

Article

Language Ideology Formation in AI-Mediated Educational Context: A Sociolinguistic Analysis

Rugaiyah ^{1,*} , Andi Idayani ¹ , Roziah ² , Nunuk Suryanti ³  and Novri Gazali ⁴ 

¹ Department of English Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Islam Riau, Pekanbaru 28125, Indonesia

² Department of Indonesian Language and Literature Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Islam Riau, Pekanbaru 28125, Indonesia

³ Department of Accounting Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Islam Riau, Pekanbaru 28125, Indonesia

⁴ Department of Physical Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Islam Riau, Pekanbaru 28125, Indonesia

* Correspondence: ruqaiyah@edu.uir.ac.id

Received: 24 January 2026; **Revised:** 22 February 2026; **Accepted:** 25 March 2026; **Published:** 18 September 2026

Abstract: This study explores the evolving intersection between Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Sociolinguistics by combining bibliometric mapping with keyword-driven content analysis. Drawing on 69 unique publications identified after a systematic deduplication process (2013–2024), the research integrates quantitative trend analysis with keyword-based thematic interpretation. From an initial dataset of 98 records retrieved from Scopus (n = 64) and Web of Science (n = 34), a subset of 48 publications was selected for deeper examination based on their conceptual relevance. Bibliometric analysis was conducted using SientoPy and VOSviewer to identify publication trajectories, leading contributors, influential journals, geographical distribution, and emerging research clusters. This mapping was complemented by a qualitative analysis centred on five key terms—Computational Sociolinguistics, Natural Language Processing (NLP), ChatGPT, language, and machine learning—allowing the study to trace dominant themes and conceptual developments shaping the field. The findings show a clear increase in scholarly attention to the sociolinguistic dimensions of AI-mediated communication, with particular emphasis on language ideology, identity formation, and the role of algorithms in shaping discourse. Rather than presenting computational approaches solely as neutral tools, the analysis suggests that technologies such as NLP and large language models may both reproduce and challenge existing linguistic hierarchies, raising important questions about representation, diversity, and equity in digital environments. This study maps the intersection of AI and Sociolinguistics by combining bibliometric mapping with keyword-based interpretation, providing an overview of the field's development over time. These findings suggest that discussions around ethical and culturally inclusive AI design are becoming increasingly visible within the literature.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence; Sociolinguistics Ideology; Language Standarization; Algorithmic Mediation; Identity Formation; ChatGPT

1. Introduction

In recent times, the landscape of language learning methods across various educational environments has been transformed by the emergence of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI), especially large language models (LLMs). Several studies show that the use of AI in writing instruction can improve language precision, content summarization skills, and facilitate students' creative expression [1]. In the context of communication and public relations education, the use of LLMs has also begun to be integrated as part of innovative pedagogy that changes the way students interact with texts and discourse production [2]. The latest systematic review even notes a rapid increase in empirical research related to the use of GenAI in language learning over the past two years [3–5].

In the field of English as a foreign language (EFL) learning, AI not only functions as a technical tool, but also influences cognitive and sociocultural dynamics in learners' self-regulation practices [6]. The Global Englishes perspective even emphasizes that the presence of GenAI in English language teaching has implications for perceptions of language standards and the legitimacy of certain language varieties [7]. In other words, AI is beginning to play a mediating role in the formation of linguistic norms in educational settings.

However, a number of studies show that AI-based language systems are not free from social and identity biases. Generative language models are known to reproduce social identity biases [8] and contain inherent biases that can influence their linguistic output [9]. From a sociolinguistic perspective, this raises fundamental questions about the relationship between technology, power, and language. Maly [10] argues that AI should be viewed within the context of social power struggles, ideologies of language, and its application rather than exclusively as a neutral technology. Park [11] even proves that AI-based chatbots have the potential to cause language bias through normalizing hegemonic forms of language.

