



Digital Media Discourse Analysis: Future Perspectives

TALAL AOUN

BADJI MOKHTAR UNIVERSITY(ALGERIA), talal.aoun@univ-annaba.dz

Received: 24 / 02 / 2025

Accepted: 22 / 03 / 2025

Published: 31 / 03 / 2025

Abstract:

This article examines digital media discourse as an interactive and multimodal phenomenon that blends language, imagery, and modern technology. It explores how the relationship between content producers and audiences is redefined through this transformation and contrasts digital media discourse with traditional media models. In addition, the study discusses the dominance of network content, changes in audience reception, the role of immersive technologies, and the integration of artificial intelligence and big data analytics. The paper further addresses challenges such as misinformation, digital bias, and the emergence of information bubbles, while also reviewing current legal frameworks that aim to safeguard public discourse.

Keywords: *digital media discourse artificial; intelligence discourse; natural language processing; digital media discourse analysis.*

I. INTRODUCTION

If you think back just a couple of decades, the way we consumed news felt fairly straightforward: newspapers, television networks, and radio stations reigned supreme, each with its own editors and journalists who decided which headlines would define our day (Fairclough, 1995). We, the audience, tuned in or read the morning paper, trusted the curated information, and often discussed the news with friends and family. That was our media world.

But the digital revolution has changed all of that dramatically. Platforms like Facebook, Twitter (sometimes called X), Instagram, TikTok, and YouTube are now central to everyday communication, overshadowing the “old” media structures by harnessing algorithms and artificial intelligence (AI) to filter and highlight stories they think we will click on (Stiegler, 1998). At the same time, citizen journalists people just like us, armed with smartphones can instantly capture events as they unfold, from local protests to global crises, sharing those raw impressions without waiting for editorial approval (Bourdieu, 1998/1996). It’s liberating, but it also prompts tough questions: How do we check the reliability of these new voices? What if misinformation sneaks into our feeds unnoticed? And how do we keep up with the constant flood of data and opinions?

Parallel to these shifts, we also see language adapting to digital norms becoming more condensed, emotional, and reliant on images, memes, or hashtags (Barthes, 1977). If we were once used to steady, text-heavy articles or broadcast segments, we now scroll through short videos, ephemeral posts, or “stories” that vanish within hours. It’s a whole new environment that calls for fresh analytical frameworks, bridging everything from critical theory and linguistics to data science and philosophy. In the following sections, I invite you to explore the multi-layered journey of how media discourse has transformed historically, technologically, and ethically while we piece together a cohesive understanding of how these elements intertwine. Think of it less like reading separate essays and more like watching how each puzzle piece connects to reveal a bigger picture.

1: Defining Discourse and Approaches to Analysis in the Digital Age

1.1 The Concept of Discourse in Media and Communication

In Information and Communication Sciences, “discourse” is more than lines of text it’s a social and cultural phenomenon, molded by institutions, history, and technology (Foucault, 1972 (1969)). Before digital platforms took hold, the boundaries of media discourse felt more stable: established editorial teams had the final say on which topics merited coverage and which angles were appropriate (van Dijk, 1988). That structure no longer applies in quite the same way.

When social media came onto the scene, it didn’t just tweak the rules; it practically rewrote them. Rather than a single editorial funnel, we’re surrounded by countless posts, comments, memes, and hashtags that swirl around in real time (Fairclough, Media Discourse, 1995). On Twitter, a succinct tweet could eclipse an in-depth news feature if it resonates emotionally. On Instagram or TikTok, visuals often overshadow words (Barthes, 1977). And new digital influencers can gain millions of followers without the old, formal checkpoints that once governed mainstream outlets (Bourdieu, 1998 (1996)). Analyzing digital media discourse thus becomes more complex and more exciting.

1.2 Main Theoretical Frameworks for Studying Digital Media Discourse

Linguistic and Semiotic Methods: Researchers study the words, syntax, and visual cues like photos and short videos that can quickly persuade or entertain (van Dijk, 1988). Think of

how a meme can convey humor or social critique faster than a long article.

