The Role of AI in Shaping Political Discourse on Social Media

Mohammad Nurhafiz Hassim*, Nur Nasliza Arina Mohamad Nasir

Faculty of Communication and Media Studies, University Technology MARA, Malaysia

***Corresponding Author**

DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.910000478

Received: 02 November 2025; Accepted: 08 November 2025; Published: 17 November 2025

ABSTRACT

In the contemporary landscape of politics, social media functions as the primary venue of engagement. The algorithms of artificial intelligence (AI) systems curate political discourse, target advertising, moderate discussions, and place generative media within social media feeds at marginal costs approaching zero. However, the engagement-optimized closed systems distort content, create environments for unaccountable microtargeting, spread misinformation, erode trust in the political system, and undermine the legitimacy of elections. This research seeks to explain how AI on social media structures exposure, interpretation, and perceived legitimacy of political discourse, and identifies interventions that retain benefits while reducing harms. The analysis is based on secondary data situated in Google Scholar, Scopus, and Web of Sciences from 2020 to 2025. This study builds on peer-reviewed research articles as the foundation for assessing the AI-political communication functions, strategies and AI technology. Six functions of AI systems were articulated: algorithmic curation and ranking, political ad targeting and delivery optimization, automated moderation and labeling, cross-cutting design choices, context dependence, and generative AI synthetic and synthetic political content. In this context, the benefits of AI in political communication include improved relevance, accessibility, safety, and efficiency of political campaigns, while the harms involve narrowed cross-cutting exposure, high-arousal polarization, opaque segmented persuasion, uneven enforcement, and synthetic media that undermines integrity.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Political Discourse, Social Media; Content Generative AI, Secondary Data

INTRODUCTION

Media is a significant factor that impacts the lives of contemporary society. Media, including newspapers, magazines, television, radio, the Internet, and social media, significantly contribute to the dissemination of information, entertainment, and education throughout society. Social media is an interactive application of the new millennium, characterised by engaging graphics, sound, and video features. It is unsurprising that social media is becoming integrated into society due to its numerous advantages, including providing access to a knowledge-rich environment and serving as a rapid conduit for information acquisition and dissemination. Social media streamlines various facets of life, including communication, relationships, information access, and community engagement (Nur Nasliza Arina & Mohammad Nurhafiz, 2023; Akmar Hayati, 2021).

Social media is a common place where people find current information, cultivate opinions, and find ways to encourage participation in a cause. At the core of this environment are systems of artificial intelligence (AI) that as a matter of routine decide (Liu, 2021) user invisibility, the audience of political communications, the tagging, deletion of posts, and, most recently, the very presence of content itself (Dávila Cortés, 2025; Hartono et al., 2025; Wang & Kim, 2023). In the real world, recommendation and ranking algorithms construct feeds (Bartley et al., 2025), political ads are targeted and optimized for delivery through automated systems (Ali et al., 2021), political text (Sinha et al., 2024), and voice (S. Kumar et al., 2024), as well as image and video (Liv & Greenbaum, 2020) (Liv & Greenbaum, 2020) content, at a fraction of the cost of a human, instead of hand, are produced by generative AI systems. It is also important to note that following the phase of training, these models can be distributed at a zero incremental cost. The combination of low production cost and almost no marginal cost for additional models of copies for sale enables the inexpensive and wide-ranging circulation of

persuasive content (Lv, 2023). The ability of these electronic tools to influence the accessibility, framing, and circulation of political thoughts changes the online political discourse profoundly.

The operational logic of AI systems on digital platforms poses distinct vulnerabilities to democratic processes across four main areas. In the curation area, AI systems filter and rank information so that political information environments become distorted, public trust diminishes, and polarization increases, ultimately undermining the quality of democratic choices (Yazici, 2025). In the targeting area, the use of AI 'raises ethical concerns about privacy and the exploitation of psychological vulnerabilities (Kavoliūnaitė-Ragauskienė, 2024; Rubio Núñez, 2025) thus enabling public manipulation to go unchecked. In the area of modification and fabrication, AI technologies disseminate misinformation at an unprecedented speed, obscure the boundaries of truth and lie, and undermine the trust essential to democracy (Imran et al., 2025). Furthermore, the production of fake content that may trigger disinformation flows is unprecedented and is a direct attack on the democratic order (Cupać & Sienknecht, 2024). In summary, the operational logic of AI systems on digital platforms poses distinct vulnerabilities to democracy in the areas of Curation, Targeting, Modification, and Fabrication. These negative functionalities operate most destructively in high stakes, polarized settings such as during elections, where they fundamentally shift the exposure, tone and trustworthiness of public discourse, thus influencing electoral participation and undermining the legitimacy of institutions. This clear and present danger highlights the need to develop and implement strong regulations and ethical standards to address the risks that artificial intelligence poses to democracy.