The sociolinguistic foundation of language modeling emphasizes that large language models (LLMs) are constructed atop historic engagements and practices for the social organization of language [12]. AI speech in this matter is not an isolated occurrence; it brings with it some socially imprinted ideas that can be important when looking at how users will perceive (which kind of language would be considered) correct language or something we could identify as valid language. This relationship is more complicated in education, because students are not simply using an AI tool; they might also be internalizing the ideas and rules of whatever programming language the AI itself generates. The current meta-analysis research about digital literacy and the use of artificial intelligence in education in Indonesia shows this relationship between digital literacy, AI, and regional language preservation [13]. This shows that AI in education has wider effects on language ecology, once again raising the possibility of severing or reinforcing certain variations.

There is a growing body of literature on the use of GenAI in educational settings [3–5]; however, most research focuses primarily on pedagogical efficacy and methods for instructional development. Currently, there is a lack of direct investigation into the ways in which students' interactions with AI contribute to the formation of language ideology. This includes the exploration of what is considered linguistically legitimate, the positioning of AI as a linguistic authority, and how learners negotiate or rest the norms they encounter.

Rather than considering AI as a technological object, this research aims to comprehend AI as a sociolinguistic environment that constructs language ideology in the classroom. The study employed an interpretative qualitative methodology to investigate the dynamics of language ideology construction through learner interaction with AI and processes of negotiation, internalisation and resistance to linguistic norms in contemporary education practices.

This study contributes to the field of AI and educational sociolinguistics by testing whether traits in learners that have previously been shown to be positively impacted by interpersonal interaction translate when mediated through an intelligent agent. Much of the research on AI in education examines how effective the technology is, or how well it teaches. This study, however, takes a sociolinguistic perspective of AI. In particular, it explores how associations with AI systems can affect learners' assessments of legitimacy, accuracy, and academic appropriateness in relation to language.

A third contribution of this study is its attempt to combine two seldom-conjunctive perspectives: linguistic ideology and algorithmic authority. Research on language ideology has addressed the social construction of beliefs about language for decades, while studies of algorithmic authority have explored the ways in which digital systems gain legitimacy and make claims to have influence over knowledge and expertise. This study combines these strands of scholarship into a framework that captures the gradual transfer of linguistic power and agency

away from human actors—for example, in our context lecturers or editors—towards algorithmic technologies that increasingly mediate academic communication.

Results of this study indicate, based on data from interviews about learning experiences with AI, that learners do not adopt a simple mimetic relationship to the language produced by AI. Instead, humans interpret, negotiate, and sometimes reshape language produced by the AI in ways that expose their own linguistic preferences and the surrounding context. These findings imply that learners are following co-constructive trajectories over their linguistic practices in AI-mediated contexts of use, suggesting that the adoption of technology usages is not simply indifferent but that it comes with ongoing negotiation related to its implications.

Finally, in consideration of the trends shown via data analysis, we offer a theoretical environmental niche through which linguistic ideology may emerge within AI-mediated learning environments. According to the research, exposure to artificial intelligence systems simply motivates reconciliation of language, which gives authority to algorithms and negotiates identity linguistically. Drawing on such interfacing perspectives, the study at hand maps interconnected dynamics that provide a conceptual framework for how AI technology operates in informing contemporary language practices and approaches to languages within educational settings.

These cross-cultural insights compel sociolinguistic understanding of learners' uptake and appropriation of AI as a site of flux, wherein language norms are not glossed over or accepted (and reproduced) but through which actors make judgements about what is salient, interpreting and sometimes contesting it; this paper thus draws on both theoretical and empirical scholarship. Generating research questions that push the analysis directly into the very process of constituting ideologies and negotiating language is what we will do next, with a view to gaining a better understanding of these processes.

Interaction with AI systems is of interest in this research to investigate its impact on students' conceptualising language in school settings. More specifically, it seeks to investigate the extent to which students understand, adopt, negotiate with and at times contest the language conventions that AI technologies mold in the course of their writing process. This study aims to adopt a sociolinguistic perspective on how AI relates to ideas about linguistic correctness, authority, and identity in contemporary learner accounts nurtured through qualitative interviews in learning environments.