Pragmatic Approaches and Online Communication: Platforms thrive on user feedback: retweets, “likes,” and comment threads. By analyzing these interactive loops, we see how meaning emerges and morphs (Wittgenstein, 1995). Algorithmic filters often decide which comments or posts get the most attention, creating “echo chambers” that reinforce group identity.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Media Power: Inspired by scholars like Fairclough (1995), CDA questions power dynamics embedded in media. In a world driven by platform algorithms, big tech companies now have the power to highlight or bury certain viewpoints (Stiegler, 1998). This shift suggests that editorial authority hasn’t vanished but has taken on new, more invisible forms.

1.3 Methodological Shifts in Discourse Analysis with AI

With AI playing a bigger role, scholars have pivoted to new analytical techniques:

- Automated Discourse Analysis: Computers comb through massive text corpora to spot trends or sentiment (Foucault, 1972 (1969))
- Algorithmic Bias: Models absorb biases lurking in their training data like stereotypes about certain groups or topics and can inadvertently magnify them (Fairclough, Media Discourse, 1995).
- Ethical Debates: Harnessing “big data” might infringe on user privacy or overshadow subtle minority perspectives, pushing us to weigh the pros and cons of large-scale data mining (van Dijk, 1988).

From this vantage point, analyzing digital media discourse demands blending linguistic, pragmatic, critical, and computational approaches so we can truly capture how messages evolve under algorithmic, user-driven forces.

2: Historical Developments and Philosophical Perspectives

2.1 From Oral Tradition to Digital Platforms

Human societies have wrestled with changes in communication technology since ancient times:

- Oral Cultures: Knowledge was shared face-to-face. Stories and performances adjusted fluidly with each retelling (Eco, 1964).
- Writing and the Printing Press: Suddenly, text could be mass-produced, giving institutions a tool to standardize language and editorial practice (Adorno & Horkheimer, 1972/1944).
- Audiovisual Media: Radio, cinema, and TV broadcast to massive audiences, often from a few centers of production. Critics worried about “mass culture” making everything homogeneous (van Dijk, 1988).
- Internet Era: Early blogs and social platforms shook up old monopolies, letting individuals publish widely (Lévy, 1997 (1994)). But, as we’ll soon see, big tech corporations have reasserted a new form of centralized power.

2.2 AI and the Possibility of Automated Speech

In the current phase, AI can generate text or moderate content in ways that challenge the notion of human oversight. Tools like ChatGPT produce entire articles that read convincingly, but who ensures factual accuracy or moral integrity (Stiegler, 1998)? Heidegger (1977/1954) warned of technology leading us into a state where we forget to question its central role in shaping our thoughts. If we rely on AI to filter or produce our news, do we risk losing the capacity for independent reasoning?

2.3 A Philosophical Outlook on the Human Element

Although the internet opened channels for user participation, algorithmic gatekeeping might be funneling discourse into narrower, profit-oriented streams, controlled by a handful of corporations (Lévy, 1997 (1994)). Foucault's (1972/1969) claim that knowledge and power are inseparable resonates here: it's not just about who runs the printing press but who runs the platform algorithms. This dynamic underscores how crucial it is to devise ethical guidelines, ensuring that digital channels remain both democratically accessible and intellectually enriching (Fairclough, *Media Discourse*, 1995, p. 166).

3: The Citizen Journalist in Digital Media

3.1 Disrupting Traditional Media

Here's where philosophy meets everyday life: the citizen journalist, armed with a smartphone, can capture a local protest or a breaking disaster story and share it instantly (Bourdieu, 1998 (1996)). Once, major media outlets decided if or when to send a camera crew. Now, ordinary people get there first. On the plus side, this leads to a more vibrant, diverse news ecosystem (Fairclough, *Media Discourse*, 1995). But it can also sow confusion if rumor spreads without editorial filters (van Dijk, 1988, p. 123).

