

AI-Mediated Academic Discourse and Language Identity: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Meaning-Making in Higher Education

Prisca Boniphace Makulilo^{1*} 

¹College of Business Education, Tanzania
prisca.makulilo@cbe.ac.tz

Emmanuel Selemeni Shindika² 

²Directorate of Education, Prime Minister's Office-Regional Administration and Local Government
(PO-RALG), Tanzania
emmanuel.shindika@tamisemi.go.tz

Bertha Anthony Maturo³ 

³College of Business Education, Tanzania
bertha.maturo@cbe.ac.tz

Received: 15/03/2026

Accepted: 07/05/2026

Published: 30/06/2026

***Corresponding author**

Citation:

Makulilo, P. B., Shindika, E. S., & Maturo, B. A. (2026). AI-Mediated Academic Discourse and Language Identity: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Meaning-Making in Higher Education. *Studies in Linguistics and Language Education*, 2(1), 25–37.

Studies in Linguistics and Language Education (SLLE)

© 2026 The Author(s).

Published by the University of
Oran 2 Mohamed Ben
Ahmed, Algeria.

This is an open access article
under the [CC BY](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license



ABSTRACT: This study examines AI-mediated academic discourse as a site of meaning-making and language identity construction in higher education through Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). The study adopts a qualitative research design to enable an in-depth interpretation of discursive patterns in AI-mediated academic texts. A total of 50 AI-generated/Aided academic texts were sampled purposively from undergraduate and postgraduate students of higher education institutions. The study focuses on AI-mediated discourse in academic texts produced in academic support services for students such as helping students with their coursework, writing support and formative feedback. This study draws on Fairclough's three-dimensional model of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and sociolinguistic frameworks of identity and power. It examines modality, language structures, and meaning-making devices specifically those encoding academic authority, standardised language norms, and authorship in AI-mediated academic texts produced within higher education support services. The study establishes that the language structures used in the AI-generated/Aided academic texts are highly modalized, more declarative and formal and presented rigid and unchanging academic language. The findings also establish that the discourse in the academic texts produced through use of AI reinforce and maintain dominant academic language varieties and styles and suppress varied meanings and representations. The AI-mediated academic discourse conceals the identity of the human writer and reduced the Academic Voice to sameness. Hence, the study recommends language awareness, authorship and identity in AI-enhanced higher education institutions.

KEYWORDS: Academic Voice, AI Discourse, Language Education, Language Identity, Meaning Making

1. Introduction

The impact of AI on modes of communication in educational settings is a theme that is increasingly being covered in the literature (Bearman et al., 2023; Ou et al., 2024; Ruano-Borbalan, 2025). It is therefore no surprise that the educational language(s) used to produce, negotiate, and represent knowledge in educational settings are evolving in the presence of conversational agents, writing assistants, and feedback tools, all of which contribute to shaping academic discourse. AI-mediated academic discourse refers to a linguistic phenomenon in which human teachers and learners communicate using AI technology within the educational context of communication and interact with algorithmically generated texts (Ou et al., 2024). According to Katsenou et al. (2025) the technology supporting this communication is not merely a communication aid but it works as a co-constructor of Academic Discourse.

Academic discourse is a genre of language use that is socially constructed within particular disciplinary fields, institutions and social power structures. Academic language is used to not only convey content, but also to perform and represent academic identities, exercise power and legitimize knowledge (Stroud & Kerfoot, 2021; Monbec & Ding, 2025). Recent developments in the field of Artificial Intelligence (AI), which enable it to communicate through discourse, also present new dynamics and potential disruptions to issues of authorship, tone, and academic authority in academic communication. Moreover, the proliferation of using AI in academic communication in learning and assessment contexts raises complex issues for academic language identity, particularly for multilingual learners and teachers in a globalised Higher Education context (Davoodi, 2025; You & Zhang, 2025).

This study adopts a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) approach, a sociological perspective in which discourse as a practice is understood in terms of power, ideology, and control (Van Dijk, 2015). CDA has frequently been used in language education to examine issues of voice, access, and inequality. However, AI-mediated academic discourse has not been extensively explored through a CDA lens. Unlike other research on AI in education focusing on pedagogical issues, ethics and affordances, language is frequently relegated to an accessory role (Crompton et al., 2024; Compagnoni et al., 2025).