Research Questions

This study adds to the scant literature through the following research questions:

RQ1: How do AI-mediated educational interactions shape learners' language ideologies?

RQ2: How do learners negotiate, internalize, or resist linguistic norms encountered in AI-mediated contexts?

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Research Approaches and Types

This study uses an exploratory research design and an interpretative qualitative method. This approach revealed insights into learners' construction and sense-making of language ideology in AI-facilitated interaction. Other qualitative research heavily relies on data and computes numbers based on statistical generalizations while interpretative qualitative research is focused on the nature of the experience and its meaning made by participants [14].

This form of thinking is compatible with the theory that considers language ideology the roles textual forms play in society, structuring their interpretation and performance [15]. It is a product of social construction which emerges through interaction in and discursive practice pides3 and the sociolinguistic resources employed by people. Consequently, the research is constructed to respond directly to the significances and locations from which members are speaking in this study of perspectives on language.

2.2. Data Sources

Participants were selected for the study by virtue of being regular users of AI writing tools within an academic or educational context, thus ensuring they had enough experience interacting with AI systems as a part of their academic or professional pursuits. This paper draws on original data gathered through in-depth interviews with the participants. The data is given as a set of attributed transcripts across semi-structured interview sessions.

In-depth semi-structured interviews were selected as the main method to collect data because they enable a

deeper exploration of participants' experiences, perspectives and language practices than more closed instruments such as questionnaires [16]. Qualitative interviews are believed to capture a cognitive and sociocultural dimension of the studies on how people and AI interact that is arguably not entirely visible through quantitative methods [17].

Participants

This research was conducted with 25 participants; they were undergraduate students, graduate students and lecturers who commonly use LLM (large language model)-based apps, including ChatGPT in academic work. Participants were selected using purposive sampling techniques, with the following criteria: (1) regularly using AI for academic purposes (writing assignments, compiling articles, or language revision), and (2) having at least three months of experience using AI to have sufficient reflection on their language practices.

A sample size of 25 participants was deemed adequate for qualitative research based on thematic analysis. In a classic study on data saturation, Guest et al. [18] showed that the main themes in qualitative interviews generally emerged consistently in the first 12 participants, and additional participants mainly enriched the variety rather than producing significant new themes. Additionally, Malterud et al. [19] put forward the concept of information power, which emphasizes that sample adequacy in qualitative research depends on the research focus, sample specificity, dialogue quality, and analysis strategy used. Given that this study has a specific focus on participants relevant to the context of AI-mediated learning, and in-depth interviews, the number of 25 participants is considered to have provided sufficient information power to produce consistent and meaningful thematic patterns.

All participants gave their consent to be interviewed, and their identities were anonymized to maintain confidentiality.

Thematic analysis determined that a sample size of 25 participants was sufficient for qualitative research. Guest et al. [18] showed in a seminal study on data saturation that the primary themes in qualitative interviews typically surfaced consistently in the first 12 participants, and that subsequent individuals primarily enhanced the diversity rather than generating noteworthy new themes. Malterud et al. [19] also introduced the concept of "information power", which illustrates that factors including study topic, sample specificity, data richness and analysis method all affect the use of qualitative sampling adequacy. The 25 participants were sufficient to establish information power for the study's specific aim; all people of relevance in direct AI-mediated learning and bounding interviews indicated, as Guest et al. [18] previously showed, a landmark dataset on data saturation, with the principal themes evident by interview 12 in qualitative interviewing through new entrants mainly adding diversity rather than importance. They also propose that the concepts of "information power" induce three affecting factors on sample adequacy in qualitative research including study focus, sample specificity and analytic technique [19].

