ละบุคคลได้ หลักสูตรแบบเจ้าของภาษา มาตรฐานทั่วโลกปรับได้แค่ปลายนิ้ว" [Th-029]

"Very good because it (AI) can design individual courses, with native-speaker standard curriculum worldwide, adjustable at your fingertips..."

In Thailand, formal schooling fails to meet exam demands, and many students turn to private tutoring (Saengboon, 2019). As a result, AI is portrayed as a cost-effective replacement not only for conventional education but also for high-priced shadow schooling, aligning with existing research on technologies as solutions (e.g., Giannakos et al., 2025). These results are also in line with previous studies that students appreciate AI for its accessibility, efficiency, and adaptive feedback (Blahopoulou & Ortiz-Bonnin, 2025; Wang et al., 2025).

Some English-language comments similarly reflect pragmatic acceptance rather than ideological opposition:

"I think "Teacherless" scenarios are useful for remote and at risk communities which constantly face teacher shortages (of course to complement teachers)" [Eng-081]

"The educational system is so broken and non-functioning at the moment that any change is welcome and can't make it any worse than it already is." [Eng-118]

Although some English-language commenters remain sceptical, many adopt a balanced stance, which emphasises coexistence between AI and teachers:

"It's better to have both teachers and AI.. because the both help for better education." [Eng-011]

“It’s good to have teaching options and choose what’s more suitable for a student, as some AI can be better suited for some students, while others prefer human interaction ...” [Eng-034]

These patterns suggest that English-language comments normalise AI by positioning it alongside existing pedagogical tools, often linking it to earlier innovations, including online quizzes, multimedia labs, YouTube, and homeschooling. In this sense, English-language commenters position AI as part of educational continuity rather than disruption. This interpretation is consistent with previous studies, indicating that both faculty and students perceive generative AI as an emerging yet manageable extension of previous technologies (Kim et al., 2025). These English-language comments include:

“When I was younger majority of the teachers just put on YouTube videos for the subjects. So I don’t see a difference” [Eng-246]

“We could call it something catchy, like “homeschooling.”” [Eng-258]

However, comments from both Thai- and English-language social media contexts reveal that positive discourse about AI replacing teachers is also shaped by the delegitimisation of human educators, often reinforced by media narratives about “bad teachers.” In both contexts, commenters construct a polarisation between AI as incorruptible, rational, and fair, in contrast to human teachers as biased, abusive, or inefficient. A Thai-language comment reflects a strong criticism that reveals frustrations with the education system and portrays AI as a solution:

“...AI ไม่เลือกที่รักมักที่ชัง ไม่ดีเด็ก ไม่บ้าอำนาจ ไม่สั่งทำโทษแบบบ้าๆ ไม่มีลิม ไม่เอาเปรียบเด็ก พ่อแม่ต่อให้มีฐานะก็เจียเจี้ย AI ไม่ได้...” [Th-029]

“...AI doesn’t play favourites, doesn’t hit children, isn’t power-crazy, doesn’t give crazy punishments, doesn’t forget things, doesn’t take advantage of children. Even wealthy parents can’t bribe AI teachers...”

Although they are less common in the English-language dataset, some English-language comments also contain negative representations of teachers:

“Because the teachers make learning boring and AI will make it engaging.” [Eng-158]

“Teachers are lazy and selfish, they make poor role models...” [Eng-254]

In the Thai context, this negative representation of teachers may obscure deeper structural problems, such as large class sizes and policy misalignment. The discourse may shift public frustration away from systemic conditions and onto individual teachers. Furthermore, it may reproduce neoliberal education by framing technology as a depoliticised solution to complex educational issues. This negativity in both contexts is further intensified by social media’s preference for sensational and emotionally charged content. Such content may overemphasise teacher misconduct and inefficiency, thereby strengthening a neoliberal contrast between flawed human teachers and efficient GenAI. In this sense, this discourse aligns with van Dijk’s Ideological Square, which, in pro-AI discourse, emphasises positive information about AI while magnifying teachers’ flaws and suppressing their strengths.

4.4.2 Lack of Humanity and Ethics in AI Teaching: Humanity Argument against AI

In both Thai- and English-language social media contexts, opposition to AI replacing teachers is constructed through discourses of humanity, digital humanism, and moral conservatism, in which teachers are positioned as moral guides. This discourse may help maintain the traditional social order, in which the human teacher is viewed as a sacred and irreplaceable entity.