3.2 Diminishing the Traditional Media Monopoly

Historically, big outlets held expensive infrastructures printing presses or broadcasting licenses making them the sole gatekeepers of truth (Adorno, 1972 (1944), p. 45). Now that barrier to entry has fallen. Lower production costs and wide internet connectivity mean anyone can post or broadcast live. This fosters openness but also uncertainty: how do we guarantee that factual standards endure amid a sea of unverified content (van Dijk, 1988, p. 211)?

3.3 Instantaneity and Emotional Framing

Speed defines the new environment. Citizen journalists often rely on raw imagery and punchy messages, capturing public interest. Meanwhile, digital platforms reward emotional, sensational content because it sparks user engagement (Baudrillard, 1994 (1981), p. 38). This dynamic, though exciting, raises questions about overshadowing in-depth investigative pieces that require more time and subtlety (Eco, 1964, p. 98).

3.4 Concerns About Accuracy and Disinformation

A critical worry is that unfiltered citizen coverage can lead to misinformation, especially under pressure or bias (Foucault, 1972 (1969), p. 206). Groups with political or commercial agendas may exploit amateur footage to push propaganda, capitalizing on the "raw" aura that resonates with audiences. Umberto Eco (1964) cautioned that giving "absolute power" to unmoderated crowds could breed chaos if no fact-checking frameworks exist.

3.5 Hybrid Journalism

In response, some professional outlets incorporate user-submitted materials into their coverage, verifying them through editorial channels (Bourdieu, 1998 (1996), p. 155). This “hybrid journalism” maintains both immediacy and reliability. Likewise, certain citizen reporters adopt self-imposed ethical guidelines or partner with organizations for fact-checking, bridging amateur impulses and institutional rigor (van Dijk, 1988, p. 234). These experiments show that the divide between professional and citizen journalism is not absolute.

3.6 Conclusion on Citizen Journalism

On balance, citizen journalists bring fresh energy to the media scene, letting more voices and perspectives flourish (Fairclough, Media Discourse, 1995, p. 20). However, they also magnify the volume of content lacking editorial oversight, making the interplay of platform algorithms critical in determining which stories trend. This dynamic points to the next question: how do we systematically analyze a media discourse so multi-layered and fluid?

4: Analyzing Digital Discourse and Emerging Approaches

4.1 From Traditional Formats to Fluid Online Structures

To address the complexities described above, discourse analysts must embrace new, more flexible methods. Under older journalism models, news was produced at regular intervals (morning papers, evening news). Now, coverage morphs continuously as people post, share, or update stories (Adorno, 1972 (1944), p. 311). Readers or viewers don’t passively consume, but actively comment, remix, or fact-check (Lévy, 1997 (1994), p. 111). Traditional “close reading” methods can’t easily account for ephemeral memes or massive tweet storms.

4.2 Key Transformations in Digital Media Discourse

- Multimodality: Text alone no longer suffices. Platforms blend text, GIFs, polls, and video in a single piece (Barthes, 1977).
- Ephemerality: Posts may vanish or morph in real time, reflecting audience feedback or new revelations (Bourdieu, 1998/1996).
- Fragmentation: Thousands of voices compete simultaneously, risking user overload (van Dijk, 1988).
- Algorithmic Influence: Platforms reorder content behind the scenes, highlighting items that spark engagement (Stiegler, 1998/1994).

4.3 Limitations of Older Analytical Methods

Classical rhetorical or conversation analyses have trouble tackling the scale and speed of modern media (Foucault, 1972/1969). Digital discourse merges short-lived memes with open-ended comment threads, requiring a more holistic approach that factors in user agency, platform design, and big data analytics (Fairclough, 1995).