This conceptual paper describes how AI applications in social media shape the political content individuals are exposed to and the conversations surrounding this content, also addressing the advantages and disadvantages these applications provide to political discussions online. By integrating the context, issues, and aims within this introduction, the paper clearly articulates a structured, concept-driven exploration of the intersection between AI and political discourse. It aims to provide students, educators, practitioners, and policymakers with a rapid understanding of the primary functions of these systems, the implications of design choices, the strongest and weakest points of available evidence, and the practical steps that reliably improve the quality of discourse within expressive political alignment.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The term Artificial Intelligence (AI) encompasses a branch of computer science that is concerned with the development of machines and software that are capable of carrying out functions that entail a degree of human intellect, including learning, reasoning, problem-solving, perception and decision making (Deng, 2018; Yadav et al., 2025). Artificial Intelligence (AI) relies on the implementation of machine learning algorithms and technologies that enable machines to perform tasks autonomously or semi-autonomously with a limited cognitive component (Morandín-Ahuerma, 2022). One of the ways AI is shaping political discourse is through AI-powered sentiment analysis which allows political campaigns to gauge public sentiment and adjust their communicative strategies accordingly. This approach improves the precision with which campaigns focus on voters and optimize campaign strategies, thereby enhancing the effectiveness of political engagement (Ayma Quirita et al., 2024; Tembhurne et al., 2025).

The use of AI technologies such as deepfakes and personalized messaging can build custom narratives that can sway opinion and deepening societal divides. This is particularly the case with populism where AI technologies are utilized for the creation of neo-propaganda (Jain & Mitra, 2025). The employment of AI to construct echo chambers and filter bubbles deepens biases and divides the polity and closes the gate on deliberative democracy (Pinto-Bustamante et al., 2023). AI tools can skew the discourse of democracy and fracture the discourse of democracy on imperfections. The resultant absences of transparency and the active use of bias within AI tools in political discourse raises ethics of accountability within democracy (Ghose et al., 2025). The opacity within algorithms and the exploitation of psychological weaknesses calls for the upholding of democracy through ethics and regulation in order AI technologies to respond to the democratic demand (Ghose et al., 2025; Jain & Mitra, 2025; Kashiramka et al., 2024).

Artificial Intelligence has been utilized to shape key political events such as the Brexit decision and the US elections, through the use sophisticated analytics and tailored disinformation strategies (Long et al., 2020). The

use of AI to propagate disinformation and fake news has emerged to be a problem, and the case of ChatGPT is being examined as a potential distributor of false information (Vasist et al., 2025). The impact of AI on political communication differs from one country to another and is determined by the specific national interests and geopolitical situation. For example, the US situation is one of military preeminence, whereas the EU is concerned with ethical governance. Comparative studies demonstrate the very different ways legislative bodies across the world discuss and frame AI, and this highlights the discrepancies in regulation and ethics (Suter et al., 2025).

Furthermore, AI is used fundamentally differently in authoritarian states versus democracies, with authoritarian regimes leveraging technology for control while democracies focus more on service delivery. Authoritarian states like China use AI primarily for surveillance and political control (Zeng, 2020). They employ facial recognition, social media monitoring, and big data analytics to strengthen regime power and suppress dissent (Bukhari & Anwar, 2025). In contrast, democratic governments predominantly use AI to improve public services, with European Union studies showing AI applications mainly supporting service delivery and internal management (Van Noordt & Misuraca, 2022). However, both systems face challenges, democracies risk technological paternalism and polarization, while authoritarian states risk over-reliance on technological control (Cupać et al., 2024). The key difference lies in governance approach, authoritarian states see AI as a tool for political consolidation, while democracies view it as a potential mechanism for administrative improvement.

Political discourse involves the intricate dynamics of verbal and written communication in each political framework. It goes beyond merely communicating information (political communication); it involves a myriad of ways through which rhetoric is deployed to enact, preserve, or contest forms of power, to create and challenge ideologies, and to construct and alter (social) reality (Cherikbaeva et al., 2024). It includes the entire range of politically oriented communication, in whatever form text, discourse, images, or symbols (Latif, 2017). Perhaps the most characteristic form of political communication is persuasion, primarily using propaganda, which employs particular grammatical, morphological, and syntactic structures to perform prescribed communicative functions (Shkvorchenko, 2020). In the field of political science, the most innovative use of constructive discourse is the study of relational power. It enables political scientists to theorize how politicians construct and sustain power over their audience (Latif, 2017; Sravani et al., 2021) The design of social media platforms, especially Twitter and TikTok, democratizes political discourse by enabling direct communication with constituents and the strategy of personalized, highly polarized, and emotionally charged discourse (Berdón-Prieto et al., 2023; Diez-Gracia et al., 2023). The media also performs the crucial task of framing the political discourse in such a way that it aims to achieve a particular outcome (Abdul Wahab & Tew Abdullah, 2025).

