

Peer Review

Review of: "Unveiling Power and Ideologies in the Age of Algorithms: Exploring the Intersection of Critical Discourse Analysis and Artificial Intelligence"

Paris Zaeri¹

1. Bauhaus Universität Weimar, Germany

This article presents a compelling exploration of the intersection between Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Artificial Intelligence (AI), offering valuable insights into how language, power, and technology interact in the digital age. The author effectively argues for the importance of integrating CDA into AI research to uncover biases, ideological assumptions, and power dynamics embedded in AI systems. The interdisciplinary approach is timely, addressing a critical gap in understanding the societal implications of AI-mediated communication.

One of the article's key strengths is its rigorous qualitative methodology, which combines document analysis of AI-generated texts with semi-structured interviews involving developers, researchers, and users. This multi-method approach provides a nuanced understanding of the issues at hand, revealing how AI technologies can perpetuate social inequalities through language and discourse. The application of Fairclough's three-dimensional CDA framework is particularly effective, as it systematically dissects textual features, discourse practices, and sociocultural contexts to expose hidden biases in AI systems. The findings are well-supported by concrete examples, such as gendered and racial biases in AI-generated content, and the analysis is enriched by direct quotes from participants, adding depth to the discussion.

The article also excels in translating theoretical insights into practical recommendations. Suggestions like developing bias-detection algorithms, establishing ethical guidelines for AI content generation, and promoting participatory design processes demonstrate a clear commitment to fostering more equitable

and inclusive AI technologies. These proposals are not only relevant for researchers but also for policymakers and industry practitioners seeking to address ethical challenges in AI development.

However, the study could benefit from a broader empirical scope. The analysis of only three AI-generated news articles and interviews with five participants, while insightful, limits the generalizability of the findings. Expanding the dataset—for instance, by examining a wider range of AI-generated texts or including more diverse stakeholders—would strengthen the study’s conclusions. Additionally, while the article acknowledges the challenges of interdisciplinary collaboration between humanities scholars and computer scientists, this discussion remains somewhat superficial. A deeper exploration of these barriers, perhaps through case studies or examples of successful collaborations, would provide a more actionable roadmap for overcoming such challenges in practice.

Despite these limitations, the article makes a significant contribution to the field by highlighting the transformative potential of CDA in AI research. Its clear structure, well-supported arguments, and practical implications make it a valuable resource for anyone interested in the ethical and social dimensions of AI. By bridging critical theory and technological innovation, the author sets a strong foundation for future research aimed at creating more just and inclusive AI systems.

So, as a preprint, this study is impressively thorough and well-argued, standing as a testament to the robustness of qualitative research even in early-stage dissemination. The clarity of its structure, the cogency of its arguments, and its commitment to real-world impact make it a valuable contribution to ongoing debates about ethics and equity in AI. Future iterations could benefit from addressing the above limitations, but even in its current form, the article lays a strong foundation for further inquiry and action.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.