4.4 New Approaches to Digital Discourse Analysis

- Interactional Dynamics: Focusing on how participants co-create meaning via replies, quote-tweets, or comment threads (Wittgenstein, 1953).
- Computational Tools:

- o Text Mining and Sentiment Analysis detect trending emotions or narratives.
- o Topic Modeling groups related content.

Each technique brings fresh insights while potentially overlooking the nuance of minority voices (van Dijk, 1988).

- Platform Studies: Different sites be they Twitter, Reddit, or TikTok shape content uniquely, from character limits to ephemeral “Stories” (Lévy, 1997/1994).
- Socio-Philosophical Angles: Borrowing from Foucault, Derrida, or Bourdieu, we discern how digital power structures reflect capital, identity, and “regimes of truth” (Bourdieu, 1998/1996).

4.5 AI and Its Regulatory Role

Digging further, we confront how AI both produces and regulates content:

- Automated Text Generation: Tools like GPT produce entire stories, raising ethical and editorial dilemmas (Stiegler, 1998/1994).
- Personalized Feeds: Automated recommendations can trap users in narrow “information bubbles” (Heidegger, 1977/1954).
- Moderation Mechanisms: AI-based filters tackle harmful content, but might overreach or fail to catch subtle misinformation (Foucault, 1972/1969).

4.6 Conclusion: Why a Pluridisciplinary Lens Is Vital

No single discipline can address the intricacies of digital discourse alone. AI shapes production and selection in ways that require linguistic, sociological, philosophical, and technological perspectives (Fairclough, 1995). By weaving these methods together, we gain a unified vantage on how content emerges, goes viral, or fades unnoticed.

5: Societal Shifts and the Evolution of Top-Down Discourse

5.1 Traditional Top-Down Models

Throughout much of the 20th century, large news organizations oversaw public discourse, with professional journalists and editors at the helm (Adorno & Horkheimer, 1972/1944). They decided which stories to run, when to publish, and which voices got a platform. Although not unbiased, they at least followed recognized editorial norms, ensuring a certain standard of quality control.

5.2 Horizontal Media Ecosystems

Social media initially felt like a breath of fresh air, promising a horizontal flow of information unfiltered by big institutions (Lévy, 1997/1994). But stepping back, we see how tech giants themselves quickly gained near-monopolistic influence: each platform’s algorithm orchestrates user feeds in ways reminiscent of older editorial controls, albeit hidden behind black-box formulas (Stiegler, 1998/1994).

5.3 How Platforms Hierarchize Content

Algorithms are not neutral. They gauge engagement clicks, shares, watch time and elevate items that incite strong reactions (Baudrillard, 1994/1981). Long-form investigative pieces sometimes lose out to quick, sensational posts. This dynamic echoes earlier critiques of mass culture, but the personalization factor intensifies it, as each user receives a custom feed, reinforcing preexisting tastes and biases (Bourdieu, 1998/1996).

5.4 A Return of Top-Down via AI and Platform Power

Hence, if the internet initially undermined old hierarchies, platform owners have effectively re-centered power:

- Algorithms as Gatekeepers: Automated curation sets the public agenda, deciding which issues rise or vanish (Stiegler, 1998/1994).
- Automated Moderation: AI-based systems sometimes over-police or under-police content, stirring controversies over censorship or negligence (Foucault, 1972/1969).
- Fake News Regulation: Fact-checker initiatives attempt to halt misinformation, though fundamental disagreements persist over who defines “truth” (Heidegger, 1977/1954).

5.5 Philosophical Ramifications: Power and Public Discourse

Connecting these developments to philosophical theories, we confront big questions:

- Legitimacy: In a fragmented digital world, how do we maintain shared factual ground (Derrida, 1976/1967)?
- Distribution of Power: Old editorial boards compete with new gatekeepers platform owners, data scientists, influencers to shape our news diets (Bourdieu, 1998/1996).
- Freedom vs. Manipulation: Digital media broadens expression but can also manipulate user behaviors through addictive features and micro-targeting (Baudrillard, 1994/1981).

