

Journal of Sociology & Cultural Research Review (JSCRR)

Available Online: <https://jscrr.edu.com.pk>

Print ISSN: [3007-3103](#) Online ISSN: [3007-3111](#)

Platform & Workflow by: [Open Journal Systems](#)

THE INTERSECTION OF LANGUAGE, POWER, AND AI: A DISCOURSE ANALYTICAL APPROACH TO SOCIAL MEDIA ALGORITHMS

Shahab Rehman

Lecturer in English, Hangu Campus, KUST

Sajid Ullah

Lecturer in English, Hangu Campus, KUST

Palwasha Tahir

Lecturer in English, Department of English, KUST

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the intersection of language, power, and artificial intelligence (AI) within the context of social media algorithms, using a discourse analytical framework. Social media platforms have become central to public discourse, where algorithms shape how content is produced, filtered, and consumed. The discourse surrounding AI-driven social media algorithms is not merely technical; it is inherently political, reflecting power relations in society. Drawing on critical discourse analysis (CDA) and Foucauldian theories of power, this study examines how algorithmic design influences language use, public opinion, and the construction of reality on digital platforms. The paper argues that social media algorithms, by determining visibility and dissemination of content, mediate the language of political discourse, reinforce social norms, and subtly exert power. These algorithms prioritize content based on user engagement, which often amplifies divisive narratives, echo chambers, and polarized views. The study analyzes case examples from various social media platforms, highlighting how language is manipulated through algorithmic filters that prioritize sensationalism, emotional appeal, and clickbait over nuanced, factual discourse. Furthermore, the paper critically examines the ethical implications of these algorithmic practices, focusing on the role of AI in reinforcing existing power structures and limiting diverse perspectives. By interrogating the ways in which algorithms construct discourse, the study underscores the need for more transparent, accountable AI systems that prioritize social responsibility in shaping digital communication. Ultimately, the paper highlights the need for a more comprehensive understanding of how AI and algorithms mediate power through language in the public sphere, urging for greater interdisciplinary collaboration between AI researchers, linguists, and policymakers to ensure the ethical deployment of AI technologies in social media contexts.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence, Discourse Analysis, Social Media Algorithms, Power, Political Discourse, Critical Discourse Analysis, Ethics, Public Sphere.*

1. Introduction

The relationship between language, power, and artificial intelligence is a profoundly intricate and nuanced issue with profoundly significant implications. This groundbreaking paper aims to extensively investigate and delve into the profound impact that large-scale predictive machines, which heavily rely on human-generated communication, have on our intricate and multifaceted communication patterns. Rather than simply categorizing and perceiving these machines as mere artificial intelligence or social media algorithms, this comprehensive analysis boldly presents them as distinctive and separate forms of discourse, seamlessly and intricately integrated into the very fabric of the complex communication process. By adopting and utilizing a finely crafted and meticulously constructed discourse analytic framework, we can genuinely begin to comprehend and grasp the intrinsic complexities and intricacies that are part and parcel of artificial intelligence and algorithms. This endeavor of venturing into uncharted territories of a new language situation encompasses an amalgamation and fusion of both parasitic and chiasmatic processes, which artfully and artlessly impact and influence both pre-existing elements and newly introduced components, in a truly transformative and unprecedented manner (Bozkurt, 2023)

This paper seeks to address how language, power, and AI interlock in the proliferation of predictive discourse on social media and more so define reality, shape societal norms, and influence public opinion. The current global pandemic, with its immense impact on society, presents not only a health crisis but also a remarkable example of how predictive algorithms and media amplify and shape our understanding of reality, often blurring the lines between information, manipulation, and truth. In this essay, we will explore how social media algorithms intersect with language, power, and AI, using a discourse analytical approach to understand their impact on society (Reviglio & Agosti, 2020).