Linguistically, Thai-language comments are particularly salient in this discourse. They construct a dichotomy in which AI is represented as inhuman, devoid of distinctively human qualities such as emotion and imagination. An important part of this argument is the keyword “จิตวิญญาณ” (soul or spirit). This quality distinguishes human teachers, who are perceived as possessing spirit and morality, from AI, which is represented as lacking these qualities. The keyword “จิตวิญญาณ” (soul or spirit) frequently co-occurs with concepts of ethics and humanity. This reinforces the view that machines cannot

reproduce essential human qualities. This rhetoric often uses negation strategies, such as “ไม่มี” (does not have) and “ไม่ได้” (cannot). These negations are expressed with phrases such as “ไม่มีจิตวิทยา” (no psychological understanding), “ไม่มีจินตนาการ” (no imagination), and “ไม่มีทางแทนครู” (no way to replace teachers). These expressions demonstrate social expectations that educators transmit not only knowledge but also virtue, morality, and cultural norms. Furthermore, this expectation is associated with the position of teachers, which is deeply embedded in the Thai education system. Following van Dijk’s Ideological Square, this construction stresses the empathy and morality of “Us,” namely human teachers, while highlighting the deficiencies of ‘Them’, namely AI. Example Thai-language comments include:

“ครูไม่สอนแค่ความรู้ ครูสอนความเป็นคน ความดี จริยธรรม ร่วมไปด้วย ซึ่ง AI ทำไม่ได้” [Th-032]

“Teachers don’t just teach knowledge - they also teach humanity, goodness, and ethics, which AI cannot do.”

“เอไอจะมีอารมณ์ความรู้สึกแบบมนุษย์กับมนุษย์มีให้กันมั้ย ปกติครูนักเรียนจะมีความรู้สึกใกล้ชิดผูกพัน” [Th-042]

“Will AI have emotions and feelings like humans have for each other? Normally, teachers and students have close, bonding feelings.”

English-language comments also reflect a moral orientation, stressing the value of human presence in education:

“This is so sad - teacher are key to develop some human skills” [Eng-043]

“nightmare. human touch necessary must be part of human development” [Eng-109]

Comments from both contexts align with findings of previous literature that students and teachers around the world perceive AI’s limitations in terms of empathy and ethical judgement (Kim et al., 2025). Giannakos et al. (2025) likewise caution that, despite its efficiency, AI cannot replace the socioemotional dimensions of education. However, Thai discourse also draws on cultural beliefs associated with the term “จิตวิญญาณ” (both soul and spirit), highlighting a holistic understanding of teaching that integrates intellectual, moral, and emotional dimensions. This humanity-centred discourse is echoed in the Thai national education policy, particularly in the National Scheme of Education B.E. 2560–2579 (2017–2036) (Office of Education Council, 2017). The policy stresses moral development alongside academic development. This dominant ideology frames education as the cultivation of “good citizens,” who are intellectually capable yet morally upright. Thus, the discourse of AI’s lack of humanity and ethics has the ideological function of safeguarding teachers’ symbolic and moral authority against the reduction of education to technology.

4.4.3 Job Loss and Unemployment: AI as an Economic Threat

Although news coverage primarily focuses on the implications of AI in education and its impact on teachers and students, comments in both Thai- and English-language social media contexts extend beyond the classroom. The discourse suggests a broader concern that if AI can replace teachers, who work directly with humans, other professions may also be at risk of automation. This unemployment discourse portrays humans as economically vulnerable workers and can be connected to neoliberal anxiety about employability and economic insecurity. The following Thai-language comments reveal this concern:

“...ให้ AI ทำงานแทนมนุษย์ทั้งหมด มนุษย์ก็คือ ตกงาน...” [Th-011]

“...If AI completely replaces humans in work, humans will be unemployed...”

“...คนจะตกงานอีกหลาย...” [Th-038]

“...Many people will lose their jobs....”

Likewise, English-language comments echo widespread fears of mass unemployment and economic disruption. Examples include:

“Next will be AI reporters , AI bus drivers, taxi drivers, call centre workers,” [Eng-086]

“Artificial intelligence will let millions without jobs worldwide starving. Ignorance is bliss.” [Eng-241]

In both Thai- and English-language social media contexts, AI is constructed not only as a tool but as a symbolic threat. It is represented as an engine of economic instability and social disruption. Such representations echo historical narratives of technological disruption, particularly those surrounding the Industrial Revolution. These narratives are recontextualised in online discourse as a recurring struggle between human labour and mechanisation.