5.6 Conclusion: Openness Versus Regulation

Thus, top-down gatekeeping hasn’t disappeared; it has morphed into a more algorithmic, sometimes invisible mechanism. As we strive to preserve open debate, we must also mitigate deceptive or harmful content, requiring transparency and accountability from the tech giants that shape so many of our information streams (Fairclough, 1995).

6: Linguistic Transformations in Digital Media

6.1 Language in a Rapidly Changing Media World

Turning to language itself, we observe fundamental changes in rhetorical style and structure. Earlier journalism valued formality and objectivity making articles accessible to broad publics (Adorno & Horkheimer, 1972/1944). In contrast, online discourse thrives on short-form expressions and emotional hooks, often sprinkled with memes, emojis, or ephemeral “stories” (Barthes, 1977). Is this a new kind of creativity, or does it degrade linguistic depth?

6.2 From Standard Journalese to Hybrid Digital Registers

1. Historical Standardization: Major news outlets adhered to grammar norms, editorial rules, and factual reporting, separating news from editorializing (van Dijk, 1988).

2. Disruption: Today's digital reporters might tweet from the field, mixing personal observations with links, images, or short videos, while user comments add informal or dialectical twists (Bourdieu, 1998/1996).

6.3 AI's Influence on Language

AI leaves its mark on how we write and read:

1. Algorithmic Standardization: Automated text generators sometimes produce uniform, formulaic content, ignoring unique stylistic flourishes (Stiegler, 1998/1994).

2. Clickbait Optimization: Crafting sensational headlines or keywords to game search engines can overshadow thoroughness (Eco, 1964).

3. Adaptive Translation: Tools that instantly correct grammar or translate between languages might reduce local color, pushing standardized phrasing (Heidegger, 1977/1954).

4. Personalization: "Micro-linguistic bubbles" form when users mostly see content reflecting their preexisting vocabulary and perspectives (Baudrillard, 1994/1981).

6.4 "Erosion" vs. "Reinvention" Debates

Some see abbreviations, emoticons, and abrupt syntax as a threat to nuanced expression (Adorno & Horkheimer, 1972/1944). Others celebrate the hybrid forms of digital discourse, weaving visuals, text, and references to pop culture in fresh, compact ways (Barthes, 1977). This tension underscores how linguistic practice isn't static but evolves with the technologies shaping communication.

6.5 Philosophical Dimensions: Language, Thought, and Reality

Following Wittgenstein (1953) and Derrida (1976/1967), we recognize that language guides how we perceive reality. If digital media fosters short, emotive updates instead of extended reflection, might that reduce our capacity for deep critical debate (Foucault, 1972/1969)? Baudrillard's (1994/1981) notion of hyperreality warns that elaborate signs and images can overshadow the original events, leaving us with an endless swirl of symbols. The ephemeral nature of online posts raises yet another question: how can societies preserve historical memory when so much discourse is fleeting?

6.6 Conclusion: The Ongoing Language Evolution

Hence, digital discourse can't be neatly classified as "better" or "worse"; it's an evolving phenomenon shaped by technology, user creativity, and the quest for attention (Fairclough, 1995). The real challenge is retaining enough intellectual space and diversity of style to encourage genuine dialogue, rather than letting short-term emotional triggers dominate everything.

7: Overall Conclusions and Future Prospects

7.1 Revisiting the Core Transformations

Throughout these interconnected discussions, several transformations stand out:

1. Undoing Top-Down Models: The rise of user-generated platforms has weakened old media monopolies, but it has unleashed mountains of unverified content (van Dijk, 1988).
2. Platformization & AI: Tech giants through algorithmic personalization now mediate much of what we see, creating new gatekeeping challenges (Stiegler, 1998/1994).
3. Novel Discourse Analysis: Traditional rhetorical or sociological methods must merge with computational and ethical insights to handle ephemeral, massive, and user-driven data flows (Foucault, 1972/1969).
4. Linguistic Shifts: Emotive brevity shapes digital rhetoric, sparking debates on whether language is being impoverished or creatively reinvented (Barthes, 1977).
5. Ethical & Regulatory Concerns: Automated content generation, filter bubbles, and misinformation highlight the tension between free speech ideals and the need for oversight (Fairclough, 1995).