This study explores the meanings, functions and consequences of AI-mediated academic discourse in the higher education context. Focusing on the construction and negotiation of meanings through the use of AI-generated and AI-assisted texts in English-medium higher education, this study aims to contribute to the scholarly discussions in the fields of academic discourse studies, language education research and critical applied linguistics. It illuminates how and what meanings are constructed and negotiated through the use of AI-generated and AI-assisted texts in English as a lingua franca (ELF) setting, and how academic voice and authorship are constructed and re-constructed. It also examines how students' academic literacy, genre competence and identity are shaped and mediated by the use of AI technologies in ELF settings.

1.1 Research Objectives

The study is guided by the following objectives:

1. To examine the discursive features of AI-mediated academic texts in higher education contexts.
2. To analyze how AI-mediated discourse shapes processes of meaning-making in academic communication.

3. To explore how language identity is constructed, negotiated, or reconfigured through interaction with AI-generated academic discourse.
4. To contribute to linguistic and language education scholarship by critically assessing the implications of AI mediation for academic discourse practices.

1.2 Research Questions

Accordingly, the study addresses the following research questions:

1. How is meaning constructed in AI-mediated academic discourse in higher education?
2. What discursive patterns characterize AI-generated or AI-assisted academic texts?
3. How does AI-mediated academic discourse influence the construction and negotiation of language identity among participants in higher education?
4. What ideological and institutional assumptions about language, authority, and knowledge are embedded in AI-mediated academic discourse?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Previous Studies on AI-Mediated Academic Discourse

There is a growing body of research on the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in higher education focusing on various aspects such as academic writing, feedback and learning support. The impact of the use of AI-based writing resources on students' written work has been investigated in a number of studies revealing changes in vocabulary use, sentence organization and language style (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019; Kohnke et al., 2023a; Kohnke et al., 2023b). This study aims to present findings on the impact of the use of AI-based writing support tools on students' writing performance in language education contexts. It specifically focuses on English as medium of instruction (EMI) in higher education contexts highlighting how these tools contribute to students' writing efficiency, effectiveness and autonomy (Akhter, 2024; Dogar & Khan, 2025).

While there is a body of research that demonstrates how AI-based language tools facilitate a range of learning activities, the majority of investigations focus on pedagogical and technological aspects such as learner engagement, achievement and usability. Language is portrayed as an outcome of technological action rather than as a social activity. In this study, it argues that the use of AI-based text production tools for learning is often presented as a neutral technology that supports learners in a range of academic activities, without fully recognising how the technology is used, who is responsible for the output produced and what this production means for the learner as an author and as an individual (Disu, 2025; Watson et al., 2025). Thus, linguistically-based research into the nature of academic discourse in AI-mediated environments is still limited.

The process and practice of writing academic texts is a discursive practice of negotiating different aspects of voice, stance and identity, as revealed by the studies in the field of applied linguistics and academic writing, such as Li & Deng (2019). With the development of algorithmic mediation, the power relations between users, the constraints of genre conventions, and the presentations of identity positions users achieve through written communication will be all transformed and re-mediated by AI composing tools, as has been discovered by studies such as Kershen & Johnson (2025), Chen et al. (2025) and Abdul-Jabbar & Bhatt (2025). Unfortunately, current research on AI and education does not fully take into account the findings of these studies, and the effects of AI on the discursive practices and identity-related effects of writing academic texts are not yet fully uncovered.

2.2 Competing Theoretical Approaches

The studies presented in this study draw on a range of Cognitive and sociocultural perspectives on AI and learning. Focusing on cognitive and sociocultural perspectives, an AI system is seen as a mediational tool which supports learning and the construction of knowledge (Skehan, 1998; Kozulin, 1998; Crompton et al., 2024; Fathi & Rahimi, 2026). In this perspective, language is seen more as a tool to facilitate learning as opposed to being an ideological and power tool (Kozulin, 1998; Crompton et al., 2024).

