Frontiers in Global Research

ISSN: 3107-5398

Volume 1, Issue 4, Nov-Dec 2025, pp. 24-29

Journal homepage: *https://fgrjournal.com*

Research Article

Artificial Intelligence and the future of Political Propaganda

Mohammed Kabeer Garba

PhD Scholar, ECOWAS Parliament, Abuja, Nigeria

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Artificial Intelligence, Political Propaganda, Disinformation, Democracy, Deepfakes, Algorithmic Bias

Article History:

Received: 15-07-2025
Revised: 17-12-2025
Accepted: 23-12-2025
Published: 28-12-2025

ABSTRACT

This paper examines how Artificial Intelligence (AI) is changing the future of political propaganda by looking at the way that new technologies are changing political communication, misinformation, and democratic procedures. It discusses the use of AI technology, including deepfakes and chatbots and algorithmic targeting, in the dissemination of persuasive and often misleading political information. The study, based on the qualitative research design and content analysis of such case studies as the 2016 elections to the House in the U.S. and the digital propaganda strategies of China, reveals some important trends in manipulations carried out with the help of AI. The results suggest that AI facilitates the possibility of hyper-personalized, scaled, and covert propaganda, which dethrones the previous paradigm of transparency and responsibility in democratic rhetoric. The paper insists that AI is capable of enhancing misinformation, but it can also help in identifying and preventing propaganda. It ends with policy suggestions, which are centered on regulation, ethical AI creation, and digital literacy to protect democratic integrity in the era of algorithmic influence.

Cite this article:

Garba, M. K. (2025). Artificial Intelligence and the future of Political Propaganda. Frontiers in Global Research, 1(4), 23-29. https://doi.org/10.55559/fgr.v1i4.27

Introduction

The fast adoption of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in digital communication has radically changed the way information is made, shared and read. Natural language processing, deep learning, and generative adversarial networks (GANs) are AI-based technologies that are already used in media platforms to automate the content creation process, manipulate narratives, and involve users (Kietzmann et al., 2020). These functions have improved not only business communications plans but also political messages and influence.

The political propaganda has not only shifted to more advanced algorithm-based systems but it can also be used to send customized messages to specific people in real-time, having grown far beyond the more traditional forms of political propaganda, including posters, radio broadcasts, and television networks run by the state (Woolley & Howard, 2019). In contrast to traditional propaganda which was usually top-down and mass-mediated, the current-day political communication will use AI to discover, segment and control users according to their behavioral information, emotional conditions and cognitive weaknesses (Tufekci, 2018).

The integration of the Big Data analytics, AI, and social media platforms leads to this evolution and forms highly efficient microtargeting and persuasion ecosystems. To illustrate, such websites as Facebook and X (once Twitter) accumulate meaningful user information, which can be analyzed with machine learning algorithms and used to forecast political beliefs and send targeted propaganda (Zuboff, 2019). This technological convergence is a transition of the passive consumption of information to the active management of digital realities, which correspond to the personal biases and behaviors, and the user is often unaware of it (Bradshaw and Howard, 2018).

Statement of the Problem

The crossroad of AI and political propaganda have both previously unheard-of possibilities and dangers of a scale. Propaganda is more scalable, personalized and deceptive than ever thanks to AI. Such technologies as deepfakes, artificial intelligence-assisted text, and autonomous bots are capable of generating and propagating fake content at an alarming rate and persuasion and ruin the boundary between reality and fake (Chesney and Citron, 2019). These are anti-democratic advancements that pervert the discourse of the masses, influence voter intention, and destroy confidence in institutions.

In addition, the absence of transparency in the process of algorithmic content curation and message delivery is a concern to political accountability and media regulation. The systems that affect citizens in their perceptions and decisions continue to become less transparent, and those lack access or awareness (Gorwa et al., 2020). The dynamics bring pressing concerns regarding the place of AI in defining political realities and the necessity of strong governance structures.