7.2 Balancing Expression and Quality

Citizen journalism democratizes coverage but can fuel rumors if not guided by editorial checks (Eco, 1964). Philosophers and policymakers call for an informed, engaged citizenry that can sift through contradictory claims (Baudrillard, 1994/1981). This requires reinforcing editorial ethics, user literacy, and institutional frameworks that preserve accuracy without smothering speech (Bourdieu, 1998/1996).

7.3 Rethinking Discourse Analysis in the AI Era

Stepping back, we see algorithmic curation and big data analysis pose unique challenges:

- Algorithmic Transparency: Understanding how platforms rank or filter content is crucial to democratic accountability (Stiegler, 1998/1994).
- Ethical Data Use: Large-scale text mining can overshadow minority voices or breach privacy if handled carelessly (Foucault, 1972/1969).
- Interdisciplinary Collaboration: Linguistics, sociology, computer science, and ethics must combine efforts to interpret digital discourse responsibly (Fairclough, 1995).

7.4 Maintaining a Nuanced Media Sphere

As news cycles accelerate and older editorial checks relax, thoughtful dialogue and detailed analysis may fall by the wayside (Adorno & Horkheimer, 1972/1944). Encouraging robust media literacy, independent journalism, and platform accountability could help preserve reasoned debate. This collaboration among educators, journalists, platform engineers, and policymakers becomes key in preventing an avalanche of superficial or manipulative content (Lévy, 1997/1994).

7.5 The Digital Age: A Continuing Experiment

Our current media environment offers more participation, but it can also fracture societies into ideological bubbles (van Dijk, 1988). By fostering critical thinking, forging well-balanced regulations, and upholding institutional checks, we can hopefully steer technology toward supporting inclusive discourse, instead of fueling further polarization (Stiegler, 1998/1994).

8: Comprehensive Conclusion and Beyond

All these discussions reveal how media discourse has moved from a top-down editorial sphere to an arena profoundly shaped by user participation, algorithmic curation, changing linguistic norms, and a growing reliance on AI. Historically, newspapers and TV networks set the tone for public debate. Now, power rests largely with platform algorithms that can catapult certain stories to viral fame while burying others (Stiegler, 1998/1994). Citizen journalists bring immediacy and diverse viewpoints, but risk introducing confusion and rumor if no consistent system checks their claims (Bourdieu, 1998/1996). Meanwhile, rhetorical styles are in flux, with hashtags, emojis, and ephemeral posts challenging older, more stable forms of reporting (Barthes, 1977).

8.1 Recapitulating Key Themes

1. Shifting Gatekeepers: Once-powerful editors now share authority with platform CEOs and data scientists, sometimes in ways that lack transparency (Stiegler, 1998/1994).
2. AI's Growing Role: Automated tools increasingly generate content and moderate discussions, posing ethical dilemmas around editorial integrity (Heidegger, 1977/1954).
3. Evolving Language: Emojis, memes, and short clips simultaneously expand creative expression and risk trivializing complex issues (Barthes, 1977).
4. Critical-Ethical Imperatives: A fragmented audience, manipulative platform designs, and fleeting attention spans highlight the urgency of oversight and user education (Foucault, 1972/1969).

8.2 Contradictions in Digital Discourse

Yes, digital media fosters more participation and can highlight underrepresented perspectives. But it also enables forms of surveillance, "black-box" curation, and corporate exploitation of user data (Eco, 1964). Tools that empower grassroots reports can also be weaponized to push extremist content or orchestrated misinformation. The outcome depends on local contexts, platform policies, and the presence of strong (or weak) civic institutions (Fairclough, 1995).