In the Thai context, this anxiety is also connected to Thailand’s policy discourse. Economic efficiency has long been a driving ideology in Thai education (Watson Todd, 2014). This emphasis is also reflected in government policy, such as the Ministry of Education Notification on Education Policy for the Fiscal Year 2025–2026 (Ministry of Education, 2024). The policy explicitly instructs schools to:

“Enhance the basic life skills of learners to earn an income during education and have a job after graduation.”

Thailand’s 2020–2027 Policy and Strategy pursue a similar goal, as well as its “National Brain Power Ecosystem,” which aims to “produce quality manpower for national development... especially for careers in research and innovation” (Office of National Higher Education Science Research and Innovation Policy Council, 2020). This rhetorical framing positions students as human capital, conceptualising universities as sites of economic production. However, such policies may not address some of the concerns raised in one of the Thai-language comments: “Why should humans study when in the future they’ll be unemployed anyway?” This sentiment reflects a tension between the internal and external goals of education. Rather than focusing solely on personal intellectual development, students are encouraged to learn skills that meet labour market demands. From this perspective, the discourse challenges the neoliberal assumption that education guarantees stable employment. It exposes tensions around the intellectual, moral, and economic purposes of education.

4.4.4 Fears of Dystopia: From Teacherless Classrooms to Imagined Societal Collapse

The theme “fears of dystopia” captures extreme scenarios in which AI may take control of human lives and society, ultimately leading to societal collapse. In this discourse, found in both Thai- and English-language social media contexts, AI is constructed as a threat. It is notable that perceptions of societal collapse are usually constructed as a threat that begins at the level of the microsystem in classrooms before expanding to macrosystems of social, political and economic organisation. This mirrors wider public attitudes that schools are the foundation of society: institutions that form moral and competent citizens needed for social functioning. If educational institutions fail in this role, the entire society is perceived to be at risk of collapse. Apocalyptic and hyperbolic language is used to sensationalise fears regarding the loss of human power to non-human or corporate-controlled systems.

Representative Thai-language comments are as follows:

“เมื่อ AI มีบทบาทในสังคมมนุษย์มากขึ้น สังคมมนุษย์พังแน่” [Th-034]

“As AI plays a bigger role in human society, human society will surely collapse...”

“...เอไอปกครองคนจนคนด้อยลงโลกไปเลย” [Th-066]

“...AI will rule humans and launch nuclear weapons to destroy the world.”

“ถ้าโครงเริ่มคล้ายหนังเรื่องคนเหล็กแล้วครับ ต่อไปมนุษย์ก็จะถูก ความคุมโดยปัญญาประดิษฐ์” [Th-099]

“The plot is starting to look like the Terminator movie. Soon humans will be controlled by artificial intelligence.”

Although the discourse is constructed through different rhetorical and cultural references, similar concerns are found in English-language comments:

“I am not a prophet, but AI will send humanity back to the dark ages.” [Eng-038]

“This gives heavy dystopian vibes.” [Eng-078]

The comments may be influenced by science fiction narratives, which intensify anxieties about AI domination. The intertextuality of these narratives also legitimises these fears, as they are tied to pre-existing cultural concerns. This can make the abstract threat of AI more tangible and even unavoidable. Drawing on van Dijk’s Ideological Square, this discursive strategy reinforces emphasis on the destructive aspects of “Them”, namely AI, while obscuring human control or downplaying human capacity to resist or determine their own future. However, most comments do not provide explicit reasons why AI use could lead to the collapse of society.

Nevertheless, a Thai-language comment suggests a potential connection between AI replacing teachers and a dystopian future:

“ผมว่าไม่สมควรจะทำแบบนั้นเพราะจะทำให้เด็กกลายเป็นทาสของ AI ไม่เชื่อฟังคนแต่ไปเชื่อฟัง AI มากกว่าต่อไป AI ก็จะคุมมนุษย์ได้ง่ายขึ้น” [Th-097]

“I don’t think this should be done because it will make children become slaves to AI, not listening to humans, but believing AI more. Later, AI will be able to control humans more easily.”

In this comment, the “teacherless classroom” can be interpreted as a symbol of moral and societal decline, in which dependence on AI may take away human judgement and autonomy.