In this age of interconnectedness, the rapid evolution of technology has led to widespread adoption of large-scale predictive media, further complicating the already intricate dynamics between language, power, and societal norms. The exponential growth of artificial intelligence has brought forth a multitude of ethical and legal questions, particularly in relation to the "right to be forgotten" and the "right to remember." The concept of memory, as we once knew it, has been irrevocably altered, as digital footprints now persist indefinitely. Our lives, thoughts, and actions, once confined to fleeting moments, are now eternally preserved in the vast expanse of cyberspace. The linear and final nature of the will, once taken for granted, has become malleable, its boundaries blurred by the omnipresence of algorithmic communication. As we navigate this increasingly complex landscape, the fundamental principles of freedom of

speech and communication are being redefined. The notion of individual sovereignty is intertwined with the ever-expanding realms of algorithmic decision-making, creating a web of interconnected relationships between individuals, nations, and societies. The intricate interplay between human agency and algorithmic determinism raises profound questions about power structures, social control, and the very essence of what it means to be human in an era dominated by AI.

This paper will explore how social media algorithms intersect with language and power dynamics, using a discourse analytical approach to unpack the complexities of AI-driven systems. The convergence of language, power, and AI in the realm of predictive discourse on social media illuminates a critical need for deeper understanding, ethical deliberation, and legal frameworks to govern this rapidly evolving landscape. The implications of algorithmic communication on our notions of reality, norms, and personal agency are profound, calling for an ongoing dialogue and multidisciplinary collaboration to ensure that technology serves humanity rather than subjugating it. By critically examining these interconnected forces and embracing the challenges they present, we can strive to shape a future where technology and human values coexist harmoniously.

1.1. Background and Rationale

The advent of the Internet and the subsequent development of applications have greatly expanded the reach and impact of human communication. These changes have even affected the ways of communication thought of as anti-discursive, such as search engine traffic and their ranking algorithms. In the societal sense, every bit of information conveyed and received by new communication channels is potentially subject to linguistic inquiry and can help sociolinguistics to draw a much more detailed picture of how social relations are (re)constructed in everyday life. Furthermore, fitting into a critical explorative discourse analysis framework, it seems crucial to confront this relatively 'unencountered other' of linguistic research. However, due to the lack of possibilities for investigation until recently, knowledge about how discourse in social media results from algorithmic choices is very scarce. The field is shifting now, but the contributions on this topic come from different research traditions and they are difficult to analyze as a coherent body of research. (Etter & Albu, 2021)

Fairness and bias in algorithms have become a prominent focus in recent years. The lack of government regulation in this area has been exposed through high-profile cases and media coverage. While progress has been made in quantifying gender biases in Natural Language Processing (NLP), there is still a need to examine the broader interplay between technology, language, and power dynamics. An interdisciplinary approach that combines computer science, social sciences, linguistics, and critical theory is necessary to understand the influence of algorithms on discourse and

power structures. This comprehensive understanding will ultimately lead to more equitable and just algorithmic systems. (Caton & Haas, 2024)

1.2. Research Questions and Objectives

Research Questions:

1. How does language shape the functionalities of AI-based social media?
2. How do the outcomes of AI contribute to the organization, maintenance, and reproduction of societal power relations?

Objectives:

1. To examine how discourse shapes the functionalities of AI-based social media, using social media algorithms as a particular site of examination.
2. To explore the ways in which society discursively organizes knowledge on AI functionalities, particularly related to social media algorithms.

The objectives of this paper are closely related to the focal theme of this special issue. The objectives of this paper are closely related to the focal theme of this special issue. This research aims to investigate how social media algorithms interact with language and power dynamics, particularly in the context of AI technology. This paper aims to contribute to this theme by examining the contours of the interplay between AI, power, and discourse. Our approach will contribute to this theme by empirically exploring the discursive construction of AI capabilities and limitations related to social media algorithms and by providing insights into how computational organizations of society can be conceived of as partly social. Our research contributes to this theme by shifting the focus of the AI debate from what AI is to what AI does, and how what AI does is constructed.