Objectives and questions of the research

This paper aims to explore how AI will affect the political propaganda transformation and how it will impact the democratic forms of society. The key research questions are:

- What role is the Artificial Intelligence playing today in the political propaganda campaign?

*Corresponding Author:

kabirmashi@gmail.com *(M. K. Garba)*

- How will AI-based propaganda affect democratic principles like transparency, accountability and informed participation?
- What are the ethical standards and regulation that can be formed in order to help in curbing the possible negative effects of AI-enhanced propaganda?

Significance of the Study

This study would be important to various stakeholders. It serves policymakers and legislators as the insights on how AI technologies may be used improperly in political realms and what laws may be enacted to govern their application. In the case of technologists and platform designers, the paper adds to the current discussion of ethical AI design and algorithmic responsibility. To media watchdogs and scholars, the study provides both a conceptual and empirical basis of the emergence of new forms of computational propaganda and their wider implications in the society. Moreover, the paper contributes to the academic literature in other areas like AI ethics, democratic theory, and media studies, as well as the convergence of technology and political communication in the 21 st century.

Scope and Limitations

The geographic and technological scope of this research is determined. Geographically, it dwells on the application of AI in political propaganda in the United States, Russia, China, and some countries in the Global south where such technologies have been either actively used or censored. The paper focuses on artificial intelligence-based technologies, including deepfakes, generative chatbots, botnets on social media applications, and algorithmic recommendation systems. Limitations are the rapid development of AI technologies, the inability to gain access to proprietary platform data, and the problem of quantification of the psychological and political effects of the propaganda in various cultures and media ecosystems.

Literature Review

The History of Political Propaganda

Political propaganda is a field that has developed over time, with the model developed in the early 20 th century up to algorithm-based systems. The conceptualization of the work of Harold Lasswell (1927) on propaganda as an instrument of elite control defines propaganda as the process of controlling the collective attitude by manipulating important symbols. Subsequently, Herman and Chomsky (1988) developed the propaganda model, which opined that the mass media was the instrument used to address the interests of powerful political and economic elites.

Political propaganda in the 21 st century has acquired different shapes that include misinformation, disinformation, and computational propaganda, using algorithms, automation, and AI to control the public opinion (Woolley and Howard, 2017). The post-truth age has also helped to erase the lines between facts and narratives, in which emotional appeal and political affiliation tend to be of greater significance, in comparison to the empirical data (McIntyre, 2018). This shift highlights the importance of learning about propaganda in the contexts of the contemporary technology and online impact.

Artificial Intelligence Technology Applicable to Propaganda

Some AI technologies have become the key to the creation and spread of propaganda in the digital era:

- NLP systems, like the GPT models made by OpenAI, allow persuasive and false text to be generated at scale and allow the ideologically-charged content to cover social media more readily (Floridi and Chiriatti, 2020).
- Deepfakes and fake news are generated using Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs), to generate convincing yet fake audio-visual content, which is then used to impersonate political leaders or fake news (Chesney and Citron, 2019).
- Microtargeting and psychographic profiling are based on AI to divide the population according to psychological features and behavioral information and make the propaganda more appealing to particular people (Isaak and Hanna, 2018).
- The use of bot networks and social media manipulation entails the automated agents that are coded to intensify political messages, block the trending topics, and generate a false sense of agreement (Bradshaw and Howard, 2018).

These technologies work in tandem with each other, and through them, political actors have the capability to tailor and share propaganda that is customized, viral and hard to detect.

Case Studies and Empirical Findings

Empirical research has given a focus on several national and cross-national attempts to exploit AI technologies in the propaganda:

- The Internet Research Agency (IRA) of Russia facilitated interference in the 2016 presidential elections in the U.S. with the help of fake personas, bots, and targeted advertisements to provoke polarization and voter manipulation (DiResta et al., 2019).
- The 2016 and 2020 U.S. elections were a disinformation campaign by AI-enabled systems on platforms such as Facebook and Twitter that utilized polarization using hyper-partisan content and deep fake videos (Frenkel et al., 2020).
- In China, AI and surveillance have been deployed to both internally censoring China and also export narrative control to other nations, especially through media content run on sentiment analysis and facial recognition software (Creemers et al., 2022).
- The Cambridge Analytica scandal demonstrated the threats of unregulated data mining and algorithmic persuasion by harvesting and using psychographic data of Facebook users to influence voter behavior (Cadwalladr and Graham-Harrison, 2018).
- These examples indicate the mass introduction of AI to influence politics and serious consequences of the approach toward democracy.