In contrast, discourse-oriented approaches view language as constituting the institutions and power structures of the social world. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) understands the social world of human communication as a site where power, legitimacy and identity are constructed and negotiated through the discourse practice (Fairclough 1995; van Dijk 2008). CDA is a theoretical framework widely used in the academic literature related to language education, particularly in the field of literacy studies dealing with access and social inequality.

However, it has not yet been fully exploited in the context of AI-mediated academic communication, which means that agentivity, voice and power in AI-mediated discourse are not yet fully explored (Floridi 2023). While genre-based approaches are certainly relevant to this debate, discourse-oriented approaches such as CDA bring more to the table, as they focus on the ideological work carried out through conventions and institutional and social rhetoric, as well as through the standardized formulae of academic language.

2.3 Limitations and Unresolved Issues in Prior Research

Several gaps need to be plugged in current learning analytics literature. For instance, Zawacki-Richter et al. (2019) observe that many studies related to language technology and learning analytics tend to focus more on the affordances and applications of the technology and pay less attention to the language itself, which results in communicative, ideological and discursive aspects of language being ignored. As a result, aspects such as meaning-making, authorship and language identity are dealt with in a very implicit manner in the literature (Lea, 2012; Magolda & King, 2012). A further gap in the existing scholarship concerns the limited empirical engagement with CDA in relation to AI-mediated discourse. Specifically, little is known about how AI tools shape and are in turn shaped by conventions of academic language and identity. How students, teachers, and AI systems negotiate these conventions across different language learning contexts remains underexplored.

Although there is a growing body of research focused on the application of AI in learning and instruction, there is little research into the impact of the algorithmically produced academic language resources constructed in these environments on learners' authorial stance, ownership and position in the legitimacy of language in educational institutions. As far as the literature review is concerned, academic language production and use is a social practice that reflects the power and ideological structures of educational institutions.

However, as education informatization develops, technology-related researches in the field of AI in education focus too much on the efficiency and function of the technology. Therefore, this study carries out a critical discourse analysis for academic language production and use in the AI-supported learning environment, which fills the research gap in the field of higher education. In addition, this study focuses on the aspects of language use in the context of AI-

supported learning environments by investigating both the AI-generated and the AI-supported texts produced by students in higher education institutions.

3. Theoretical Framework

3.1 Critical Discourse Analysis

This study employs the theoretical framework of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). According to Fairclough (1995), CDA is concerned with how power is exercised through the adoption of ideologies and how legitimacy is constructed in a discourse. Hence, this study aims at exploring how power, ideologies and legitimacy are linguistically constructed and naturalised in the output of the academic texts generated with the assistance of the AI. Other approaches which have been used to explore the structures of the discourse such as interactional structures of discourse, word frequency and the stylistic features of texts such as the works of Sacks et al. (1974), Sidnell & Stivers (2012), Baker (2023), McEnery & Hardie (2011), Shaw (2016) and Bhatia (2014) are not adopted in this study. This is due to the fact that CDA is concerned with power dynamics of social discourse practices. Fairclough (1995) and van Dijk (2008) affirm that discourse is a form of social practice that is necessarily power-based.

CDA considers language as a social practice which not only reflects social structures, power relations and ideology but at the same time, constitutes them. The three-dimensional model of discourse introduced by Fairclough (1995) views the text, discursive practice and social practice to have a more detailed understanding of the construction and legitimization of meanings in institutions. This Discourse Analytic approach is highly relevant to analyze how language produced by AI reinforces existing academic conventions, language use inequalities stemming from social factors and power relations of authority and authorship in the context of AI-mediated academic discourse (van Dijk, 1993, 2008).

3.2 Language Identity and Meaning-Making

This study draws on theories and concepts from the field of sociolinguistics in order to examine how language identity, academic identity and educational development intersect in the context of the university. Taking a sociolinguistic perspective on language identity means drawing on a discourse-theoretical understanding of language that foregrounds identity as a dynamic, relational, and context-dependent discursive construction, rather than a fixed or static attribute (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Norton, 2013). Students' language identity is formed and reproduced in social interaction through language practices (Norton, 2013). In the academic context, students' academic identities are constructed and negotiated in relation to the institutional discourse of the university they enter, as well as to the genres and evaluative language use embedded in these contexts (Ivanič, 1998; Hyland, 2012).