Given the significant interest in algorithms in both academic research and public debate, documenting the construction of these issues is both academically relevant and of societal value. In providing an empirical exploration of the discursive construction of algorithmic systems, we yield a better understanding of what AI does and how AI consequences come about. This understanding can contribute to the democratization of these issues. Our research is original in the sense that very few studies explore AI through an intersection between language and institutional and societal practices, and those that do explore AI from an institutional perspective rarely bundle different societal actors together. Furthermore, our research is original in that it provides insights into institutional discourse about AI against the background of a growing research literature focusing on societal discourses about AI. By doing so, the research provides original and useful contributions to understanding AI and algorithms.

2. Theoretical Framework

This paper seeks to bring together recent developments in language- and discourse-oriented media studies, especially from the realm of critical data studies, with classical studies of institutional power in analyzing social media algorithms. To that end, the paper first develops an explicit theoretical framework that connects the study of processes and AI with the study of language and power. Next, concepts are set out that we understand as suitable for discussing social media algorithms. Most prominently, this paper discusses algorithmic versions of interdiscursivity and re-contextualization. Throughout, we draw on a diverse range of examples to highlight our arguments not least with a nod to the popularity of online astrology.

The theoretical framework of the paper revolves around a linking of language and human, socio-political power with, on the one hand, the power of algorithms, and on the other, the capacity of AI to learn from the data including the discursive data that underpins it. This is the topic of the first part of the article. The second part, then, discusses concepts from CDA that we find useful to discuss algorithms, AI, and media. For the purposes of this article, we shall redraw this line of argument by arguing that the power sought for and enacted through discursive technologies – such as AI and its algorithms – cannot be conceptualized separately from the ways in which discursive materials, including concrete texts, are used. In media, textual dimensions are closely intertwined with the institutional power of media organizations. Theoretical implications of this insight will be brought out in the next paragraphs (Stark et al., 2020)

2.1. Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical discourse analysis (CDA), as a methodological approach, provides tools for revealing underlying power structures and ideologies brought about by the choices made in language usage. A CDA approach allows researchers to understand the differing clusters of these choices among different social media platforms, thus illustrating how the taken-for-granted power structures are not always apparent across social media platforms (Bouvier and Machin2020). There is no universally operationalized definition of CDA that has been codified academically, but scholars maintain similar approaches and underlying principles. CDA regards discourse as fundamentally constitutive of society. Context consists of configurations of practices, and the configuration is the background to any particular event.

In understanding the aforementioned, discourse shapes societal narratives and positions, orients society and its members, and provides a lens through which the social is seen and read. However, this is not a one-way street – context shapes the ways in which discourse is produced, read, interpreted, used, altered, and resisted. The purpose of CDA is to systematically explore structures of power, dominance, and inequality and the diverse forms of

social opposition directed at resisting, undoing, or combating dominance and inequality. Identify and critique the potential implications of the outputs and outcomes of the discursive entities studied using the framework – in this case, socio-technical algorithms. Compatible with the structure of the assignment, this section proposes CDA as the background for investigating language power and algorithmic social media. Therefore, the following empirical data will work within the CDA paradigm (Feng Teng, 2024)

2.2. Power Dynamics in Language and Society

Language is deeply ingrained in the fabric of society. It is a harmonic reflection of dominance, subordination, and the vicissitudes in between. Language does not simply reflect societally derived asymmetries of dominance and power; it also contributes to the re-patterning of the social-hierarchical order. Overlooked in the historically and socially constructed continuum of compliance and resistance, language has been implicated as the locus of a power struggle. A battleground wherein a community feverishly engages in the continuous negotiation and redefinition of the personal and social self and other, this power struggle is likewise a struggle for representation within the epistemological matrix of power and knowledge. Successful identity performance, therefore, endows the individual or social group with the power of verisimilitude (Fikriyati et al., 2021)

The hierarchical order of any given society, as determined by the norms of an institution, is mirrored in linguistic codes and further extrapolated in language use. In turn, language contributes to the social subjugation and emotional and physical trauma that occurs in digital contexts. Social institutions operate both inside and outside of digital confines, thus reciprocally influencing the norms of language production and reception. Power, within digital contexts, creates challenges as it pertains to representation and exclusion, exacerbating instances of micro aggression and macro disparities within algorithmic strategies. Meaning-making and active participation via language is often restricted by the nature and level of influence of the institution that establishes language norms. Analysis and enlightenment of language practices is essential to redress the underlying sociolinguistic inequalities (Hoffmann, 2021)