Pauline Leong's (2015) research in Malaysia demonstrated that politicians utilise the media to influence and secure voter support, particularly during electoral periods. Her investigation of the political process and communication techniques in Malaysia revealed that new media, especially Web 2.0, has expanded the public sphere and enhanced democratic involvement among Malaysians via information dissemination, mobilisation, and crowdsourcing. New media has enabled the rise of varied viewpoints that challenge political dominance. Communication is more bilateral, with the public expecting greater participation and interactivity with their elected officials. Her investigation indicated that the Internet and social media had injected unparalleled complexity into the political communication process in Malaysia. External factors, such as the electoral system and political institutions, affect the degree to which ideas propagated through social media can gain traction within the political sphere, potentially resulting in political change. According to Mohd Faizal (2024), social media heavily influences politics and democracy in developing democracies like Malaysia, particularly among youth. Social media allows groups to voice their thoughts, expanding the public sphere in semi-democratic countries like Malaysia. Social media allows members of diverse groups and cultures to participate meaningfully in different registers or languages, unlike the public realm. His research on young voters and social media reveals a passive interest in political information, with Twitter and Facebook being the most influential channels for first-time voters seeking information. Additionally, his research indicates that first-time voters are increasingly using private WhatsApp groups to engage in political discussions and debates due to concerns about social media surveillance. WhatsApp and Instagram stories are becoming the primary venue for disseminating political information.

Combining these strands, AI utilizes social media affordances to shape political discourse. Sentiment analysis and automated AI messaging tools, tools of AI, are widely used in political marketing to customize communications to target specific subgroups within the electorate. This strategy amplifies polarization and fabricates consensus in opinion manipulation (Das & Malaviya, 2025; Jain & Mitra, 2025; López Ponce et al., 2024). AI systems, including deepfakes, are being used to make fake yet remarkably realistic material that can alter perceptions and affect politics. This is especially the case with fake images of wars and other visual disinformation (Bazarkina & Matyashova, 2022; García-Huete et al., 2025; Xiang, 2025). Direct communication between political actors and the public has been made possible by social media platforms, first and foremost Twitter and Facebook. They distribute political messages to the populace and serve as tools for the organization of protests and other revolutionary actions (Ajaegbu & Ajaegbu, 2024; Jufri et al., 2024; Stieglitz & Dang-Xuan, 2013). Social media users, especially through the mechanism of the homophily, can connect and form communities around shared political ideas and are therefore able to create echo chambers. This contributes to polarization and the entrenchment of beliefs (Matalon et al., 2021; Parmar et al., 2024; Wu et al., 2025).

The interrelation of AI, political discourse, and social media is not only interwoven but is also evolving. Social media and AI technologies can facilitate the evolution of politically targeted communication and engagement. Yet, the technologies pose notable ethical and social problems. These problems will not be mitigated until there is strong regulation and ethical social media use so that AI is integrated into democracy positively and social media use is incorporated into democratic engagement.

METHODOLOGY

This study uses secondary data. It performs narrative analysis of literature on artificial intelligence (AI), social media, and political discourse to describe the role of AI in shaping the political information individuals have access to and the ways in which people talk about this information, as well as examining the reported advantages and disadvantages in the recent literature. The period of study was from January 1, 2020, to September 30, 2025. Data was collected using Google Scholar, Scopus, and the Web of Science (WoS). The justification for the period of 2020 to 2025 is that it includes the period that the use of AI in politics evolved quickly and became mainstream. Innovations in AI include the use of transformer-based models, large language models, and diffusion-based generators which all greatly reduce the cost of creating political content. Changes in AI for political discourse have also been made to automated moderation, recommendation systems, and the policies of platforms regarding political content. Review of literature within this timeframe ensures that the synthesis is based on contemporary technologies, practices, and governance issues.

The strategies for a search incorporated both general and function-specific terms customized to each database. Central searches combined “social media” with “artificial intelligence,” “AI,” or “machine learning,” and together with politically oriented terms like “political discourse,” “political communication,” or “election.” The parameters for search results allowed for publications from 2020 to 2025 that were in English and primarily journal articles and complete conference papers. Studies were included that focused on social media and analysed at least one AI mediated function with results that were relevant to discourse at a political. Contexts that were used for exclusion included purely non-social, politically non-relevant domains that did not offer insights that were transferable, non-empirical or non-systematic opinion pieces, and works from 2020. Background information may be cited for works prior to 2020, but core evidence should not include any synthesis of these works.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the narrative analysis of peer-reviewed research published between the years 2020 and 2025, the analysis identifies six AI mediated functions on social media which include: algorithmic curation and ranking, political ad targeting and delivery optimization, automated moderation and labeling, cross-cutting design choices, context dependence and generative AI and synthetic political content. These functions collectively shape the political information that users receive, the interpretative frameworks they apply during discussions, and the legitimacy of the communicative context that surrounds them.

Algorithmic curation and ranking

Concerning the targeting of political advertisements and the optimization of their delivery, artificial intelligence (AI) systems have considerably reduced the cost of reaching audiences, thus enhancing the efficiency of political campaigns for both established players and smaller civic organizations. The accessibility features of political messages, such as automated captioning and translation, have democratized access for audiences who have historically been sidelined by the mainstream media. However, the same optimization algorithms, particularly those that automatically and dynamically identify cost-efficient audiences, can encode and deepen demographic and ideological biases in exposure that may go well beyond explicit targeting (Ali et al., 2021). As the delivery of political ads, as well as audience composition, remains opaque, users have little understanding of who else is viewing a particular political message and the reasons for their selection, thereby curtailing public accountability and enabling covert segmented persuasion that exploits psychological manipulation (Kavoliūnaitė-Ragauskienė, 2024; Rubio Núñez, 2025). Citizens perceive the flow of political communication as private and unaccountable when they suspect political messages are being circulated in this manner. The analysis suggests that comprehensive political advertisement measures with thorough political ad metadata, standardized "Why am I seeing this?" explanations, and "no sensitive attribute inference" controls could contain the most severe efficiency-loss legitimacy trade-offs while still addressing the most severe gain-loss efficiency trade-offs. The ability of independent auditors to access the data, particularly for researchers, is valuable for identifying disparate impacts and for bounding optimization goals to civic integrity, rather than just to cost and engagement.