These findings in both Thai- and English-language social media contexts are consistent with Bearman et al.’s (2023) study, which identified a persistent “dualism of dystopia-is-now versus utopia-just-around-the-corner” in AI discourse within higher education. Similarly, both datasets construct AI as enabling the transfer of authority from teachers and institutions to machines and corporations. This can possibly intensify fears of technocratic control, data exploitation, and reduced opportunities for critical thinking.

In addition to the four main themes, the category “Others” accounted for the second-largest proportion of comments in the thematic analysis. However, this category was dominated by brief affective expressions expressing positive or negative sentiment towards AI. These comments were often vague and did not directly address AI in education. A small number of both Thai- and English-language comments also related AI to political contexts. For example, some English-language comments referred to the “Trump 2024” campaign, while some Thai-language comments proposed that AI should replace politicians in order to eliminate corruption. In addition, only the Thai-language comments mentioned Thailand’s infrastructural readiness to implement AI, an issue also connected to government policy and political governance. These smaller shared and context-specific topics reflect the complexity and intertextuality of discourse of AI in education. Although they were not central themes, they suggest that public responses to AI in education are also shaped by political contexts and top-down governance in each national context, which may influence educational conditions as strongly as, or even more strongly than, AI itself.

5.0 Discussion

While the theme “AI replacing teachers” emerged as the most frequently discussed theme, the other three themes were predominantly associated with negative rather than positive sentiment. These negative perceptions of AI in education can be interpreted through van Dijk’s (1998) Ideological Square. This ideological discourse constructs a binary opposition between “Us” and “Them,” or “humans” and “non-humans.” In particular, the opposition between AI and human teachers is reinforced through the value placed on human educators’ ability to cultivate humanity, emotion, and ethics. These qualities are

viewed as aspects of being human that machines cannot easily replicate. The analysis shows that commenters across the Thai- and English-language datasets expressed shared concerns about ethical risks, the decline of human values, and uncertainty about AI's long-term impact on education. This finding is consistent with previous studies that have reported AI-related anxiety or concerns (e.g., Ng et al., 2021; Ravšelj et al., 2025; Rispler et al., 2025). It can be inferred that underlying anxieties about AI may cut across linguistic and cultural contexts.

In the Thai context, some commenters in this dataset often emphasised the cultural notion of “จิตวิญญาณ” (soul or spirit). The notion is associated not only with humanity, spirit, compassion, and holistic teaching, but also with long-standing cultural beliefs about the teachers' moral role. Some Thai commenters in the data often represent AI as lacking “จิตวิญญาณ” (spirit or soul), a belief that links education to holistic development, moral consciousness, and emotional cultivation rather than merely to knowledge transfer or economic efficiency. As a result, fears about AI reflect deeper cultural concerns about the loss of moral order and human connection. At the same time, despite these anxieties, positive portrayals of AI in the “AI replacing teachers” theme often emerged through comparisons with existing problems in the Thai education system. Negative representations of teachers created discursive space for AI to be positioned as a more trustworthy alternative. This reflects a dual polarisation (first, between human and non-human entities; and second, between the idealised teacher and the flawed real-life teacher). Such contextualised discourse aligns with van Dijk's (2009) theory of context, in which language users interpret social phenomena based on shared local experiences and socially grounded knowledge.

In contrast, some English-language commenters in this dataset normalise AI in teaching by comparing it to existing alternative or technology-assisted educational models, such as homeschooling, media labs, online tutoring, or YouTube-based learning. This discursive construction aligns with broader discussions of AI-supported pedagogy (Casal-Otero et al., 2023; Ravšelj et al., 2025). Rather than depicting AI as a direct replacement for human teachers, many English-language commenters framed it as a complementary tool that could support or enhance teaching and learning. This balanced stance is consistent with higher education studies showing that students and faculty members acknowledge AI's benefits while also expressing concerns about ethics, pedagogical integrity, and overreliance (Kim et al., 2025; Blahopoulou & Ortiz-Bonnin, 2025). In English-language social media discourse, which often appears to conceptualise education as a pragmatic system of skill development, AI is discussed in terms of efficiency, access, and innovation (Giannakos et al., 2025; Barrett & Pack, 2023). The similarities and differences in discursive construction across Thai- and English-language social media contexts highlight the role of socio-cultural beliefs in shaping AI discourse. Moreover, the ideological constructions identified in this study reveal how discourse not only reflects but also reproduces culturally embedded worldviews concerning the purpose of education and the meaning of being human in the age of AI.