2.3. Data Collection Techniques

All data were collected using semi-structured interviews that asked questions concerning how individuals felt about using AI, differences in perceived value of AI-produced language compared to non-AI-generated equivalents and user attitudes toward the linguistic conventions emerging from these interactions. Semi-structured interviews allow you to be flexible in discussing issues as they arise, yet the same questions are asked of all participants [14]. In this way, the approach allows for a more explicit engagement with the process of meaning negotiation in sociolinguistic research [15]. Qualitative interviewing is particularly valuable for examining human-AI interaction because it reveals participants' cognitive interpretations, lived experiences, and sociocultural contexts that cannot always be adequately represented through quantitative measurements [20].

2.4. Data Analysis Techniques

We performed the analysis with Braun and Clarke's Thematic Analysis. This process was used to identify patterns of meaning that emerged from participants' interaction with AI in learning. The analysis was conducted by repeatedly reading the interview transcripts to achieve a holistic grasp of the data content. Then, relevant text portions were given initial codes in relation to the study subject. Then, these codes were organized into groups based on their meanings and turned into bigger themes. This process was repeated until themes that appeared consistent and useful for the study were identified.

Validity of Analysis

To retain the authenticity, each theme was reviewed for its relevance against the original data. In order to ensure the clarity of the analysis, exact statements from the participants were also included in the results section. Without wanting to make statistical generalizations, this research aimed to provide a situational approximation of the processes that were behind pluralization of linguistic ideologies in relation to the subjects we analyzed.

3. Results

Twenty-five interviews were analysed using reflexive thematic analysis. Through mind mapping and coding, some of the meaning units that emerged from the participants were related to how they incorporated AI. The raw codes were then subsequently organized into conceptual themes that described participants' common experiences in educational environments as they interfaced with AI. Three broad themes emerged from the study that shine a light on how linguistic ideology is formed in AI-mediated learning environments. Code and themes were developed using an interactive approach. These themes show how use of AI influences not just the work of human writing, but also people's understanding of language within expressions like correct, academic and respectable. Because participants often cited events that overlapped several themes, the number of participants for each topic does not represent mutually exclusive categories, and may therefore sum to greater than the total number of study participants.

The three themes include:

- (1) Normalization of AI-Standardized Language
- (2) AI as Linguistic Authority
- (3) Linguistic Resistance and Identity Preservation

The three themes are not disconnected but describe interrelated processes in the emergence of language ideology. While some felt less inclined to produce that language because it was AI, others viewed AI as an acceptable linguistic authority. Other participants negotiated and resisted etymological linguistic rules based on AI, in order to keep both their language style and identity.

3.1. Normalization of AI-Standardized Language

The first theme is that people want to change the way they speak and write in order to align with linguistic patterns generated by AI. Of 25 interviewees, 18 complained that their encounters with AI pushed them to speak more formally or otherwise replicate the style of text generated by such systems.

The results suggest that dependent use of what AI churns out could change the ways people build sentences, choose words and grasp language styles widespread in schools. In other instances, these are tweaks that were purposely designed to make better use of AI. In other instances, the participants spoke of a quieter process of internalization, in which the A.I.'s linguistic patterns subliminally sank in and altered their writing styles.

Here we present examples of data extraction and the initial codes constituted during the analysis process to illustrate how these patterns of meaning emerged from the interview data (see **Table 1**).

Table 1. Coding Structure of Theme 1: Normalization of AI-Standardized Language.

Data Extract	Initial Code	Theme
"This is how I use ChatGPT, in English or formal Indonesian."	Talk to the AI in formal terminology.	Normalization of AI-Standardized Language
"I aim for more clarity in my sentences so that AI understands it better."	Implementing a new structure for sentence configuration for AI	Normalization of AI-Standardized Language
"I occasionally structure my sentences like AI unintentionally."	AI writing habits inbuilt into our nervous system	Normalization of AI-Standardized Language
"AI makes my writing sound more academic."	You are instructed to speak in the formal style.	Normalization of AI-Standardized Language

The first codes that arose from the data yielded a topic we labelled Normalization of AI-Standardized Language as outlined in **Table 1**. These codes indicate that participants of the study generally alter their speech to align with patterns captured by the AI, either intentionally or not.