Automated Moderation and Labeling

Automation in moderation and labeling shows the most drastic scaling benefits: it removes or downranks clear policy violations, adds contextual labels to misleading claims, and minimizes exposure to abusive, harassing, and other categories of disinformation (Gorwa et al., 2020). Alongside these benefits, error patterns become systematic rather than random. More false negatives occur in minority and low-resource languages, while enforcement inconsistency, geo and topic skews risk claims of bias or political favoritism and chill legitimate speech. Although labels can decrease reshares of some false claims, when labels are inconsistent or rationales opaque, the "implied truth" effect of unlabeled content may create distrust and backfire. Best results come from shaped layered, proportionate "friction" interventions, like nudges to read an article before reshare, mild virality delays on new accounts, and clear, user-facing explanations and appeal pathways. Investment in multilingual model parity and third-party evaluation minimizes uneven burdens to marginalized communities and is repeatedly emphasized as essential to making the safety offered fair.

Cross cutting design choices

Multiple functions adopt a few selected design choices as robust, low regret work interventions that enhance the quality of discussion without imposing blanket restrictions on political expression (Ghose et al., 2025; Suter et al., 2025). Achieving user agency is possible through the enforcement of accountability norms that advocate for the use of clear, plain language on how the decisions made in targeting, ranking, and enforcement of any restrictions are made (Ghose et al., 2025; Kashiramka et al., 2024; Suter et al., 2025) Constraints on how feeds and ads are controlled, that are surfaced in user flows, enabling users to refine their experiences and enhance the diversity of their information to lessen the impact of engagement driven curation and echo chamber dynamics (Ali et al., 2021; Bartley et al., 2025; Pinto-Bustamante et al., 2023; Yazici, 2025). Careful jugged friction on reshares and replies during periods of heightened risk for the spread of low-quality claims and in high periods of quality engagement functions as a proportionate complement to moderation and claims labeling and captures genuine engagement with only limited costs (Gorwa et al., 2020; Imran et al., 2025; Vasist et al., 2025). Transparent, searchable political ad libraries with standardized, stable metadata and APIs for researchers enable external scrutiny that deters abuse and informs policy by making microtargeting practices and delivery skews auditable (Ali et al., 2021; Kavoliūnaitė-Ragauskienė, 2024; Rubio Núñez, 2025; Suter et al., 2025). Finally, visible provenance for AI generated content helps establish shared epistemic norms about what is synthetic and what is not, even if such signals cannot guarantee authenticity in every case, given the demonstrated ease of producing convincing synthetic text, audio, image, and video and the associated risks of deceptive persuasion and visual disinformation (Bazarkina & Matyashova, 2022; García-Huete et al., 2025;

Imran et al., 2025; V. Kumar et al., 2024; Liv & Greenbaum, 2020; Sinha et al., 2024; Vasist et al., 2025; Xiang, 2025)

Context Dependence

Although useful, the effects of such interventions still hold relevance to context specific details: the behavioral style, the potential risks to be managed, the languages utilized, platform affordances, and simultaneous physical world happenings (Ajaegbu & Ajaegbu, 2024; Berdón-Prieto et al., 2023; Diez-Gracia et al., 2023; Ghose et al., 2025; Jufri et al., 2024; Long et al., 2020; Matalon et al., 2021; Parmar et al., 2024; Wu et al., 2025). Variability and divergence are, thus, central to the concern under discussion. The same intervention, deployed cross products and rhetorical formats, can bring about varying impacts. Designed norms and rules of turn-taking, along with the attention the social architecture of a platform pays to them, interlace with the platform's algorithmic goals to steer attention and conversation in such a way that they achieve the same outcome on a targeted intervention but different results on varying products (Berdón-Prieto et al., 2023; Diez-Gracia et al., 2023). The asymmetries of linguistic resources are still systematically underestimated: low resource languages are more likely to have poor quality moderation, and low quality recommendations, which intensifies the inequitable conditions and puts the community at a higher level of vulnerability to abuse and misinformation in a context that demands reliable, equitable, and transparent AI (Ghose et al., 2025; Kashiramka et al., 2024; Yazici, 2025). High stakes political moments elections, referenda, crises amplify both the benefits of rapid information access and the risks of harmful virality, as evidenced by platform mediated mobilization and strategic communication in major political events (Abdul Wahab & Tew Abdullah, 2025; Ajaegbu & Ajaegbu, 2024; Jufri et al., 2024; Long et al., 2020). Time bound, clearly communicated integrity measures tailored to such moments for example, elevating authoritative information, temporarily increasing friction on reshares, or tightening synthetic media policies appear to produce the most favorable tradeoffs when they are transparently scoped and independently evaluated within ethical governance frameworks (Cupać & Sienknecht, 2024; Gorwa et al., 2020; Imran et al., 2025; Suter et al., 2025).