The methodology used in this study also illustrates the use of AI in educational research. GenAI may help researchers gain insights and generate new knowledge. However, we observed that each AI-based sentiment analysis tool produced different results. This variation may result from differences in their underlying language models or from other unknown factors, since the inner workings of these “black boxes” are not fully transparent to users. As a result, we argue that human involvement is still essential for interpreting and evaluating AI-generated outputs. This mirrors the use of AI in education, where educators need to engage critically with AI, especially when deciding when and how it should be applied in teaching and learning. This methodological insight also points to a pedagogical dilemma: AI should function as a complement rather than a replacement for human insight, empathy, and ethical reasoning, which are qualities integral to both teaching and critical inquiry.

6.0 Conclusion

This study reveals complex public perceptions of AI in education. While “AI replacing teachers” emerged as the dominant theme, it contained both optimism and anxiety. Positive sentiment reflected the expectations that AI could offer efficient solutions in a system perceived as flawed, whereas negative sentiment expressed moral concerns about the loss of the human dimensions of teaching. When Thai-

language themes were applied to the English-language data, they captured similar issues, suggesting the cross-contextual relevance of shared concerns about education in the age of AI. However, cultural nuances shaped how these concerns were framed. Specifically, Thai social media users emphasised moral, emotional, and spiritual dimensions of education. By contrast, English-language commenters tended to normalise AI by comparing it with established non-traditional learning models, such as online platforms or homeschooling. In addition, some English-language comments expressed a balanced stance that favoured coexistence, in which AI could complement, but not replace human teachers. It is important to note that this study's data were limited to a specific group of social media users, which may not represent broader public opinion. Larger-scale data collection could provide a more comprehensive understanding of public opinion and discourse surrounding AI use in Thai education.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to acknowledge the financial support provided by Petchra Pra Jom Klao PhD Research Scholarship from King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi. The authors also sincerely thank the anonymous reviewers for their valuable and constructive feedback, which contributed to the improvement of this paper. In addition, the authors are grateful to Punjaporn Pojanapunya for her help with the use of AntConc software and related statistical knowledge.

Conflict of Interest

The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

Author Contribution Statement

US: Conceptualisation, Methodology, Formal Analysis and Investigation, Data Curation, Writing - Original Draft Preparation, Writing - Review and Editing, RWT: Supervision, Conceptualisation, Methodology, Writing - review and editing

Funding

This work was supported by Petchra Pra Jom Klao PhD Research Scholarship from King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi [Contract number 36/2566].

Ethics Statement

This research did not require IRB approval because it used publicly available secondary data from online comments. To protect commenters' privacy, usernames, profile links, profile pictures, and other identifying details were removed during data preparation and are not reported in the manuscript.

Data Access Statement:

Research data supporting this publication are available upon request to the corresponding author.

Author Biography

Udomsak Sirita is a PhD student in Applied Linguistics at King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi and an assistant professor at Maejo University, Thailand. His research interests include CDA and corpus linguistics.

Richard Watson Todd is a professor at King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi, Thailand. He has a PhD from the University of Liverpool. His research interests include text linguistics, corpus linguistics and educational innovations.

References

- Angkurawaranon, S., Inmutto, N., Bannangkoon, K., Wonghan, S., Kham-Ai, T., Khumma, P., Daengpisut, K., Thabarsa, P., & Angkurawaranon, C. (2024). Attitudes and perceptions of Thai medical students regarding artificial intelligence in radiology and medicine. *BMC Medical Education*, 24, Article 1188. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-024-06150-2>
- Anthony, L. (2024). *AntConc* (Version 4.3.1) [Computer software]. Waseda University. <https://www.laurenceanthony.net/software/antconc/>
- Anthropic. (2024). *Claude 3.5 Sonnet* [Large language model]. <https://claude.ai/>
- Apify. (2025). *YouTube Comments Scraper* [Web scraper]. <https://apify.com/streamers/youtube-comments-scraper>
- Ball, S. J. (2016). Neoliberal education? Confronting the slouching beast. *Policy Futures in Education*, 14(8), 1046–1059. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210316664259>
- Barrett, A., & Pack, A. (2023). Not quite eye to A.I.: Student and teacher perspectives on the use of generative artificial intelligence in the writing process. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20, Article 59. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00427-0>
- Bearman, M., Ryan, J., & Ajjaw, R. (2023). Discourses of artificial intelligence in higher education: A critical literature review. *Higher Education*, 86, 369–385. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00937-2>
- Blahopoulou, J., & Ortiz-Bonnin, S. (2025). Student perceptions of ChatGPT: Benefits, costs, and attitudinal differences between users and non-users toward AI integration in higher education. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30, 19741–19764. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-025-13575-9>
- BNC Consortium. (2007). *The British National Corpus* (XML edition) [Data set]. Oxford Text Archive. <http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14106/2554>
- Brathwaite, J. (2016). Neoliberal education reform and the perpetuation of inequality. *Critical Sociology*, 43(3), 429–448. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920516649418>
- Carroll, M. (2024, August 31). UK's first 'teacherless' AI classroom set to open in London. *Sky News*. <https://news.sky.com/story/uks-first-teacherless-ai-classroom-set-to-open-in-london-13200637>
- Casal-Otero, L., Catala, A., Fernández-Morante, C., Taboada, M., Cebreiro, B., & Barro, S. (2023). AI literacy in K–12: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 10, Article 29. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-023-00418-7>
- Coeckelbergh, M. (2024). What is digital humanism? A conceptual analysis and an argument for a more critical and political digital (post)humanism. *Journal of Responsible Technology*, 17, Article 100073. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrt.2023.100073>

- Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn University. (n.d.). *Thai National Corpus* (3rd ed.) [Data set]. <https://www.arts.chula.ac.th/ling/tnc3/>
- Dong, X., & Lian, Y. (2021). A review of social media-based public opinion analyses: Challenges and recommendations. *Technology in Society*, 67, Article 101724. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2021.101724>
- Elmholdt, K. T., Nielsen, J. A., Florczak, C. K., Jurowetzki, R., & Hain, D. (2025). The hopes and fears of artificial intelligence: A comparative computational discourse analysis. *AI & Society*, 40, 4765–4782. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-025-02214-z>
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Fütterer, T., Fischer, C., Alekseeva, A., Chen, X., Tate, T., Warschauer, M., & Gerjets, P. (2023). ChatGPT in education: Global reactions to AI innovations. *Scientific Reports*, 13, Article 15310. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-42227-6>
- Giannakos, M., Azevedo, R., Brusilovsky, P., Cukurova, M., Dimitriadis, Y., Hernandez-Leon, D., Järvelä, S., Mavrikis, M., & Rienties, B. (2025). The promise and challenges of generative AI in education. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 44(11), 2518–2544. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2024.2394886>
- Huai, S., Liu, S., Zheng, T., & Van de Voorde, T. (2023). Are social media data and survey data consistent in measuring park visitation, park satisfaction, and their influencing factors? A case study in Shanghai. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 81, Article 127869. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2023.127869>
- Humprecht, E., Hellmueller, L., & Lischka, J. A. (2020). Hostile emotions in news comments: A cross-national analysis of Facebook discussions. *Social Media + Society*, 6(1), Article 2056305120912481. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120912481>
- Jones, W. J., & Rhein, D. L. (2018). Tutorial schools in Thailand: Perceptions and motivations of Thai high school students. *FIRE: Forum for International Research in Education*, 4(2), 66–83. <https://doi.org/10.18275/fire201704021137>
- Karlsen, A. S., & Scott, K. D. (2019). Making sense of Starbucks' anti-bias training and the arrests of two African American men: A thematic analysis of Whites' Facebook and Twitter comments. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 32, Article 100332. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2019.100332>
- Kim, J., Klopfer, M., Grohs, J. R., Eldardiry, H., Weichert, J., Cox, L. A., & Pike, D. (2025). Examining faculty and student perceptions of generative AI in university courses. *Innovative Higher Education*, 50(4), 1281–1313. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-024-09774-w>
- Kim, J. J. H., Soh, J., Kadkol, S., Solomon, I., Yeh, H., Srivatsa, A. V., Nahass, G. R., Choi, J. Y., Lee, S., Nyugen, T., & Ajilore, O. A. (2025). AI anxiety: A comprehensive analysis of psychological factors and interventions. *AI and Ethics*, 5(4), 3993–4009. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-025-00686-9>
- Kordzadeh, N., & Young, D. K. (2018). Exploring hospitals' use of Facebook: Thematic analysis. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 20(5), Article e190. <https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.9549>
- Lampropoulos, G., Ferdig, R., & Kaplan-Rakowski, R. (2025). A social media data analysis of general and educational use of ChatGPT: Understanding emotional educators through Twitter data. *Educational Technology & Society*, 28(3), 51–65. [https://doi.org/10.30191/ETS.202507_28\(3\).SP05](https://doi.org/10.30191/ETS.202507_28(3).SP05)
- Leesa-Nguansuk, S. (2024, February 1). Thais among top social media users. *Bangkok Post*. <https://www.bangkokpost.com/business/general/2734744/thais-among-top-social-media-users>