According to Bucholtz and Hall, identity is formed through interactional positioning, indexicality, and ideology (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005). Because of the introduction of the AI-mediated discourse in the academic communication, the mediation process in academic interactions between students and educators is changed, and consequently the students' language agency, voice and ownership of meaning in academic communication are changed. Therefore, meaning-making in academic communication is a discursive process occurring in the context of human interaction and algorithmic mediation, (Gee, 2025). This study focuses

on the students' language identity as it is constructed discursively through their language use, including linguistic and pragmatics resources, such as: (1) Stance, (2) Modality, (3) Pronoun positioning, and (4) Evaluative language, and the AI-generated academic language resources that are produced and reproduced in academic contexts (Hyland, 2005; Hyland, 2012).

3.3 Integrating CDA and Language Identity in AI-Mediated Contexts

The study employs Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) theories in conjunction with sociolinguistic theories of language identity. This study's theoretical orientation addresses both macro- and micro-level structures of power in discourse. At the macro level, it attends to institutions, language ideologies, and broader power relations. At the micro level, the focus shifts to discursive practices, including language structures, discourse strategies, and speech acts. Consequently, it is possible for this study to analyze how meanings are produced and negotiated, and how language identities are constructed, negotiated and even contested by virtue of technology-based construction of academic discourse using the AI (Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 2008; Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Norton, 2013).

Language is a crucial aspect of knowledge construction and academic legitimacy in higher education. This study presents a framework for investigating how an individual's identity is constructed through and by language at the textual level. Taking modality, impersonality, stance and evaluative language as examples of textual practices at the pedagogical discourse level, based on the theories of Hyland (2005, 2012) and Ivanič (1998) on standardisation and academic legitimacy, this study investigates possible identity constructions and their interrelations through a detailed analysis of the language use in undergraduate students' assignments.

4. Research Methodology

4.1 Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative research design grounded in Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). A qualitative approach is appropriate because the study examines how meaning-making and language identity are discursively constructed in AI-mediated academic discourse rather than measuring frequencies or predicting variables (Creswell & Creswell, 2017; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). CDA functions as both a theoretical and analytical framework, enabling a critical examination of language use in relation to power, ideology, and institutional practices in higher education (Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 2008; Wodak & Meyer, 2015). The focus is therefore on interpretive depth and critical explanation rather than representativeness or generalizability (Fairclough, 1995; Lin, 2014).

4.2 Data Sources and Corpus

The data used for this research is made up of academic texts produced by means of Artificial Intelligence (AI) either directly or with human intervention. These texts are students' written assignments, descriptions of the tasks assigned, feedback on the written assignments, and other academic support texts. The AI tools included in this study are ChatGPT (GPT-4), Grammarly, and QuillBot, selected on the basis that they were the tools most frequently identified in participants' self-reports and evidenced in the submitted texts. In addition, these tools were selected because they are among the most accessible and commonly used generative AI platforms in academic support environments. The input data for the production of these texts

were researcher-designed stimuli, which were designed to replicate the demands for academic support that are common in contemporary higher education settings, such as asking for explanations of the assignments given to the students, advice on how to produce different types of texts, and the formative feedback given to the students. However, in this study, AI-generated texts refer to output produced primarily by AI system in response to prompts, whereas AI-assisted texts refer to texts in which AI output is edited, expanded, reorganized, or reformulated by the user.

The corpus of academic texts that was built up for this study consisted of around fifty (50) AI-mediated context drawn from undergraduate and postgraduate students in two higher education contexts. To preserve anonymity, the institutions are not identified by names are instead referred to as Context A and Context B. In the two settings, English functions as the language of communication. However, the students operate in multilingual learning environments in which English serves primarily as an academic language rather than necessarily as a first language. This contextualization is important because students engaging with AI in multilingual English-medium settings and interpret AI differently from native-English users.