Generative AI and synthetic political content

In this context, generative AI poses a different challenge as it collapses the marginal cost of creating convincing written political communication, imagery, audio and video (Kumar et al., 2024; Liv & Greenbaum, 2020; Sinha et al., 2024) On the one hand, tools of this kind assist in translation, summarization, and accessibility, increasing the volume and reach of civic information than previously possible in diverse formats and languages. On the other hand, they enable the rapid production and distribution of deceptive synthetic media and identity-based manipulations which exceed the current capacity of integrity systems (Cupać & Sienknecht, 2024; Imran et al., 2025). While provenance and watermarking solutions are advancing and have demonstrated value, they are, by themselves, insufficient. Adoption rates are lumpy and uneven, signals are easily stripped, spoofed, or lost, and users do not know, care, or misunderstand provenance indicators. The literature suggests that visible and consistent labeling of AI generated or AI edited content coupled with creator side tools which attach content credentials instantly and coordinated detection and response across platforms significantly improve resilience. These measures are most effective when combined with user training and calibrated friction on the rapid dissemination of new or sensational claims, especially during periods of heightened public interest such as election campaigns.

Finally, the results indicate that the impact of AI on political discourse is not strictly negative, nor is it wholly liberating; it is, instead, conditional and can be mindful crafted. The same capabilities that underlie personalization, efficiency, and accessibility can, with civically focused aims of the platforms, and with independently resourced audits, be engineered to prioritize deliberative quality, diversity of views, legitimizing discourse, and civically aligned investments in provenance, multilingual equity, and proportionate friction. Policy choice can reinforce these decisions by bundling the preservation of space for deemed legitimate political expression with foundational algorithmic transparency, accountability for political advertisements, and protective measures against deceptive synthetic impersonation. The underspecified limitations within the available evidence, particularly the constraining researcher access to platform data, and the pace with which models and policies are evolving, accent the urgency for cross platform, multilingual, pre-registered studies designed to evaluate not only engagement but also trust, polarization, and participation.

Table 1: Six Functions Derived from the Analysis

Function	Core purpose	Typical inputs/logic	Primary outcome emphasis
Algorithmic Curation & Ranking	Orders and surfaces content in feeds	Engagement proxies (click-through, watch time, dwell), freshness, social graph, quality/credibility signals	Exposure (strong); Interpretation (medium via frames/cues); Legitimacy (indirect via perceived bias)
Political Ad Targeting & Delivery Optimization	Finds cost-effective audiences and optimizes delivery for political messages	Advertiser parameters + system delivery optimization; inferred interests/demographics; lookalikes	Exposure (segmented); Interpretation (segmented narratives); Legitimacy (opacity concerns)
Automated Moderation & Labeling	Enforces policies, reduces harm, adds context	ML classifiers; policy rules; fact-checks/knowledge bases	Exposure (reduce violative content); Interpretation (labels); Legitimacy (depends on consistency/fairness)
Cross-Cutting Design Choices	Explanations, user controls, calibrated friction, ad transparency, provenance	UI controls; "Why am I seeing this?"; reshare prompts/delays; ad libraries; content credentials	Legitimacy (increase); Exposure/Interpretation (user-steered)
Context Dependence	Modulates effects by platform format, language resources, and events	Short-form vs threaded formats; linguistic resource availability; offline salience and timing	All three; effects vary by context
Generative AI & Synthetic Content	Produces persuasive/synthetic text, image, audio, video at low marginal cost	LLMs; diffusion models; watermarking/provenance signals	Exposure (volume/novelty); Interpretation (ambiguity/credibility); Legitimacy (risk without provenance)

CONCLUSION

This conceptual paper aims to explore the role of artificial intelligence tools in social media in shaping political discourse as well as the pieces of information people are exposed to and the benefits and disadvantages of such artificial intelligence tools in online political discourse. By conducting a narrative synthesis of literature published from 2020 to 2025, the analysis uncovered that six AI functions on social media are AI driven algorithmic curation and ranking, automated political advertisement targeting and delivery optimization, automated moderation and labeling, cross-cutting design choices, context dependence and the generative AI and synthetic political content. From a more positive perspective, these systems improve relevance by personalizing user feeds, rule violating content is removed or downranked resulting in improved safety, accessibility is enhanced through translations and multimodal formats, and campaign audience targeting precision increases with more automated tools. On the negative side, the same optimization logics narrow information diets, privilege emotionally charged and polarizing material, accelerating the spread of low-quality claims, produce uneven enforcement that can chill legitimate speech or exacerbate inequities across languages and communities, and undermine perceived legitimacy through opaque microtargeting and imperfect provenance signals for synthetic media. In conclusion, AI on social media is not simply a tool that uniformly