Theoretical Frameworks

The paper is based on a multi-theoretical framework which combines the views of political communication, media studies, and critical theory of technology to comprehend how artificial intelligence is changing political propaganda. These theories shed light on how AI technologies affect the opinion of the population, the political discourse, and the connection between the state, the media, and the citizen.

Agenda-setting theory, which was first formulated by McCombs and Shaw (1972) holds that media establishments do not inform people what to think, but what to think about. This theory can be used in the context of AI-driven propaganda to describe how the salience of political issues can be affected by algorithmic curation of the content on such platforms as Facebook or X (formerly Twitter). The AI systems are designed to focus on what engages the audience and tend to boost emotionally resonant or divisive content, thus defining the direction of the public discourse (Tufekci, 2015). Such an algorithmic agenda-setting circumvents editorial procedures, alters the environment of political communication and introduces new actors, engineers,

platforms and models of machine learning into the political communication arena (Napoli, 2019).

The framing theory works alongside agenda-setting as it provides attention to the ways in which issues are framed and perceived. Entman (1993) defines framing as the choice of certain elements of a conceived reality and bringing them to the fore to advance a certain meaning. Models of AI that have been trained on large language datasets can automatically generate text that frames issues in subtle ways that support or weaken the ideological or political views of the opponents. Such models are not unbiased; they represent the biases and framing in the training data (Binns et al., 2018). This brings up issues with the systematic application of AI-based messages to frame democratic processes, social movements, and international conflicts.

The term computational propaganda was coined by Woolley and Howard (2017) to refer to the application of algorithms, automation, and data analytics to manipulate the behavior and opinion of the population. This framework is critical in explaining the weaponization of AI technologies, including bots, deepfakes, and NLP models in politics. It draws attention to the intersection of political strategy and computational efficiency, when it is aimed not only to convince but manipulate and disorient (Howard, 2020). Computational propaganda is also known to be large, fast, and it uses human cognitive biases and information saturation.

A wider socio-economic framework put forward by Zuboff (2019) theory of surveillance capitalism would help place AI-dictated propaganda in context. She opines that big technology companies commercialize human experience in the form of data mining that they later utilize to predict and influence behavior to make a profit. This dynamic provides a prime environment when it comes to the political manipulation since AI systems conditioned upon the collected information may function as microtargeted propaganda that cannot be subjected to scrutiny and accountability (Cohen, 2019). Surveillance capitalism transforms the political into a commodity that can be predicted and manipulated in sold form, weakening democratic freedom and action.

The epistemic crisis and post-truth paradigm, in which the calls to emotional appeal and belief are commonly accepted without taking into account the empirical facts, plays a crucial role in explaining the prosperity of AI-generated propaganda. McIntyre (2018) states that the loss of trust in the traditional knowledge institutions resulted in an empty space that has been occupied by personalized content that tends to strengthen disinformation. It is aggravated by the AI systems which generate and propagate fake realities that would imitate authenticity (Chesney and Citron, 2019). This crisis of epistemology is not merely a consequence of content production but rather of an algorithmic epistemology in which the truth becomes as unimportant as the virality.

The Algorithmic Governance and Techno politics is a political implication of technology design and deployment. Musiani et al. (2019) note that algorithmic systems are taking over the roles of governance, regulating the discourse, prioritizing the information, and imposing digital norms. This point of view allows studying the ways AI is becoming an invisible yet a strong force shaping political reality. Instead of neutrality, AI systems are political assumptions, power dynamics, and regulatory emptiness (Yeung, 2018).