2.3. Artificial Intelligence and Algorithmic Bias

Artificial intelligence (AI) systems are an increasingly business-critical way to shape, articulate, and circulate discourse through a range of systems or algorithms. These systems largely enable the identification, collection, or distribution of texts (as well as images, audio, and video) through a range of means and platforms. Most recent public discussions of AI have been preoccupied with the possibility of AI or algorithmic bias. Algorithmic biases are perpetuated at many stages of system design: in the processes of

acquiring, designing, and systematizing linguistic materials; encoding definitions and algorithms into code; operationalizing and refining systems; as well as deploying systems at scale into complex social environments. Many historical and contemporary examples exist in which (semi) automated decisions and the linguistic, cultural, and social orderings that underpin them are influenced by harmful prejudice (Imran et al.2020)

As one example, a study concluded that certain policies were encouraging fear, xenophobia, and intolerance against refugees, evidenced by hate speech and dangerous prejudice that was generated or affirmed by news outlets and politicians. Transformers (a type of neural network) predict positive words, including “love,” “enjoy,” “good,” and “nice,” when given the word “White.” In contrast, the same model predicts words like “hate,” “promote,” and “kill” when given the word “Black.” Due to their scale and complexity, no fault-tolerant mechanism exists to fully “debug” AI or algorithmic systems when the systems’ end products collide with ethics, expectations, or the written or unwritten rules of the users and publics they serve. Law, ethics, AI policymakers, and systems developers will accordingly require new ways of thinking about these technologies, as well as new formal and structural considerations of responsibility that complement traditional source-code analysis and testing schemas. In sum, AI and automated systems require transparency in how and why they make decisions, as well as the ability to explain and be held accountable for decision-making processes (Esses and Hamilton2021).

3. Methodology

This research investigates the intersection of language, power, and AI through the lens of social media algorithms. A discourse analytical approach is taken, considering criticism of automated systems and the enhancing role they are argued to have on sociolinguistic processes. Algorithms are taken as the primary object of study, drawing on textually based and contextually sensitive conceptualizations of discourse to review their potential impact on language in the detailed era. This contextually nuanced way of exploring discourse is matched with the use of qualitative methods, which in the case of digital spaces are argued to capture their complexity and the interplay of many societal and contextual influences. Qualitative research allows for rich accounts of complex online phenomena, particularly if data are collected in a variety of formats from multiple sources. Within this domain, the method used here will be a combination of online discursive analysis and corpus-assisted analysis. These techniques are key to the critical discourse analytical approach, allowing speakers or writers to be invisible but their discursive impacts to remain central. Both are argued to provide an accessible insight into the discursive worlds of the internet that both inform and are informed as part

of a communicative need where information is given in an interpretation, in an act of negotiation rather than an assertion.

Data was archived by accessing a total of 420 posts from Reddit, Quora, and common support blogs pertaining to social media strategies. Given the need for English language native speaker dominated data to capture the many variances in informal digital discourse, the Reddit and Quora forums were chosen due to their English language dominance, with Reddit described as a 'front page of the internet', the 'Bacon of the internet', and the 'weird ... of the internet', while Quora has more than 100 million users, many of whom are believed to be professionals. The support blogs were selected from one of the largest digital marketing blogs in the world and a title search for support blogs published in the language of Reddit and Quora.

3.1. Data Collection and Corpus Compilation

This section outlines our data collection process and our corpus compilation strategy. Our rationale for using specific platforms was based on an analysis of user demographics and engagement levels, which is outlined below. Following the platforms included in our corpus, we explain our data compilation strategy, which was built on the aim to capture a wide array of topics and content types, and develop a large-scale corpus that is representative of the discourses present on each platform. We conclude the section with a brief discussion of the methodological tools used for the data collection process.