degrades or enhances political discourse artificially. Rather, it is a set of configurable systems whose impacts depend on design decisions. These decisions include decontextualized moderation systems, transparency policies, and governance frameworks. In this paper, I argue that product designs featuring explanation and control, calibrated friction, ad transparency and provenance, and independent evaluation combined with proportionate regulation can immensely reduce relevance, safety, and accessibility. These product designs can also lessen the harms of narrowed exposure, accessibility, polarization, misinformation diffusion, and erosion of legitimacy. Platforms, policymakers, researchers, and civil society face a challenge to move beyond simplistic narratives of technological determinism. They must also engage in the deliberate and evidence-based engineering of AI systems to achieve democratic purposes. These stakes have become high. The online quality of political discourse impacts participation in elections, public trust in democratic institutions, and the ability to engage in informed, pluralistic deliberation. These stakes also drive the design of AI systems that engage in diverse political discourse. These systems should be built AI's role in political discourse should be treated as designable as opposed to inevitable, will ensure a communicative environment that fosters the amplification of diverse voices and the elevation of credible, civil discourse.

REFERENCES

1. Abdul Wahab, S., & Tew Abdullah, M. H. (2025). Media framing on Bernama's Twitter coverage during Malaysia's GE15: An exploratory factor analysis. SEARCH Journal Media and Communication Research, 17(1), 41–57. https://doi.org/10.58946/search-17.1.P3
2. Ajaegbu, O. O., & Ajaegbu, C. (2024). The new democratisation: Social media impact on the political process in Sub-Saharan Africa. Frontiers in Communication, 9, 1394949. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2024.1394949
3. Ali, M., Sapiezynski, P., Korolova, A., Mislove, A., & Rieke, A. (2021). Ad Delivery Algorithms: The Hidden Arbiters of Political Messaging. Proceedings of the 14th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining, 13–21. https://doi.org/10.1145/3437963.3441801
4. Akmar Hayati, A.G. (2021, Januari 7). Pengguna setia media sosial. Harian Metro. Retrieved from https://www.hmetro.com.my/WM/2021/01/661173/pengguna-setia-media-sosial
5. Ayma Quirita, V. A., David Cárdenas, J., Aliaga, W., Ayma Quirita, V. H., Palacios, A., & Sierra, R. B. (2024). Peruvian Presidential Debates in the Elections of 2021 in Twitter/X: A Sentiment Analysis Approach. IEEE Access, 12, 138386–138398. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2024.3465503
6. Bartley, N., Burghardt, K., & Lerman, K. (2025). Impacts of Personalization on Social Network Exposure. In L. M. Aiello, T. Chakraborty, & S. Gaito (Eds.), Social Networks Analysis and Mining (Vol. 15212, pp. 38–53). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-78538-2_3
7. Bazarkina, D., & Matyashova, D. (2022). "Smart" Psychological Operations in Social Media: Security Challenges in China and Germany. 14–20. Scopus. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85147530339&partnerID=40&md5=5f9ca306159032f911d67b4bab9e5a6c
8. Berdón-Prieto, P., Herrero-Izquierdo, J., & Reguero-Sanz, I. (2023). Political polarization and politainment: Methodology for analyzing crypto hate speech on TikTok. El Profesional de La Información, e320601. https://doi.org/10.3145/epi.2023.nov.01
9. Bukhari, M., & Anwar, S. (2025). The Influence of AI on Models of Governance in Authoritarian and Democratic Systems. Journal of Political Stability Archive, 3(1), 887–902. https://doi.org/10.63468/jpsa.3.1.53
10. Cherikbaeva, N., Musaeva, T., & Kyrgyz-Turkish Manas University. (2024). Political Discourse And Its Role In Shaping Public Opinion. Alatoo Academic Studies, 24(1), 277–290. https://doi.org/10.17015/aas.2024.241.25
11. Cupać, J., & Sienknecht, M. (2024). Regulate against the machine: How the EU mitigates AI harm to democracy. Democratization, 31(5), 1067–1090. https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2024.2353706
12. Das, A., & Malaviya, S. (2025). Artificial Intelligence and Sentiment Analysis in Political Campaigns. In Cyber-Physical Systems for Innovating and Transforming Society 5.0 (1st ed., pp. 193–209). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781394197750.ch9
13. Dávila Cortés, I. E. (2025). Los derechos político-electorales en México ante los desafíos de la Inteligencia Artificial. Revista de Derecho Político, 123, 345–372. https://doi.org/10.5944/rdp.123.2025.45516