3.1.1. Interpretation of Code Patterns

The codes demonstrate that use of AI also challenges language norms in academic contexts, as well as helping with actual writing. Many said they found themselves trying to change how they spoke and wrote, making it more formal when speaking with AI.

For example, Respondent 015 stated:

"Yes, when I use ChatGPT, I use it in English or formal Indonesian."

So the comment clarifies that people are convinced that if they use AI, they have to make sure that their language register is more formal. It means people love that AI works better with organized language.

Respondent 05 made a similar point: "I try to make these sentences more structured, because, you know, AI understands a good structure of sentence more."

This passage also shows how both actors act strategically, to some degree. They tailored their style to favour linguistic structures viewed as easier for the AI system to process.

Along with conscious adaptation, some participants described a more implicit form of internalising.

Respondent 07 said:

"Sometimes I unconsciously arrange my sentences similar to AI's structure".

This comment suggests that the output of AI could potentially affect the way in which users generate language, sometimes without their conscious awareness.

3.1.2. Thematic Meaning

Overall, this tendency shows that many users have grown to perceive more codified and standardized language as a more effective approach to engage with AI. So, engaging with AI does change not just how human beings including us, write but also what is seen as scholarly and in good faith patterns of expression. These results indicate that AI is likely a major factor in bringing formal language into the mainstream through academic communication mechanisms afforded by technology.

This study specifically explores RQ1, which reflects how linguistic ideology takes place among learners through AI-mediated interactions in an educational context. Such an evolution of sentence structure suggests that the participants are influenced, subconsciously, or at least in a way to prompt their attunement to certain features as frequently encountered as part of AI-generated texts, i.e., some level at least change towards what is credible/formal writing style seems to be imposed into places whereby by definition they cannot be so formal/correct only due to exposure time and get reflected in this sort of intervention through sample corrections applied over them.

3.2. AI as Linguistic Authority

A second theme reflects that some participants began treating AI as an authority on language, with respect to the correct, scholarly and appropriate language while writing. Seventeen out of the 25 people interviewed said they frequently used A.I. not only to write but also to edit for grammar, sentence structure and word choice.

The research hints that some daily users of AI are beginning to view the AI systems themselves as possessing reliable language assessment skills. In some cases, participants stated that AI provides faster, more consistent, and more systematic feedback than other sources of language evaluation.

To show how these patterns of meaning emerged from the interview data, **Table 2** presents several examples of data extracts along with the initial codes generated during the coding process.

Table 2. Coding Structure of Theme 2: AI as Linguistic Authority.

Data Extract	Initial Code	Theme
"For Grammar, I trust AI more because it is faster"	Trust in AI grammatical correction	AI as Linguistic Authority
"Usually AI gives a more academic sentence"	AI seen as producing academically appropriate language	AI as Linguistic Authority
"AI is more objective than human feedback"	Perception of AI objectivity	AI as Linguistic Authority

Table 2 shows that several codes that emerged from the interviews relate to participants' perceptions of AI as a source of linguistic authority. Participants not only use AI as a technical tool, but also as a reference in determining

the form of language that is considered correct and academic. In addition to adjusting their language style, many participants also showed a tendency to view AI as a reliable source of linguistic evaluation. **Table 2** shows several codes that emerged from the interviews, such as trust in AI grammar correction, AI produces academic sentences, and perceived AI objectivity.

3.2.1. Interpretation of Code Patterns

These codes indicate that in the practical use of AI, participants not only use AI to generate text, but also to validate the quality of the language they use. In some cases, participants even stated that they trust AI more than other sources of evaluation in terms of grammar and academic structure.

Respondent 03 stated:

“For grammar, I trust AI to be faster and more accurate”.

This statement shows that participants view AI as an efficient and reliable linguistic evaluation tool. The speed with which it provides language corrections is one of the main reasons why AI is considered a practical reference source in the writing process.

Respondent 09 also expressed a similar view:

“When I am unsure about structure or word choice, I ask AI. Usually the result sounds more academic”.