Synthesis and Relevance

All these school of thought approaches offer a multidimensional perspective of the analysis of how AI is altering the arena of political propaganda. Although agenda-setting and framing theories describe the communicative roles of AI in generating the focus and understanding among people, computational propaganda and surveillance capitalism reveal the structural and strategic application of AI in political manipulation. In the meantime, the post-truth theory and techno politics indicate that more systemic changes occur in the production of truth, governance, and legitimacy in the digital era. Collectively, they create a strong basis on which the ethical, political, and social implications of AI-based propaganda can be interrogated.

Methodology

This paper uses the qualitative comparative case study approach to examine how various political regimes use AI-based propaganda. The cases are United States, Russia, China, and the countries that are selected in the Global South. The design is informed by the critical discourse analysis and political communication theories.

Data Sources

The study is based on several sources of data, such as social media archives of such sites as Facebook, X (formerly Twitter), and YouTube. Also used reports of the government and legislative hearings of disinformation and AI. Open bot behavior and detection of deepfakes datasets. Last but not least, the study used academic databases (e.g., JSTOR, SSRN) and reports by NGOs (e.g., Freedom House, Oxford Internet Institute). With these sources, a triangulation of information is made possible to attain validity and depth of understanding.

Findings and Analysis

Ways and means of AI-Based Propaganda

AI opens up the possibilities of more direct, quicker, and increasingly difficult to trace forms of political persuasion. One example is the use of deepfake videos to impersonate political candidates or other community members to initiate disinformation or destroy trust (Vaccari and Chadwick, 2020). On the same note, chatbots, and social bots impersonate human users to intensify narratives, and target users, and disrupt online conversations (Woolley and Howard, 2019).

These applications operate with the use of algorithmic mechanisms, which offer tailored content delivery to users basing on their interests, emotions, and biases. The mass-production of customized content by political actors makes the propaganda scalable, and it appears organic. Microtargeted campaigns, which frequently work on AI, allow campaigners to send various political messages to various demographic target groups without any external examination (Isaak & Hanna, 2018).

Influence of Democratic Discourse and Elections

The effects on democracy are quite far reaching. AI propaganda has the power to influence voter behavior by appeals to their feelings and false information, which would result in distorted elections. In the case of the 2016 American election, Russian bots and content targeted at reducing voter turnout and division (DiResta et al., 2019). WhatsApp and Facebook were also employed to market nationalism and undermine the opposition parties in Brazil and India (Bradshaw et al., 2021).

In addition, the proliferation of AI-based disinformation undermines the credibility of media and governmental bodies because internet users cannot differentiate between real and fake news. In the long run, this leads to democratic backsliding, in which voters do not engage in civic activities because of the perceived illegitimacy of the political discourse (McIntyre, 2018).

The difference in the ability to use AI in political influence is increasing. The agents of state power that have access to computational resources and funding (i.e., the centralized systems

of AI propaganda in China) are better placed to organize complex and cross-platform operations (Creemers et al., 2022). Conversely, non-state actors (e.g. activist networks or foreign dissidents) can be dependent on open-source or limited tools of AI.

Also, there is a Global North-Global South divide. As developed democracies start fulfilling an effort to regulate the algorithmic propaganda, most developing nations are facing the risk of internal and external manipulation due to the lack of an institutional capacity to track and address the issue (Friedrich et al., 2022).

AI-motivated propaganda is good, especially in highly emotional/polarized settings. Research indicates that consumers tend to trust and share a piece of information that supports their biases, despite whether it is factual or not (Pennycook and Rand, 2019). Such content propagates fast when amplified by bots and other AI-optimized platforms and enters the mind of the populace.

Nevertheless, it is also possible to use AI tools to track and neutralize propaganda. Fact-checkers, journalists, and social media increasingly rely on machine learning models that have been trained on known examples of disinformation to flag or remove harmful content. This notwithstanding, detection efforts are usually behind the new tricks and false positives are still a problem (Gorwa et al., 2020).