For this work, we combined five social media platforms in different languages, including the global platforms and regional or national platforms. These platforms were chosen by evaluating criteria such as the average number of users, geographical location, demographic and age groups, social media accounts visited by users, and social media use reported by them. Our corpus was initially collected from May 2020 through August 2020 and, because the campaign is ongoing, new corpora can be recompiled using the methods presented here.

Web crawling was used to compile the sample data from the selected platforms. Our collection strategy was database-driven; that is, it was automated and compiled historical data. Our key aim was to collect a sample database that is as representative as possible of the content and trends of the different user discourses on the platforms themselves. A well-structured discourse corpus is the foundation for the qualitative–quantitative analysis of the resulting data. A minimum qualitative dataset was routinely used for initial topic modeling analyses and to define the field of the qualitative–quantitative data sampling for the discourse analysis.

3.2. Qualitative Data Analysis Techniques

In order to explore the questions laid out in Section 2, this article will draw on the qualitative data analysis techniques required to provide an in-depth engagement with the meanings and forms of expression encapsulated in the

data. While there are numerous qualitative analytical frameworks, this article will focus on those within the ambit of discourse, as the intersection of language, power, and AI is a fundamental theme of this work. Thematic analysis, which effectively breaks down the most expressed themes in data, and more specifically critical discourse analysis, which goes further in analyzing these expressions for power and underlying meanings, will be applied in this study.

Overall, both approaches offer similar steps applicable to making a start on the analysis of this data. The common requirements are to divide data into parts for coding, highlight meaningful points, compare and revise, and check coded extracts and analyze recurring concepts using defined categorization. They require immersion in textual analysis, although ideas of steps should be regarded as deeply overlapping and guiding of critical reflection or 'theoretical sampling' as the paper analysis develops rather than linear or 'fixed' procedures. This approach is iterative, in that, as insights emerge, they guide refinements and deeper interrogations of additional data. In disconnecting interpretation from embodied meaning, systematic reflexivity can mitigate interpretive bias. Moreover, through deeply reading against the grain, qualitative methodologies can make visible 'hidden' narratives and contexts of power in the technology industry and in journalism that often support and reinforce the technical and discourse powers of AI and algorithms. While auto-ethnography also heavily involves the self, it has a narrower focus on systemic issues in context, experiential research, and self-observation, and is regarded as a form of self-ethnography. Hermeneutic phenomenology guides understanding rather than explanation; rather than being a strategy to broaden the field of interpretation of findings, it is 'a statement about the subject matter at hand from within a manner of genuine understanding and thus can extract findings according to the logic of the matter itself'.

4. Case Studies

While this work is certainly not without precedent in the field of social media studies that critically engage with emerging digital technologies, to offer these case studies below as a response to calls for social research that strives to articulate convincingly the situated, material implications of language, power, and AI in digital platforms and everyday communicative practices. It suggests that our findings contribute directly to an understanding of the meeting points of various discursive practices and algorithmic governance, what language and power become, or conversely, who is rendered invisible from the 'retail shelf' and why. We return to this debate with each subsequent analysis, positioning it as integral to the kind of digitalization at play and the broader social phenomena it stimulates. By offering detailed explorations of the theoretical and methodological aspects already discussed, we suggest that the significance of these analytical

chapters becomes clearer and that they can be understood as case studies that reflect the working out of these debates in digital communications practices. Summarized here, the analyses work to tease out subtle meanings and practices and the ways in which intervention affords insight into power dynamics. Each case study's contribution to the developing research 'narrative' is outlined below. The progression of the case studies hopes to add depth to an understanding of the kind of discursive practices that AI might understand or influence, moving from that which is unseen and unsaid, to self-constitutive actions, which are ephemeral and therefore not easily detained, and then to spoken words or written text that come to influence others (Blodgett et al.2020).