Illustrates that AI is being used to help decide which words and sentence structures belong in academic writing. Here, the A. I. isn't only giving users a different way of phrasing something -it rewires how they think about types of language that are often more academic in nature.

Respondent 19 added:

“I feel AI is more objective because it does not have personal bias”.

This comment expresses one of the core beliefs we hold that some people felt AI understood language better than we do. Because AI, at least on the surface, appears to give an impartial perspective, this notion makes AI seem like a legitimate authority—almost a determining body for how language should be used.

3.2.2. Thematic Meaning

So, AI not only shifts where humans write, but it also changes how they think about who or what is authoritative in shaping conventions for academic language. More broadly, this pattern suggests people have changed their idea of who's the final word on language. More recently, the most likely assessors of language were professors, lecturers and human editors. But with the advent of AI, some people started to think algorithmic systems are a major way for how good language is. So, AI not only profoundly changes the way people write; it also redefines how people think about who or what has authority over language standards that are coming to be considered academic.

These findings further support RQ1: AI both transformed participants' writing practices and shaped their beliefs about the origins of linguistic authority. To this extent, AI is starting to be framed around what it can define as acceptable and valid conventions used in the language of academia.

3.3. Linguistic Resistance and Identity Preservation

The third point made is that AI affects how people use language, and not all users fully adopt that language behavior shaped by the AI. From a sample of 25 individuals, 14 described times when they actively modified, edited, or outright rejected some outputs by the AI product to better reflect their own style, communicative context, or linguistic identity.

These results illustrate that AI calibration does not always result in passive acceptance of the language used by the system. Instead, some participants showed a selective attitude toward using AI, in which they evaluated and adjusted AI output before using it in their final texts. To show how these patterns of meaning emerged from the interview data, **Table 3** presents several examples of data extracts along with the initial codes generated during the analysis process.

Table 3 shows that a number of initial codes that emerged from the interview data were related to forms of linguistic resistance to AI output. Codes such as revising AI output, adjusting language for context, and selective

acceptance of AI suggestions indicate that some participants did not automatically accept the language generated by AI, but instead evaluated and modified it before using it.

Table 3. Coding Structure of Theme 3: Linguistic Resistance and Identity Preservation.

Data Extract	Initial Code	Theme
"I usually change the wording so it sounds more natural."	Revising AI output to maintain naturalness	Linguistic Resistance
"If AI language is too formal, I modify it."	Adjusting AI output to match context	Linguistic Resistance
"I do not use all AI suggestions."	Selective acceptance of AI suggestions	Linguistic Resistance

3.3.1. Interpretation of Code Patterns

These codes suggest that when people use AI, they are still part of how it will end up looking in text. AI is generally formalized or structured in a way that people don't feel the syntax, grammar and diction are appropriate as per their own way of talking.

For example, DRN respondents stated:

"I usually change the wording so it sounds more natural".

The comment reveals that people consider how language sounds when deciding whether to judge an AI output. Here, participants judged the grammaticality as well as whether the style of language was appropriate for daily communication tasks.

Respondents from FRA-D expressed a similar vantage point, saying:

"If the language that AI has suggested is too formal, I change it."

This comment demonstrates that people analyze the circumstances before investing in AI concepts. People take language that is overly formal or too much standardized to fit the content of their communication.

In addition, AM-L respondents stated:

"I do not use all AI suggestions."

What this indicates is that people are using AI output only when they have no alternative. They don't always give complete obedience to AI's advice. Finally, they consider whether the proposals truly reflect their writing style.

3.3.2. Thematic Meaning

In conclusion, this article showcases that although AI does help enhance the way people use written language, at the end of the day it's really a matter of how you want yourself to be. In this particular instance, resistance does mean no use of AI whatsoever. Instead, it means finding a middle ground between the language rules that A.I. applies and each person's own language preferences. The findings will show how the mediation of new language standards and linguistic identity occurs during an encounter with AI and ways it can play out in a range of academic communicative practices.