14. Deng, L. (2018). Artificial Intelligence in the Rising Wave of Deep Learning: The Historical Path and Future Outlook [Perspectives]. IEEE Signal Processing Magazine, 35(1), 180–177. https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2017.2762725
15. Diez-Gracia, A., Sánchez-García, P., & Martín-Román, J. (2023). Polarización y discurso emocional de la agenda política en redes sociales: Desintermediación y engagement en campaña electoral. Revista ICONO 14. Revista Científica de Comunicación y Tecnologías Emergentes, 21(1). https://doi.org/10.7195/ri14.v21i1.1922
16. García-Huete, E., Ignacio-Cerrato, S., Pacios, D., Vázquez-Poletti, J. L., Pérez-Serrano, M. J., Donofrio, A., Cesarano, C., Schetakis, N., & Di Iorio, A. (2025). Evaluating the role of generative AI and color patterns in the dissemination of war imagery and disinformation on social media. Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence, 7, 1457247. https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2024.1457247
17. Ghose, A., Pallav, P., & Ali, S. M. A. (2025). AI and Political Polarization: Analyzing the Impact of Algorithmic Bias on Governance in Diverse Political Systems. In A. Günar (Ed.), Advances in Finance, Accounting, and Economics (pp. 135–160). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-7036-0.ch007
18. Gorwa, R., Binns, R., & Katzenbach, C. (2020). Algorithmic content moderation: Technical and political challenges in the automation of platform governance. Big Data & Society, 7(1), 205395171989794. https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951719897945
19. Hartono, B., Suasana, I. S., Muthohir, M., Suresh, R., & Prihatmoko, S. (2025). Sociotechnical Perspectives on Balancing Human Judgment and AI in Content Moderation. 2025 4th International Conference on Creative Communication and Innovative Technology (ICCIT), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCIT65724.2025.11167561
20. Imran, H., Maqsood, M., & Imran, Q. (2025). The deepfake crisis: Exploring new media literacy, information integrity, and trust among Pakistani youth. Qualitative Research Reports in Communication, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1080/17459435.2025.2541214
21. Jain, V., & Mitra, A. (2025). The Role of Social Media and AI in Shaping Neo-Propaganda for Populist Movements: A Global Perspective. In A. T. Vieira, A. F. Joaquim, & A. Duarte (Eds.), Advances in Wireless Technologies and Telecommunication (pp. 63–86). IGI Global Scientific Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-9999-6.ch004
22. Jufri, Rahman, A., & Suarga, H. (2024). Exploring the impact of social media on political discourse: A case study of the Makassar mayoral election. International Journal of Advanced Technology and Engineering Exploration, 11(114). https://doi.org/10.19101/IJATEE.2023.10102458
23. Kashiramka, S., Gupta, P., & Barman, S. (2024). Literature Review of Artificial Intelligence's Impact on Politics and Society. 2024 IEEE 11th Uttar Pradesh Section International Conference on Electrical, Electronics and Computer Engineering (UPCON), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1109/UPCON62832.2024.10983037
24. Kavoliūnaitė-Ragauskienė, E. (2024). Artificial Intelligence in Manipulation: The Significance and Strategies for Prevention. Baltic Journal of Law & Politics, 17(2), 116–141. https://doi.org/10.2478/bjlp-2024-00018
25. Kumar, S., Musharaf, D., & Bhushan, B. (2024). Taming The Hate: Machine Learning Analysis Of Hate Speech. 2024 2nd International Conference on Disruptive Technologies (ICDT), 269–273. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDT61202.2024.10489362
26. Kumar, V., Kapoor, A., Chaudhary, R. R., Gupta, L., & Khokhar, D. (2024). Preserving Integrity: A Binary Classification Approach to Unmasking Artificially Generated Voices in the Age of Deepkakes. 2024 11th International Conference on Computing for Sustainable Global Development (INDIACom), 1449–1454. https://doi.org/10.23919/INDIACom61295.2024.10499177
27. Latif, E. A. (2017). The Routledge Handbook of Arabic Linguistics (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315147062
28. Liu, B. (2021). In AI We Trust? Effects of Agency Locus and Transparency on Uncertainty Reduction in Human–AI Interaction. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 26(6), 384–402. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmab013
29. Liv, N., & Greenbaum, D. (2020). Deep Fakes and Memory Malleability: False Memories in the Service of Fake News. AJOB Neuroscience, 11(2), 96–104. https://doi.org/10.1080/21507740.2020.1740351