- Information Overload vs. Depth: Endless streams can undermine reflective engagement (Baudrillard, 1994/1981).
- Community vs. Tribalism: Online spaces can unify like-minded users or intensify echo chambers.
- Human vs. Algorithmic Moderation: While AI can swiftly remove harmful content, it might also misjudge context, restricting legitimate dialogue (Stiegler, 1998/1994).

8.3 Governance Issues

Legislators and civic groups often struggle to catch up with platform innovations:

- Algorithmic Transparency: Who decides how user feeds are arranged (Heidegger, 1977/1954)?
- Content Moderation Norms: Achieving consistent, fair rules that don't stifle legitimate speech (van Dijk, 1988).

- Data Ownership: Clarifying user rights over personal data that often fuel personalization (Foucault, 1972/1969).

8.4 Education: Media Literacy as a Foundation

Given the dynamic, often chaotic nature of digital discourse, media literacy emerges as a vital tool to empower individuals especially younger generations to identify biases, manipulative headlines, or algorithmic influences (Fairclough, 1995). Teaching critical consumption, as opposed to naive scrolling, may help sustain a more informed citizenry.

8.5 Paths Toward a More Reflective Digital Future

If guided by thoughtful ethics and well-crafted policy, digital media can flourish as a space for creativity and cross-cultural dialogue (Lévy, 1997/1994). However, if commercial or partisan interests rule unchecked, the realm might descend into echo chambers or a swirl of unverified rumors. Potential solutions include co-regulatory frameworks, decentralized platforms, and new economic models rewarding quality journalism (Adorno & Horkheimer, 1972/1944). Fundamentally, though, the digital revolution offers both opportunity and risk. As Stiegler (1998/1994) notes, technology is never neutral; how we harness it or let it harness us will shape public life for generations.

When we take a truly integrated look at citizen contributions, AI curation, rhetorical evolution, and philosophical underpinnings, we see they form a complex feedback loop. Each dimension be it the user with a smartphone, the platform algorithm, or the tradition of editorial scrutiny affects the others. Understanding that interplay is crucial for any discussion of democracy, cultural identity, or ethical communication in the digital era (Foucault, 1972/1969). And while no single stakeholder can solve all the issues, a collaborative effort spanning journalists, platform operators, policy-makers, educators, and regular users offers the best hope of cultivating a reflective, inclusive, and responsible public discourse environment.

References :

- Adorno, T. W., & Horkheimer, M. (1972). *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (J. Cumming, Trans.). Herder and Herder. (Original work published 1944)
- Barthes, R. (1977). *Image, music, text* (S. Heath, Trans.). Hill and Wang.
- Baudrillard, J. (1994). *Simulacra and simulation* (S. F. Glaser, Trans.). University of Michigan Press. (Original work published 1981)
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *On Television* (P. P. Ferguson, Trans.). The New Press. (Original work published 1996)
- Derrida, J. (1976). *Of grammatology* (G. C. Spivak, Trans.). Johns Hopkins University Press. (Original work published 1967)
- Eco, U. (1964). *Apocalittici e integrati: Comunicazioni di massa e teorie della cultura di massa*. Bompiani.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media discourse*. Edward Arnold.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge* (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). Pantheon Books. (Original work published 1969)
- Heidegger, M. (1977). *The question concerning technology, and other essays* (W. Lovitt, Trans.). Harper & Row. (Original work published 1954)
- Lévy, P. (1997). *Collective intelligence: Mankind's emerging world in cyberspace* (R. Bononno, Trans.). Perseus Books. (Original work published 1994)
- Stiegler, B. (1998). *Technics and time, 1: The fault of Epimetheus* (R. Beardsworth & G. Collins, Trans.). Stanford University Press. (Original work published 1994)
- van Dijk, T. A. (1988). *News as discourse*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical investigations* (G. E. M. Anscombe, Trans.). Basil Blackwell