These findings speak directly to RQ2, which queries how emergent language rules of AI are accepted, negotiated or rejected by students. However, the modifications that users applied to AI output indicate an overall lack of consensus on these linguistic rules determined by the system. Rather, they negotiate (actively) what language means for their own personal style of discourse, context and linguistic identity.

3.4. Synthesis of Findings

Using AI in learning not only transforms writing but also influences how we understand what counts as accurate, scholarly and valid language, which is one of the three themes that emerged from thematic analysis. There is a tension between the ways that algorithmic systems create standards of language, and the way that people work to maintain their own linguistic identity when they interact with AI.

The first topic, Normalization of AI-Standardized language, and the second theme, AI as Linguistic Authority, directly answer RQ1: specifically, how a learner's application of AI impacts their linguistic ideology within an educational domain. Both topics show that participants change their speaking and writing styles to be consistent with the speech patterns the AI creates when they encounter them repeatedly. And some began to view AI itself as a

reliable metric for judging language, so no longer would people ever just take someone's word that there were not 1,000 ways to say the same thing, because AI was changing how people thought about accurate and scholarly use of language.

The third subject directly dealing with RQ2 is language Resistance and Identity Preservation. It concerns the ways that a learner may accept, reject or modify what they consider to be standards of language even those set by AI. The findings show that AI really does change our use of language, but still some ignore—or intentionally modify some of the recommendations given by the system. It also allows people to maintain their speech patterns for themselves, adapt them to suit the situation, and preserve their identities in language.

These three themes reveal that AI's impact on how we use language is not everything it might seem. Instead, interaction with AI creates a dialectic where individuals are learning the rules of AI-generated language and negotiating and resisting those same dynamics. Therefore, AI comes to play not merely a technical writing instrument but a formative support for the varied facets of linguistic philosophy on technology-based learning.

Results show that this technology will change how students think about what's normative language and also intellectual or authentic when they revise their writing. The following section will address these findings by linking them to scholarship on language ideology, sociolinguistic authority and AI-mediated communications in the classroom.

4. Discussion

The results of this study elucidate the effects of AI technology on students' language ideologies and linguistic modalities inside educational institutions. The discussion contextualizes these findings within the framework of prior research on language ideology, sociolinguistics, and domain mediation via AI. The topic centers on three primary themes derived from the analysis: AI-standardized language as a normative expectation, AI as a (linguistic) authority, and the tactics learners use for linguistic resistance and identity maintenance. We look at each area to see how A.I. is helping to mold, modify, and rethink the laws of language in today's classrooms.

4.1. Normalization of AI-Standardized Language

This study first discovers that frequent engagement with AI results in a significant proportion of users altering their language use to align more closely with the linguistic structures produced by AI systems. Some people said that conversing with AI made them use better-ordered phrases, more advanced words, or even switch to English. This may mean that AI text becomes a kind of not-so-explicit guide for users on which usage or style might be more appropriate for an academic setting, bit by bit [2].

This finding agrees with other research that has found the way language is represented in training data can have a notable impact on large language models. Grieve et al. [12] explain that language models are not simply linguistic analyzers but also reflect the sociolinguistic distributions of their training corpus, which is often English and standard varieties. Furthermore, Lee et al. [7] show that the use of generative AI in language learning can indirectly reinforce the dominance of standard language forms in the global education context. In this case, students might begin to believe that some language forms (for example, academic English) are more "correct" or legitimate than others. Similar findings were also discovered by Law [5] in a literature review on the use of generative AI in language learning. The study showed that AI writing tools often produce language styles that are consistent with formal academic registers, so users tend to adjust their writing to align with these patterns.

From a sociolinguistic perspective, this phenomenon is closely related to the concept of language ideology, namely how certain forms of language are socially perceived as more correct, more prestigious, or more academically valid. Gal [21] emphasizes that language ideology is formed through a long social process, in which certain forms of language become symbols of linguistic legitimacy in certain communities. In the context of language technology, Blodgett et al. [22] also assert that language technology is never completely neutral because it often reproduces existing linguistic power structures in society. Thus, the findings of this study indicate that AI not only functions as a technical tool in writing but also has the potential to influence how users understand the forms of language that are considered correct and academic in technology-mediated learning practices.