The 50 texts were selected through purposive sampling based on the following criteria: (1) visible evidence of AI mediation, (2) relevance to academic discourse in higher education, (3) a minimum length of 500 words, and (4) suitability for analysing meaning-making, authorship, and language identity. Of the 50 texts, 35 were fully AI-generated and 15 were AI-assisted texts involving human editing and reformulation. The corpus included texts from both undergraduate and postgraduate levels across the two learning contexts.

The sample size of 50 texts was considered appropriate for two reasons. First, Critical Discourse Analysis prioritises depth of interpretive engagement over statistical representativeness. Second, the 50 texts constituted the full set of available texts meeting the study's inclusion criteria during the data collection period. The sample was therefore, both analytical sufficient and procedurally justified for a qualitative CDA study.

4.3 Analytical Framework and Procedures

The data analysis was based on Fairclough's (1989,1995, 2013) three-dimensional model of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), comprising textual analysis, discursive practice, and social practice. At the textual level, linguistics elements such as modality, pronouns, evaluative language, transitivity, lexical choice, and rhetorical structuring were examined. Discursive practices focused on the production, positioning, and consumption of AI-mediated texts within academic discourse. Social practice addressed the broader institutional and ideological structures in which the discourse was embedded, including authority, authority, authorship, legitimacy, and standardization.

The analysis was conducted cyclically, beginning with close reading and coding of recurring linguistic features in the texts and gradually moving towards interpretation across the three levels of CDA. In addition, the analysis involved comparing AI-generated and AI-assisted texts in order and evaluative stance. This comparative step strengthened the analysis by showing how different degrees of AI mediation shaped discourse patterns across the corpus.

4.4 Analytical Focus: Meaning-Making and Language Identity

This study examined how academic knowledge and legitimacy are discursively constructed in AI-mediated environments, and how language identity is performed through voice, stance, agency, responsibility, and evaluative positioning with AI-mediated academic discourse. The analytical focus was therefore not only on what the texts communicated, but also on how they communicated it and what kinds of authorial and institutional identities were reproduced through those linguistic choices.

4.5 Ethical Considerations

The study involved the analysis of de-identified academic texts produced in AI-mediated educational contexts. Although the study did not collect sensitive personal data, human participants were indirectly involved through the provision of texts. Accordingly, informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to inclusion in the corpus. All texts were anonymized, and institutional identifiers were removed to ensure confidentiality, privacy, and responsible academic use of data. The study further adhered to principles of academic integrity and responsible handling of AI-mediated educational materials.

4.6 Trustworthiness and Rigor

Rigor was ensured through systematic coding, theoretical transparency, reflexivity, and sustained engagement with the data. Credibility was further supported through iterative comparison across texts and triangulation between CDA and sociolinguistics identity theory.

5. Findings

This section presents the findings of the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of AI-mediated academic discourse in relation to meaning-making and identity in higher education. The analysis focuses on observable linguistic patterns across the corpus, including modality, syntactic structures, lexical choices, and discourse features.

5.1 Discursive Construction of Academic Authority and Expertise

The corpus shows a strong tendency toward the use of high-modality and declarative constructions. Common expressions include *must*, *should*, and *it is essential to*, as illustrated in extracts such as “This framework must be applied in all academic contexts” and “It is essential to understand the definitions of the key terms before moving on to the argument.” These constructions present statements in a definitive and prescriptive form. Across the dataset, there is limited use of hedging or alternative propositions. Declarative sentence structures dominate, and knowledge is consistently expressed in generalized and non-contingent terms.

5.2 Normalization of Standardized Academic Language Practices

The corpus exhibits recurring linguistic features associated with formal academic writing. These include the use of formal vocabulary, a predominance of passive constructions, elaboration of foundational concepts, and explicit signalling of logical relationships. There is also frequent use of discourse markers such as *moreover* and *in conclusion*, which structure the flow of arguments. These features appear consistently across texts, contributing to a high degree of uniformity in language use.