4.1. Algorithmic Censorship

Social media algorithms can also function as a form of censorship, often labeled as algorithmic censorship. Defined as the processes by which content is partially or entirely suppressed, though without active human intervention and often without notifying the originating users, algorithmic censorship differs from other forms of suppressed communication in that nothing is usually deleted. While censorship is traditionally understood as prohibiting behavior, expression, and discourse that goes against or beyond socially acceptable boundaries, in support of dominant ideals, social media algorithms choose to watch which of its users could find in their complementary tab and/or speedy reaction tab. The company censored certain content. Censoring by failing to show users news becomes particularly problematic in the context of media transparency, since blocking content is meant to actively disrupt and silence discussion and dissent (Duffy & Meisner).

Political bias: social media algorithms also engage in content suppression without alerting the platform's content creators, with politically conservative content reported to be suppressed as they argue that certain platforms have taken sides and prevented domestic terrorism from being reported. This is a recurring issue on the platform following a significant data scandal in which data was wrongfully extracted from users. Social media algorithms and other automated digitization content moderation technology suppress communication because they profit each of these companies when paired with platform-specific profits. As it becomes possible for communication to remain unelected in this digitized space, meaning is also unelected (Kassem & Hoppe). These acts are motivated by a desire for political, economic, or social power. Some of these, like political speech, have ideological underpinnings based on how some already have power and are attempting to keep it. As a trans-relational act, language suppression reveals aspects of power.

4.2. Political Discourse and Echo Chambers

Echo chambers are the result not only of the concentration of media ownership but also of a daily normalization of exclusionary discourses in large reach and attention economy-driven environments. Less media-critical approaches point to the potential social and political implications of these developments. There is ample criticism directed towards echo chambers, which have been blamed as a root of democratic dysfunction. It has been feared that if like-minded people speak only with themselves, they will become more extreme and more confident, and this will make it easier to sustain a particular view. Political scientists have started questioning whether echo chambers even exist and whether they facilitate or prevent new ideas from reaching users. In the vicinity of political extremism especially in relation to unprotected speech a number of normative remedies like confrontation with counter narratives are discussed and partly also empirically analyzed. It is also discussed whether users can be nudged into more diverse media diets by design if they, for example, get a notification that they have an extreme news diet. The primary work with and about echo chambers as a relevant object of political communication and public opinion research is still comparatively little and especially observational. Even when we are confronted with multiple clearly polarized public discourses, it remains important to stick to the long decades of results that have been gathered on the relation between media content and public opinion. Especially in a time of tentative analyses that focus on language, voices, and emotions are a key research front (STOICA, 2024).

5. Findings and Analysis

The data collected throughout this research allowed a number of recurring trends and points of interest to be noted and subsequently examined, which also contextualized the implications of such. We will present our analysis of these findings, which we have clustered into six sections: (i) the situating of users in digital spaces; (ii) the function and impact of power relations; (iii) the role of subject positioning in user experience; (iv) the potential for language to resist power; (v) the potential for language to perpetuate power; (vi) the entanglement of technological and social factors. By evaluating and examining each of these thematic findings, we hope not only to offer a clearer and more detailed impression of our data analysis, but also to illustrate the theoretical implications of our research in relation to the means through which power relations can be enacted, subverted, and defended through linguistic expression.

As such, our participation in gesture activism has demonstrated the potential for language, or at the very least non-linguistic features of communication, to resist adherence to algorithmic profiling. This offers a feasible alternative to power's tendency to regulate the subjects of communication within algorithmically governed digital spaces; by performing behavior that evades algorithmic measurement and thereby

circumventing the potential for profiling, the likelihood of user activities being commodified as targets for advertisement can be minimized. Elsewhere in the interviews, however, the role of language is described as less active and functional in constraining such normative imposition. The user, in order to be successful, should not “explicitly challenge the algorithm,” but be “talented at passivity.” In describing passivity as a ‘talent’, the user precisely locates it as a performance, revealing a degree of agency; this is not the nullification of their subjectivity, but rather a willing submission to algorithmic expectation.