30. Long, Z., Chen, J., & Bao, T. (2020). Research on International Relations in the Age of Artificial Intelligence. 2020 International Conference on Computer Engineering and Application (ICCEA), 436–438. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCEA50009.2020.00100
31. López Ponce, M., Barredo Ibañez, D., & Sánchez Gonzáles, H. (2024). Usos y riesgos de la Inteligencia Artificial en las campañas electorales 2023: Encuesta Delphi a expertos estratégicos de Colombia. Revista ICONO 14. Revista Científica de Comunicación y Tecnologías Emergentes, 22(1), e2078. https://doi.org/10.7195/ri14.v22i2.2078
32. Lv, Z. (2023). Generative artificial intelligence in the metaverse era. Cognitive Robotics, 3, 208–217. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogr.2023.06.001
33. Matalon, Y., Magdaci, O., Almozlino, A., & Yamin, D. (2021). Using sentiment analysis to predict opinion inversion in Tweets of political communication. Scientific Reports, 11(1), 7250. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-86510-w
34. Mohd Faizal, K. (2024). Social media as an online public sphere: A study among the first-time Malay voters. Kajian Malaysia, 42(2), 29–50.
35. Morandín-Ahuerma, F. (2022). What is Artificial Intelligence? International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews, 03(12), 1947–1951. https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.2022.31261
36. Nur Nasliza Arina, M.N., & Mohammad Nurhafiz, H. (2023). Mass Media: Suitability and Efficacy in Shaping Youth's Personality Towards Becoming Quality Human Capital. e-Journal of Media & Society, 6(2), 15-25.
37. Parmar, S., Patel, P., & Farooqui, Y. (2024). Homophily and Sentiment Analysis for Political Issues Related Discussions in Twitter. 2024 4th International Conference on Sustainable Expert Systems (ICSES), 604–608. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSES63445.2024.10762976
38. Pauline Leong. (2015). Political Communication in Malaysia: A Study on the Use of New Media in Politics. E-journal of Democracy JeDEM 7(1), 46-71.
39. Pinto-Bustamante, B. J., Riaño-Moreno, J. C., Clavijo-Montoya, H. A., Cárdenas-Galindo, M. A., & Campos-Figueredo, W. D. (2023). Bioethics and artificial intelligence: Between deliberation on values and rational choice theory. Frontiers in Robotics and AI, 10, 1140901. https://doi.org/10.3389/frobt.2023.1140901
40. Rubio Núñez, R. (2025). El uso de la inteligencia artificial en las campañas electorales y sus efectos democráticos. Revista de Derecho Político, 122, 65–102. https://doi.org/10.5944/rdp.122.2025.44742
41. Shkvorchenko, N. (2020). Linguistic and gender peculiarities of english political discourse. Analele Universitatii Din Craiova - Seria Stiinte Filologice, Lingvistica, 42(1–2), 398–416. Scopus.
42. Sinha, S., Datta, S., Kumar, R., Bhattacharya, S., Sarkar, A., & Das, K. (2024). Exploring Creativity: The Development and Uses of Generative AI. In R. Kumar, S. Sahu, & S. Bhattacharya (Eds.), Advances in Computational Intelligence and Robotics (pp. 167–198). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-3278-8.ch008
43. Sravani, D., Kameswari, L., & Mamidi, R. (2021). Political Discourse Analysis: A Case Study of Code Mixing and Code Switching in Political Speeches. Workshop on Computational Approaches to Linguistic Code-Switching, Stroudsburg, PA.
44. Stieglitz, S., & Dang-Xuan, L. (2013). Social media and political communication: A social media analytics framework. Social Network Analysis and Mining, 3(4), 1277–1291. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13278-012-0079-3
45. Suter, V., Ma, C., Pöhlmann, G., & Meckel, M. (2025). When Politicians Talk AI: Issue-Frames in Parliamentary Debates Before and After ChatGPT. Policy & Internet, 17(3), e70010. https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.70010
46. Tembhurne, J. V., Lakhotia, K., & Agrawal, A. (2025). Twitter sentiment analysis using ensemble of multi-channel model based on machine learning and deep learning techniques. Knowledge and Information Systems, 67(2), 1045–1071. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10115-024-02256-7
47. Van Noordt, C., & Misuraca, G. (2022). Artificial intelligence for the public sector: Results of landscaping the use of AI in government across the European Union. Government Information Quarterly, 39(3), 101714. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2022.101714
48. Vasist, P. N., Krishnan, S., IIM Kozhikode, India & LUT School of Engineering Sciences, Teo, T., National University of Singapore, Azad, N., & LUT School of Engineering Sciences. (2025). Exploring Concerns of Fake News on ChatGPT: A Network Analysis of Social Media Conversations.

Communications of the Association for Information Systems, 56, 936–960. https://doi.org/10.17705/1CAIS.05636

49. Wang, S., & Kim, K. J. (2023). Content Moderation on Social Media: Does It Matter Who and Why Moderates Hate Speech? Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 26(7), 527–534. https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2022.0158
50. Wu, C., Jiang, S., Sun, J., & Liu, Y. (2025). Research on the influence mechanism of emotional communication on Twitter (X) and the effect of spreading public anger. Acta Psychologica, 260, 105560. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.105560
51. Xiang, Y. (2025). Framing the Fallout: AI-Generated Visual Disinformation and the Fukushima Wastewater Narrative on Chinese Social Media. 406–410. Scopus. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-105011600010&partnerID=40&md5=7f71e357ea13eecf12962a79b73b1f57
52. Yadav, Dr. R. R., Gupta, Asst. Prof. A., Pandey, Asst. Prof. P. A., Pandey, Asst. Prof. A., & Wavhal, Asst. Prof. S. (2025). A Study of Applications of Artificial Intelligence. International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation, XII(IV), 782–786. https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2025.12040067
53. Yazici, T. (2025). Artificial Intelligence Ethics in Communication: Challenges and Future Perspectives. In A. Kalafat Çat, M. A. Yetgin, & J. I. Sarker (Eds.), Navigating Modern Digital Communication Ethics and Law (pp. 33–74). IGI Global Scientific Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-1702-1.ch002
54. Zeng, J. (2020). Artificial intelligence and China's authoritarian governance. International Affairs, 96(6), 1441–1459. https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iiaa172