5.3 Reconfiguration of Authorship and Linguistic Agency

The corpus contains frequent use of agentless constructions such as it can be argued that and research suggests that. These constructions minimize explicit authorial presence in the text. Additionally, first-person pronouns are largely absent, and claims are often presented without clear attribution to an identifiable author. The linguistic patterns observed indicate a preference for impersonal forms of expression.

5.4 Discursive Negotiation of Academic Voice and Identity

Across the AI-mediated texts, there is a convergence of syntactic structures, lexical choices, and discourse markers. This results in a high level of textual uniformity. Expressions of personal stance, evaluative positioning, and critical engagement appear less frequently. The texts tend to maintain a neutral and impersonal tone, with limited variation in voice or stylistic features.

5.5 Ideological Implications of AI-Mediated Meaning-Making

The corpus consistently reflects the use of standardized academic language forms, characterized by neutrality, clarity, and formal expression. Across the texts, there is a preference for structured, ordered, and explicit forms of communication, with limited deviation from conventional academic discourse patterns.

5.6 Summary of Key Findings

The analysis reveals the following dominant patterns in AI-mediated academic discourse:

1. Frequent use of high-modality and declarative constructions;
2. Consistent reliance on standardized academic language features;
3. Prevalence of agentless and impersonal constructions;
4. High degree of textual uniformity across the corpus;
5. Limited presence of personal voice and evaluative positioning.

1. Discussion

This study investigates how AI-mediated academic discourse shapes meaning-making and language identity in high education. A Critical Discourse Analysis is conducted on language features that emerge in AI-generated identity performed through higher education discourse. Recurring features include high modality and declarative certainty, mainly the use of formalized, traditional academic word choice, agentless discourse, hedging, the absence of first-person pronouns, evaluative neutrality, and overuse of discourse markers. Notably, this study finds that AI-mediated academic discourse is not neutral support but rather a further reinforcement of conventional academic authority, standardization, and legitimacy.

6.1 AI-Mediated Discourse and the Reproduction of Academic Authority

This study analyzes how language and discourse constructs authority in academic texts. Analyzing text generated by AI, the study finds that AI-generated academic discourse relies heavily on high-modality and declarative statements of certainty and prescriptiveness like *must*, *should*, *it is essential to*, *this framework must be applied in all academic contexts*, and *it is also essential to understand the definitions of the key terms before moving on the argument*. Instead

of generalizing to all institutional academic discourse, the findings illustrate how language in the corpus under study reproduce some linguistics markers of academic authority, namely strong modality and declarative framing.

6.2 Meaning-Making Under Conditions of Discursive Standardization

The findings indicate that AI-mediated texts are characterized by repeated use of standardized vocabulary, passive constructions, elaboration of concepts, and frequent discourse markers such as moreover and in conclusion. These linguistic patterns contribute to coherence and structural clarity, but they also limit stylistic variation and interpretive flexibility. From a Critical Discourse Analysis perspective, such patterns reflect the normalization of institutional language practices, where particular forms of expression are privileged over others (Fairclough, 1995). AI-mediated meaning-making therefore appears to reflect a tendency toward discursive standardization, where formal correctness and structural consistency are prioritized over variation in expression, consistent with observations in previous studies on AI-supported academic writing (e.g., Kohnke et al., 2023).

6.3 Language Identity, Authorship, and Academic Voice

The analysis of authorship and voice also reveals interesting features about what is happening to the student writers' identity and voice in the digital era. The majority of the study corpus consists of verbs forms without agents (e.g. it can be argued) and hedging forms (e.g. research suggests that, while there is evidence to suggest that, however, there is also a lack of). The inclusion of these forms of qualification are seen as a further attempt to neutralize evaluation and to maintain the voice of the academia in an effort to appear more credible or authentic.

However, the findings find no indication that the inclusion of AI writing processes influence students to express voice or authorship differently. On the contrary, the findings suggest that students operate more as editors, curators or language correctors than as original creators of text or authors. These findings are grounded in linguistic evidence and do not stem any theoretical assumptions about how students behave when they use AI as part of their writing processes. In multilingual higher education, the way in which individuals choose what to say and how to say, it is constrained by the discursive filtering of various linguistic identities and favourite styles of discourse.