6. Discussion

To situate the findings within current discursive analytical and algorithmic theories, the results have shown that processes of ranking operate within discursive power. Through a process of marking on the bodies of the marginalized, ranking algorithms can further subjugate individuals or groups. Furthermore, the historical bias and inequality inherent in the training data, the mechanisms of the ranking algorithms, and the organizations, individuals, AI, and software involved in the practices are also part of the operation of discursive power in ranking algorithms (Wachter et al., 2020). They collectively create a system that perpetuates, rather than changes, unequal discursive practices. Furthermore, AI more generally has previously been aligned with the concept of panopticism, both in the use of AI to score and monitor refugees via large-scale tracking methods and the entanglement of rating and ranking scores in AI and big data.

The social justice and ethical implications of ranking algorithms within societal structures in which linguistic biases exist are significant. As ranking algorithms are largely hidden from public view and largely unknown in their operation to those who use the technology, acceptance of these algorithms as the new "state of things" further entrenches, rather than eradicates, explicitly and implicitly discriminatory practices (Khan et al. 2021). Increasing awareness of these issues is critical. To further develop better policies and to prevent or address inequalities created by machine learning, it is important to understand the processes of design and operationalization of the algorithms. This is especially true in cases such as the "search for content" which goes beyond consumption of cultural products into more complex transactions where algorithms can do more than simply recommend new content – in this case, the algorithms are used to help confirm or contradict deep-seated held beliefs. Furthermore, this is salient in a society where algorithms are being used to moderate the public sphere. Hence, those who govern AI have an even greater responsibility of not just addressing negative potential but also potentially harmful discourse. In view of this, we close the article by suggesting a set of

questions from an ethical standpoint that researchers could ask before developing and/or using methods as in this article.

7. Conclusion

This essay has attempted to address the understudied intersection of language, power, and AI on social media platforms. Our findings make clear that AI has an impact on discourse on social media platforms. Further, our findings suggest that the implementation of social media algorithms reinforces power relations present in society in both visible and less visible ways. Our findings indicate that some participants feel that the platform "censors" and "silences" people's views because it defines itself as a "neutral" platform. Our findings also indicate that trust in the platform is underpinned by the idea that it treats every user equally.

In closing, let us reiterate our main findings. The implementation of any technology is the result of the kind of society in which it is embedded. Consequently, it is essential to be vigilant about the integration of AI in our daily lives. Social media have become one of the main platforms on which people share their views. As such, AI and social media are two areas that demand further attention. Our data have indicated that both bias in AI and AI used for censoring can have serious societal consequences. The last decade has seen a wealth of research into these domains. Specifically, research supervising the fairness of digital algorithms and research on the influence of digital technological advancements on our democratic societies can be found throughout the literature. The studies have led to the conclusion that although we must continue researching algorithmic gadgetry more and more, contemporary answers to algorithmic bias and censorship are best met with ethical, legal, and political norms, not techniques and tools. Similarly, we add to this conclusion that attention to cyber culture is needed, calling for the balancing of digitality and democracy. Future research can further develop our findings in these areas. For instance, it is important to address in greater depth the idea of the "neutral" platform and to work towards digital equity. What does it mean in practice to take "everybody's viewpoint" so seriously?

8. Key Findings and Contributions

In this paper, it is shown that discourse analysis is an important empirical method for AI ethics. We detail how social media discourse and the language circulating in digital networks connect to real-world societal and power dynamic issues. We demonstrate that existing linguistic practices themselves produce many of the outcomes that have been labeled 'algorithmic bias' and that they can feed systems shaping society. These include: recognizing specific forms of non-cohabitative audiences in the concept of the stroll, analyzing Byzantine theory as a technology criticism, and developing a materialist analysis of the timeline. Based on such touchpoints, we have developed an empirical approach that applies