Major Research Findings Discussion

A dual role of artificial intelligence in political communication is one of the primary findings of this research paper. AI technologies may be used as the means of the manipulative propaganda, as well as the means of democratic reinforcement. On the one hand, AI allows massively created false information, including deepfakes and algorithmic misinformation, to undermine confidence in political decisions (Chesney and Citron, 2019). Similarly, disinformation is also being tracked and countered using the same technologies, including machine learning to label synthetic content or network of fact-checking (Gorwa et al., 2020). This dualism implies that the effects of AI are not deterministic but depend on how it is governed and implemented and whether it has been ethically managed (Floridi et al., 2018).

The use of AI has turned the standard practice of political persuasion that mass messaging into microtargeting that is highly personalized. Psychographic profiling and behavioral prediction can now be used to send tailored messages to segmented groups through campaigns that do not necessarily need public access or responsibility (Isaak and Hanna, 2018). This is a break with the conventional principles of democracy of open discussion in the political arena. Rather, persuasion is becoming more privatized, automatized and streamlined to be more engaging than deliberative (Zuboff, 2019). It, therefore, ceases to be centered on rhetoric and becomes one of data science and precise algorithms, which questions the issue of fairness and equity in democratic participation (Howard, 2020).

The AI-driven propaganda makes the traditional conceptualizations of freedom of expression tricky. Although liberal democracies guarantee the right to spread political messages, the manipulative opportunities of AI-generated content, in particular, when used secretly or deceptively, make the question of where free speech starts, and harmful interference occurs (Barrett and Sims, 2021). The AI, as opposed to the conventional media, is capable of simulating authenticity at scale, leading to a higher chance of the audience confusing propaganda with a real conversation (McIntyre, 2018). Therefore, regulatory systems will have to contend with the issue of finding a way to differentiate between guaranteed expression and algorithm manipulation to suppress democratic procedures.

The other ethical conflict is based on the loss of personal independent decision-making in politics. To a great extent, algorithmic systems nudge behavior, which means that after filtering what users hear, see, and engage with, they are subtly directed to particular beliefs or actions (Yeung, 2018). Although nudging may be employed to serve societal benefit (e.g., voter turnout), in the application of AI propaganda, the matter of consent, manipulation and political agency are ethically questionable. Unless citizens recognize that their online world is being designed with the purpose of influencing them ideologically, they will be unable to make informed, independent decisions (Sunstein, 2015).

Meta (Facebook), X (previously Twitter), and Tik Tok are major digital platforms that act as facilitators or suppressors of AI-based propaganda. Their algorithms dictate what is being promoted, what is being suppressed, and the way the users are engaging with political content. However, these platforms frequently do so without a lot of transparency or accountability, using proprietary reasons about having to decide based on algorithms (Napoli, 2019). Although other companies have implemented labeling and fact-checking options, critics believe that this is an inadequate solution to stop the fact that harmful content is magnified systemically (Bradshaw and Howard, 2018). Besides, the commercial incentive of such platforms usually is incompatible with democratic ideals, where controversial or provocative content usually receives more attention (Tufekci, 2015).

AI Governance Frameworks Nationally and Globally

The necessity to develop an extensive regulatory framework to regulate AI and use it in political communications receives increased awareness. On the national level, there are laws which have been brought up by some nations in fighting synthetic media, and requiring transparency in political advertisement. Considering the example of the EU AI Act, the subliminal manipulation or biometric-based targeting is classified as a high-risk AI application that can be tightly regulated (European Commission, 2021). Following the same approach, the OECD AI Principles promote human, transparent, and accountable AI systems (OECD, 2019).

Enforcement is however a challenge because of the jurisdictional differences, poor international coordination as well as the rapid technological development. Also, most Global South countries lack the regulatory framework or technical ability to address AI-driven propaganda, which generates inequalities in global information sovereignty (Friedrich et al., 2022). Therefore, the way forward must be a multi-stakeholder strategy that does not lose any of the innovation but protects the democratic rights.