These interpretations are based on observed linguistic patterns in the corpus, including the use of agentless constructions, hedging expressions, and the absence of first-person pronouns. Together, these features contribute to reduced authorial visibility and a more impersonal academic voice.

6.4 Ideological Implications for Linguistics and Language Education

While new shifts are emerging to further consolidate the normalization of certain forms of academic language, this study focuses on the way in which AI-mediated discourse presents the standardized forms of academic language as natural, efficient and legitimate forms of communication. From a Critical Discourse Analysis perspective, A tools do not only transmit language, they also produce particular language ideologies about issues of correctness, neutrality and authority. Therefore, it is timely that we foreground greater critical language

awareness within higher education about how authority, legitimacy and standardization of language are produced and manifest in these new AI-generated forms of academic discourse.

6.5 Contribution of the Study

This study examines the use of modality, personal absence, a standardized language system and restricted voice as discursive resources in AI-generated academic writing. The study extends Critical Discourse Analysis about the use of AI in education from issues of efficiency and usability to consider language itself, particularly in relation to how authorship, authority and identity are negotiated. This study therefore contributes to existing scholarship on academic discourse, language in education, and critical applied linguistics.

7. Conclusion

This study reveals that AI-mediated academic discourse is not neutral and simply supportive of academic practices, but rather has the capacity to shape how knowledge, authority, and academic identity are constructed within higher education. A Critical Discourse Analysis of generated and assisted academic texts shows that the language produced and assisted by AI is extremely standardized, largely impersonal, and very authoritative. Considering that academic language is already highly privileged in higher education. This study concludes that the use of AI in academic setting is further restrict the authorship, linguistic agency, and identifies of multilingual and English education students within a discourse that values clarity over uniqueness of voice and interpretative flexibility. This study contributes to an emerging body of research on the responsible integration of AI in education by showing that the use of AI is not simply a writing aid, but also an ideological and policy response. There is a growing need for language awareness, ethical use of AI, and the protection of student voice, particularly in highly digital academic environments.

Acknowledgments

The authors sincerely thank all participants for their valuable time and insights. The authors also appreciate the support of the respective institutions that facilitated this study.

References

- Abdul-Jabbar, W. K., & Bhatt, I. (2025). Post-authorship and AI-assisted writing: Singularity, communication, and pedagogy in higher education. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 7(4), 1136–1149.
- Akhter, E. (2024). AI-based language education platforms: A systematic analysis of EdTech tools for English proficiency. *Journal of Sustainable Development and Policy*, 3(4), 1–31.
- Baker, P. (2023). *Using corpora in discourse analysis*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Bearman, M., Ryan, J., & Ajjawi, R. (2023). Discourses of artificial intelligence in higher education: A critical literature review. *Higher Education*, 86(2), 369–385.
- Bhatia, V. K. (2014). *Worlds of written discourse: A genre-based view*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4–5), 585–614.