- Li, J., & Huang, J.-S. (2020). Dimensions of artificial intelligence anxiety based on the integrated fear acquisition theory. *Technology in Society*, 63, Article 101410. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2020.101410>
- Lowe-Calverley, E., & Grieve, R. (2018). Thumbs up: A thematic analysis of image-based posting and liking behaviour on social media. *Telematics and Informatics*, 35(7), 1900–1913. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2018.06.003>
- Ministry of Education. (2024). *Ministry of Education notification on education policy for fiscal years B.E. 2568–2569*. Office of the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Education. <https://bps.moe.go.th/ministry-of-education-notification-on-education-policy-of-the-fiscal-year-2025-2026/>
- Mogavi, H. R., Deng, C., Kim, J. J., Zhou, P., Kwon, Y. D., Metwally, A. H. S., Tlili, A., Bassanelli, S., Bucchiarone, A., Gujar, S., Nacke, L. E., & Hui, P. (2024). ChatGPT in education: A blessing or a curse? A qualitative study exploring early adopters' utilization and perceptions. *Computers in Human Behavior: Artificial Humans*, 2(1), Article 100027. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbah.2023.100027>
- Muhammad, A., Wiratunga, N., & Lothian, R. (2016). Contextual sentiment analysis for social media genres. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 108, 92–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knosys.2016.05.032>
- National Electronics and Computer Technology Center. (n.d.). *S-Sense* [Computer software]. AI for Thai. <https://demo-service.aiforthai.in.th/sentiment/ssense>
- Ng, D. T. K., Leung, J. K. L., Chu, S. K. W., & Qiao, M. S. (2021). Conceptualizing AI literacy: An exploratory review. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 2, Article 100041. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2021.100041>
- Nida-Rümelin, J., & Weidenfeld, N. (2022). *Digital humanism: For a humane transformation of democracy, economy and culture in the digital age*. Springer.
- Office of Education Council. (2017). *The National Scheme of Education B.E. 2560–2579 (2017–2036)*. Ministry of Education. <https://www.onec.go.th/us.php/home/category/CAT0001145>
- Office of National Higher Education Science Research and Innovation Policy Council. (2020). *Higher education, science, research and innovation policy*. Ministry of Higher Education, Science, Research and Innovation. <https://www.nxpo.or.th/th/en/higher-education-science-research-and-innovation-policy>
- Ongardwanich, N., & Uppamaithichai, T. (2024). Development of the professional teacher spirituality scale. *Journal of Education and Innovation*, 26(3), 285–299. https://so06.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/edujournal_nu/article/view/269264
- Onoja, I. B., Bebenimibo, P., & Onoja, N. M. (2022). Critical discourse analysis of online audiences' comments: Insights from the Channels TV's Facebook audiences' comments on farmers–herders conflicts news stories in Nigeria. *SAGE Open*, 12(3), Article 21582440221119470. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221119470>
- OpenAI. (2024). *GPT-4o* [Large language model]. <https://chatgpt.com/>
- Pholphirul, P., Rukumnuaykit, P., & Teimrad, S. (2023). Teacher shortages and educational outcomes in developing countries: Empirical evidence from PISA-Thailand. *Cogent Education*, 10(2), Article 2243126. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2243126>
- Pojanapunya, P., & Watson Todd, R. (2018). Log-likelihood and odds ratio: Keynes statistics for different purposes of keyword analysis. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 14(1), 133–167. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cllt-2015-0030>