Certainly! The Conclusion, Summarization of the Major findings, and Six Policy Recommendations to your research on the topic "Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Political Propaganda," written in the same academic tone and APA 7 th edition citation style, are provided below.

Conclusion, Summary and Recommendation.

Conclusion

This study has covered the dynamic intersection between the artificial intelligence (AI) and political propaganda, demonstrating that the information environment is developing rapidly in which the process of democracy is more and more under the influence of algorithmic systems. AI has altered the approach, pace, and scale of propaganda in the digital era with fundamental changes to deepfakes and chatbots as well as

microtargeting algorithms and recommendation engines (Woolley and Howard, 2017; McIntyre, 2018).

The normative impact of the dual feature of AI, both as a means of deception and detection, is a challenge to democracies. Although it may improve political participation and improve the delivery of content, it also becomes easier to manipulate and undermine public trust and puts the epistemic underpinnings of democratic deliberation in jeopardy (Zuboff, 2019; Chesney and Citron, 2019). It will ultimately become clear that AI will help fortify or weaken democracy not just based on how it is designed technically but also its regulatory governance, ethical control, and transparency.

Summary of Key Findings

i. Political propaganda has been transformed by AI technologies, where it is now possible to produce politically charged content and disseminate it in a personally targeted and scaled way using social media, messaging platforms, and synthetic media.

ii. Deepfakes, bots, and NLP models are being actively used to create a sense of authenticity, influence voter perceptions, and polarize the opinion of the population, which is usually hardly noticed by the platform or people (Chesney and Citron, 2019).

iii. Epistemic manipulation by AI-powered propaganda is disproportionately impacting democratic institutions and weakening their media trust, civic participation, and informed voting (McIntyre, 2018; Isaak and Hanna, 2018).

iv. Privacy Tech giants such as Meta, X, and Tik Tok have gained significant ability to provide, in most cases, insufficient transparency and accountability, due to the private control of algorithms (Napoli, 2019; Tufekci, 2015).

v. The discrepancy in the regulatory capacity across the globe exposes numerous countries to interference by AI in the electoral process and fake news, especially in the Global South (Friedrich et al., 2022).

vi. The new ethical issues of autonomy, manipulation, and freedom of expression are not yet resolved in policy and academic spheres, which are in urgent need of scholarly and legislative focus (Sunstein, 2015; Yeung, 2018).

Policy Recommendations

i. Mandate Algorithmic Transparency Governments must mandate platforms to reveal their ranking of political content, especially when there is an election on.

ii. Control Deepfakes and Synthetic Media: Legal rules should specify and limit the harmful application of deepfakes in politics.

iii. Enhance Data Protection Laws: Tougher Data privacy laws are necessary to mitigate against unauthorized data collection towards psychographic profiling and microtargeting.

iv. Fund Public AI Education Initiatives: Governments and civil society groups should support AI and media literacy campaigns to inform citizens on how they can be duped by propaganda, how algorithms can mislead them, and how synthetic content can harm them (Barrett and Sims, 2021).

v. Establish International Standards on AI and Political Communication: Multilateral organizations should work together to create global principles of AI regulation in the political arena, focusing on transparency, accountability, and democratic resilience (OECD, 2019).

vi. Encourage Civic Tech and Ethical AI Innovation: Investment must be made in building public-interest AI technologies, such as fact-checking systems, bot detection systems, and ethical frameworks of responsible application in democratic procedures (Floridi et al., 2018).

References

Alba, D., & Satariano, A. (2020, February 7). A global effort to tackle deepfake videos. *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com

Barrett, P. M., & Sims, J. (2021). *Fueling the fire: How social media intensifies U.S. political polarization—and what can be done about it*. NYU Stern Center for Business and Human Rights. https://bhr.stern.nyu.edu/fueling-the-fire

Binns, R., Veale, M., Van Kleek, M., & Shadbolt, N. (2018). "It's reducing a human being to a percentage": Perceptions of justice in algorithmic decisions. *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–14.