- Chen, J., Wang, Z., & Zhou, X. (2025). AI-assisted writing: Exploring academic writing strategies of graduate students across disciplines through activity theory. *Higher Education Studies*, 15(4), 243–253.
- Compagnoni, I., Oguilve, V., & Wen, W. (2025). Ethical frontiers of AI in language pedagogy: Navigating transparency, accountability, and equity. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 17(4), 1–25.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage.
- Crompton, H., Edmett, A., Ichaporia, N., & Burke, D. (2024). AI and English language teaching: Affordances and challenges. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 55(6), 2503–2529.
- Davoodi, A. (2025). Applied AI and pedagogical judgment in multilingual teaching and learning: Bringing EQUAL AI to life. *Language, Technology, and Social Media*, 3(2), 351–366.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2011). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. Sage.
- Disu, L. (2025). *Becoming with AI: Identity and meaning-making among graduate students in creative disciplines* [Master's thesis, Uppsala University].
- Dogar, M. F., & Khan, S. (2025). AI-enhanced English language learning at the undergraduate level: A mixed-methods analysis of effectiveness and challenges. *ASSAJ*, 4(2), 503–513.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). Discourse as social practice. In *Language and power* (pp. 17–42). Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Fathi, J., & Rahimi, M. (2026). Utilising artificial intelligence-enhanced writing mediation to develop academic writing skills in EFL learners: A qualitative study. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 39(1–2), 263–302.
- Floridi, L. (2023). AI as agency without intelligence: On ChatGPT, large language models, and other generative models. *Philosophy & Technology*, 36(1), Article 15.
- Gee, J. P. (2025). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. Routledge.
- Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. Continuum.
- Hyland, K. (2012). *Disciplinary identities: Individuality and community in academic discourse*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity* (Vol. 10). John Benjamins.
- Katsenou, R., Kotsidis, K., Papadopoulou, A., Anastasiadis, P., & Deliyannis, I. (2025). Beyond assistance: Embracing AI as a collaborative co-agent in education. *Education Sciences*, 15(8), Article 1006.
- Kershen, J. L., & Johnson, B. (2025). Becoming a teacher of writing in an AI-assisted world: Considering personal epistemologies, writing theories, and the use of AI platform technologies. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 25(1), 32–58.
- Kohnke, L., Moorhouse, B. L., & Zou, D. (2023a). Exploring generative artificial intelligence preparedness among university language instructors: A case study. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 5, Article 100156.
- Kohnke, L., Moorhouse, B. L., & Zou, D. (2023b). ChatGPT for language teaching and learning. *RELC Journal*, 54(2), 537–550.
- Kozulin, A. (1998). *Psychological tools: A sociocultural approach to education*. Harvard University Press.

- Lea, M. R. (2012). New genres in the academy: Issues of practice, meaning making and identity. In *University writing: Selves and texts in academic societies* (pp. 93–109). Brill.
- Li, Y., & Deng, L. (2019). Writer identity construction revisited: Stance, voice, self, and identity in academic written discourse. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 42(3), [page range not provided].
- Lin, A. (2014). Critical discourse analysis in applied linguistics: A methodological review. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 34, 213–232.
- Magolda, M. B. B., & King, P. M. (2012). *Assessing meaning making and self-authorship: Theory, research, and application* (ASHE Higher Education Report, 38[3]). John Wiley & Sons.
- McEnery, T., & Hardie, A. (2011). *Corpus linguistics: Method, theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Monbec, L., & Ding, A. (2025). *Recovering language in higher education*. Palgrave.
- Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation*. Multilingual Matters.
- Ou, A. W., Stöhr, C., & Malmström, H. (2024). Academic communication with AI-powered language tools in higher education: From a post-humanist perspective. *System*, 121, Article 103225.
- Ruano-Borbalan, J. C. (2025). The transformative impact of artificial intelligence on higher education: A critical reflection on current trends and future directions. *International Journal of Chinese Education*, 14(1), 2212585X251319364.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696–735.
- Shaw, P. (2016). Genre analysis. In *The Routledge handbook of English for academic purposes* (pp. 243–255). Routledge.
- Sidnell, J., & Stivers, T. (Eds.). (2012). *The handbook of conversation analysis*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford University Press.
- Stroud, C., & Kerfoot, C. (2021). Decolonizing higher education: Multilingualism, linguistic citizenship and epistemic justice. In *Language and decoloniality in higher education: Reclaiming voices from the South* (pp. 19–46).
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 249–283.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and power*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-07299-3>
- van Dijk, T. A. (2015). Critical discourse analysis. In *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 466–485).
- Watson, S., Brezovec, E., & Romic, J. (2025). The role of generative AI in academic and scientific authorship: An autopoietic perspective. *AI & Society*, 40(5), 3225–3235.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Methods of critical discourse studies*. Sage.
- You, Y., & Zhang, Y. (2025). Developing AI literacies and negotiating professional identities: A study of pre-service English teachers in a ChatGPT-facilitated pedagogy. *Journal of China Computer-Assisted Language Learning*, 5(2), 260–286.
- Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education: Where are the educators? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16(1), Article 39.