- Rangsarittikun, R., Watson Todd, R., & Louw, S. (2025). AI and politics: Do political ideologies influence people's views on AI? *Discourse and Interaction*, 18(1), 121–142. <https://doi.org/10.5817/DI2025-1-121>
- Ravšelj, D., Keržič, D., Tomaževič, N., Umek, L., Brezovar, N., Iahad, N. A., Abdulla, A. A., Akopyan, A., Segura, M. W. A., AlHumaid, J., Allam, M. F., Alló, M., Andoh, R. P. K., Andronic, O., Arthur, Y. D., Aydın, F., Badran, A., Balbontín-Alvarado, R., Saad, H. B., . . . Aristovnik, A. (2025). Higher education students' perceptions of ChatGPT: A global study of early reactions. *PLOS ONE*, 20(2), e0315011. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0315011>
- Reveilhac, M., Steinmetz, S., & Morselli, D. (2022). A systematic literature review of how and whether social media data can complement traditional survey data to study public opinion. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, 81(7), 10107–10142. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11042-022-12101-0>
- Rispler, C. H., Mashlach-Eizenberg, M., & Yakov, G. (2025). Understanding students' perceptions of generative AI: Implications for pedagogy and graduate employability. *Journal of Teaching and Learning for Graduate Employability*, 16(1), 145–170. <https://doi.org/10.21153/jtlge2025vol16no1art2084>
- Saengboon, S. (2019). Shadow education in Thailand: A case study of Thai English tutors' perspectives towards the roles of private supplementary tutoring in improving English language skills. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 12(1), 38–54. <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/168575>
- Sanmuang, K., Boonmoh, A., Inree, T., & Kha-angku, P. (2024). Exploring ChatGPT prompts used by Thai EFL elderly students to promote community products and their attitudes towards ChatGPT: Case study of Sakon Nakhon School for the elderly, Thailand. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 45(4), 1269–1278. <https://doi.org/10.34044/j.kjss.2024.45.4.20>
- Scarborough, W. J. (2018). Feminist Twitter and gender attitudes: Opportunities and limitations to using Twitter in the study of public opinion. *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World*, 4, Article 2378023118780760. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2378023118780760>
- Sierra, S. (2021). A Mexican Autodefensa Facebook group's use of binarity, legitimization strategies, and topoi of religion, family and struggle. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 42, Article 100497. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2021.100497>
- Sky News. (2024, August 31). *School introduces UK's first 'teacherless' classroom using artificial intelligence* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MHFCVbUcwIE>
- TNN. (2024, September 5). *Ang-grìt rêrm hông riian rái kroo cháí AI sǎn taen kroo má-nút bàep derm* [UK launches teacherless classrooms using AI to replace human teachers] [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MxmIIAzE0c>
- TNN Tech. (2024, September 5). *Ang-grìt rêrm hông riian rái kroo cháí AI sǎn taen kroo má-nút bàep derm* [UK launches teacherless classrooms using AI to replace human teachers] [Video]. Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/watch/?v=439443265796629>
- Tufekci, Z. (2014). Big questions for social media big data: Representativeness, validity and other methodological pitfalls. *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, 8(1), 505–514. <https://doi.org/10.1609/icwsm.v8i1.14517>
- van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. SAGE.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2009). *Society and discourse: How social contexts influence text and talk*. Cambridge University Press.

- Waluyo, B., & Kusumastuti, S. (2024). Generative AI in student English learning in Thai higher education: More engagement, better outcomes? *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 10, Article 101146. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.101146>
- Wang, C., Li, X., Liang, Z., Sheng, Y., Zhao, Q., & Chen, S. (2025). The roles of social perception and AI anxiety in individuals' attitudes toward ChatGPT in education. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 41(9), 5713–5730. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2024.2365453>
- Wang, G., Liu, Y., & Tu, S. (2023). Discursive use of stability in New York Times' coverage of China: A sentiment analysis approach. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 10(1), Article 666. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-02165-0>
- Wanniarachchi, V. U., Scogings, C., Susnjak, T., & Mathrani, A. (2023). Hate speech patterns in social media: A methodological framework and fat stigma investigation incorporating sentiment analysis, topic modelling and discourse analysis. *Australasian Journal of Information Systems*, 27. <https://doi.org/10.3127/ajis.v27i0.3929>
- Watson Todd, R. (2014). Education as an end in itself. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Thailand Inter-University Conference: Education innovation for the knowledge-based economy—Curriculum, pedagogy and technology* (pp. 9–15). https://arts.kmutt.ac.th/crs/downloads/article_repository/20170228153957-education-as-an-end-in-itself.pdf
- Watson Todd, R., Pansa, D., Jaturapitakkul, N., Chanchula, N., Pojanapunya, P., Tepsuriwong, S., Towns, S. G., & Trakulkasemsuk, W. (2021). Assessment in Thai ELT: What do teachers do, why, and how can practices be improved? *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 14(2), 627–649. <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/253377>