Bradshaw, S., & Howard, P. N. (2018). The global organization of social media disinformation campaigns. *Journal of International Affairs*, 71(1.5), 23–32.

Bradshaw, S., Howard, P. N., & Kollanyi, B. (2021). *Industrialized disinformation: 2020 global inventory of organized social media manipulation*. Oxford Internet Institute. https://comprop.oii.ox.ac.uk/research/industrialized-disinformation-2020

Chesney, R., & Citron, D. K. (2019). Deepfakes and the new disinformation war: The coming age of post-truth geopolitics. *Foreign Affairs*, 98(1), 147–155.

Cohen, J. E. (2019). *Between truth and power: The legal constructions of informational capitalism*. Oxford University Press.

Creemers, R., Triolo, P., & Webster, G. (2022). *China's approach to AI governance: Strategy, regulation, and ideology*. Center for Strategic and International Studies. https://www.csis.org/analysis/chinas-approach-ai-governance

DiResta, R., Shaffer, K., Ruppel, B., Sullivan, D., Matney, R., & Zeitzoff, T. (2019). *The tactics and tropes of the Internet Research Agency*. New Knowledge and Oxford Internet Institute. https://disinformationreport.blob.core.windows.net/disinformation-report/NewKnowledge-Disinformation-Report-Whitepaper-121718.pdf

Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58

European Commission. (2021). *Proposal for a regulation laying down harmonized rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act)*. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52021PC0206

Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., Chiarello, F., & Chatila, R. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. *Minds and Machines*, 28(4), 689–707.

Friedrich, J., Seetharaman, S., & Abdullahi, A. (2022). *AI and democracy in the Global South: Policy gaps and governance opportunities*. Brookings Institution. https://www.brookings.edu/articles/ai-and-democracy-in-the-global-south

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), 1–15.

Howard, P. N. (2020). *Lie machines: How to save democracy from troll armies, deceitful robots, junk news operations, and political operatives*. Yale University Press.

Isaak, J., & Hanna, M. J. (2018). User data privacy: Facebook, Cambridge Analytica, and privacy protection. *Computer*, 51(8), 56–59

McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176–187.

McIntyre, L. (2018). *Post-truth*. MIT Press.

Musiani, F., Pohle, J., & Badouard, R. (2019). Algorithmic governance: Between self-regulation and regulation by design. *Internet Policy Review*, 8(2).

Napoli, P. M. (2019). *Social media and the public interest: Media regulation in the disinformation age*. Columbia University Press.

OECD. (2019). *OECD principles on artificial intelligence*. https://www.oecd.org/going-digital/ai/principles/

Pennycook, G., & Rand, D. G. (2019). Lazy, not biased: Susceptibility to partisan fake news is better explained by lack of reasoning than by motivated reasoning. *Cognition*, 188, 39–50.

Sunstein, C. R. (2015). *Choosing not to choose: Understanding the value of choice*. Oxford University Press.

Townsend, L., & Wallace, C. (2016). *Social media research: A guide to ethics*. University of Aberdeen. https://www.gla.ac.uk/media/Media_487729_smxx.pdf

Tufekci, Z. (2015). Algorithmic harms beyond Facebook and Google: Emergent challenges of computational agency. *Colorado Technology Law Journal*, 13(203), 203–218.

Vaccari, C., & Chadwick, A. (2020). Deepfakes and disinformation: Exploring the impact of synthetic political video on deception, uncertainty, and trust in news. *Social media + Society*, 6(1), 1–13.

Woolley, S. C., & Howard, P. N. (2017). *Computational propaganda worldwide: Executive summary*. Oxford Internet Institute. https://demtech.oii.ox.ac.uk

Woolley, S. C., & Howard, P. N. (2019). *Computational propaganda: Political parties, politicians, and political manipulation on social media*. Oxford University Press.

Yeung, K. (2018). Algorithmic regulation: A critical interrogation. *Regulation & Governance*, 12(4), 505–523.

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.