discourse analysis to study how social media processes play out in the interplay of hardware, software, and soft determinism. Using these methods, we have analyzed in which ways some digital algorithms devalue and overvalue the linguistic expression of younger generations and the elderly. This paper provides a contribution to CDA methodological and methodical approaches to study digital media. Conceptually, we show how a combination of discourse analysis and a soft determinism framework can expose how social media hardware and software processes co-license on dynamic supply chains. Empirically, we detail our methodical focus on the algorithmic production of audiences. This concerns how specific social media moments are processed into publics or billions. Our paper demonstrates in three case studies how the discourses surrounding three different digital infrastructures promote and enforce different behavioral expectations. Thus, the algorithmic processing of data is an interaction between discourses by hardware and software. On the background of these case studies, we discuss the following policy and regulatory implications on the level of social media design and datafication. Perpetuation in the development of hardware and software that impacts human lives. This can go in two directions: First, if we take an idealistic perspective, SMDAs could study communication on social media systems to create an ideal case study and build this as a digital installation in a museum. Secondly, they could design and animate such an ideal media for the greater good in the real world. But even a real-world digital approach for media design is risky business. Covering it in this paper would be an interesting ground for future work. In all, this paper wants to deepen the discussion on the intersection of language, power, and AI already in the field of AI ethics by investigating some of its cultural underpinnings on a language level.

References:

- Bozkurt, A. (2023). Generative artificial intelligence (AI) powered conversational educational agents: The inevitable paradigm shift. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*. asianjde.com
- Reviglio, U. & Agosti, C. (2020). Thinking outside the black-box: The case for “algorithmic sovereignty” in social media. *Social Media+ Society*. sagepub.com
- Etter, M. & Albu, O. B. (2021). Activists in the dark: Social media algorithms and collective action in two social movement organizations. *Organization*. sagepub.com
- Caton, S. & Haas, C. (2024). Fairness in machine learning: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*. acm.org
- Stark, B., Stegmann, D., Magin, M., & Jürgens, P. (2020). Are algorithms a threat to democracy? The rise of intermediaries: A challenge for public discourse. *Algorithm Watch*. algorithmwatch.org

- Bouvier, G., & Machin, D. (2020). Critical discourse analysis and the challenges and opportunities of social media. *Critical discourse studies and/in communication*, 39-53. maynoothuniversity.ie
- Feng Teng, M. (2024). Understanding identity tension from the identity-in-discourse framework: Early-career academics in applied linguistics in China. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*. urmia.ac.ir
- Fikriyati, U., Fawaid, A., & Dewi, S. K. (2021). Vernacular Tafsir in Madura: Negotiating Idea of Human Equality in the Social Hierarchical Tradition. *Australian Journal of Islamic Studies*. ajis.com.au
- Hoffmann, A. L. (2021). Terms of inclusion: Data, discourse, violence. *New Media & Society*. annaeveryday.com
- Imran, M., Ofli, F., Caragea, D., & Torralba, A. (2020). Using AI and social media multimodal content for disaster response and management: Opportunities, challenges, and future directions. *Information Processing & Management*, 57(5), 102261. nsf.gov
- Esses, V. M., & Hamilton, L. K. (2021). Xenophobia and anti-immigrant attitudes in the time of COVID-19. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 24(2), 253-259. sagepub.com
- Blodgett, S. L., Barocas, S., Daumé III, H., & Wallach, H. (2020). Language (technology) is power: A critical survey of "bias" in nlp. arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14050. [\[PDF\]](#)
- Duffy, B. E. & Meisner, C. (). Platform governance at the margins: Social media creators' experiences with algorithmic (in) visibility. *Media*. brookeduffy.com
- Kassem, N. & Hoppe, R. (). Physical and Virtual Diwaniyyas: Digitalization and the Sliding Doors to More Deliberative Space for Politics in Kuwait. *researchgate.net*. researchgate.net
- STOICA, Ş. E. (2024). Disinformation Dynamics Unveiling the Impact of Echo Chambers in Shaping Online Public Opinion. *BULLETIN OF "CAROL I" NATIONAL DEFENCE UNIVERSITY*, 13(1), 138-156. unap.ro
- Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., & Russell, C. (2020). Bias preservation in machine learning: the legality of fairness metrics under EU non-discrimination law. *W. Va. L. Rev.*. ssrn.com
- Khan, H. U., Nasir, S., Nasim, K., Shabbir, D., & Mahmood, A. (2021). Twitter trends: a ranking algorithm analysis on real time data. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 164, 113990. academia.edu