4.2. AI as Linguistic Authority

The second theme shows that some participants began to view AI as a reliable source of linguistic evaluation. Many people reported using AI to check their grammar, improve sentence flow, or make their writing appear more scholarly. Some people even thought that AI was more objective or consistent than input from people.

This finding relates to the concept of algorithmic authority, which is the tendency of users to trust algorithmic systems as sources of knowledge or evaluation. Shin [23] explains that AI is playing an increasingly important role in shaping how users assess truth, credibility, and authority in the digital environment. Another study [24] shows that trust in AI often arises because the system is perceived as providing consistent feedback that is free from personal bias. In the context of education, Fitzek and Bârgăoanu [2] found that students often use large language models not only to generate text, but also to evaluate the linguistic quality of their writing. In addition, research [5] shows that AI writing tools are increasingly being used as language assessment tools in the context of digital academia.

From a sociolinguistic perspective, this change indicates a possible shift in the source of linguistic authority. Whereas academic language standards were previously determined by teachers, editors, or the academic community, AI technology is now beginning to play a new mediating role in the language evaluation process. AI systems may gradually gain authority, since people view them as objective and precise. The findings of this research show that when it comes to academic linguistic styles, not only does the presence of AI impact written texts, but it also frames users' perceptions of who has the power and authority to dictate these norms in the language.

4.3. Linguistic Resistance and Identity Preservation

Although AI has a fairly strong influence on participants' linguistic practices, the results of this study also show that users do not fully accept the linguistic norms generated by AI. Some participants actively modify AI-generated text to better suit the communication context or their personal style. In some cases, they also reject AI suggestions that are considered too formal or incompatible with their linguistic identity.

These findings indicate that users still have linguistic agency when interacting with language technology. Research by Wang et al. [4] shows that learners often use self-regulation strategies when using AI writing tools, including adjusting or rejecting some of the output generated by the system. Another study by Muawanah et al. [13] also shows that the use of AI technology in learning does not always lead to language homogenization, as users often maintain local linguistic practices in digital interactions. Additionally, Helm et al. [25] show that language technology can create tension between global linguistic standards and local linguistic diversity. From a sociolinguistic perspective, such resistance practices can be understood as a form of language ideology negotiation. Woolard [15] explains that language ideology is never static, but is constantly negotiated through everyday language practices. Furthermore, research by Ilbury et al. [26] shows that users in digital environments often adapt standard language forms to maintain their linguistic identity.

Thus, the findings of this study indicate that the influence of AI on language practices is not entirely deterministic. Instead, conversing with AI creates a negotiating ground where people can agree to the system's language rules, alter them or reject them altogether.

5. Limitations

Some quibbles with this research should be noted. First, the research was based on qualitative interviews with few participants, so results should be taken as exploratory rather than generalizable to all learners using AI in educational contexts. Second, the study is based on participant reflections of their own AI experiences rather than observations of participants' writing practices or interactions with AI systems. This can create chasms between what they say they did and what they actually did. Still, the majority of participants in this study are academics and their attitudes towards the use of language supported by an AI were likely varied from those who engaged with it without academic context, which may involve professional work settings or informal online communities. Lastly, due to the rapid evolution of generative AI technologies and their adoption, consumers' attitudes and behaviors may evolve. Therefore, to gain a better understanding of how AI influences language ideology and use, more research could investigate the uses of AI in various contexts based on diverse data sources.

6. Future Research

This work can be extended by future studies exploring AI-mediated language practices in broader educational and sociolinguistic contexts. Studies involving individuals of diverse linguistic background, professional background or multilingual online communities may generalize further with respect to the impact of AI on linguistic behaviours and beliefs. Moreover, additional research may triangulate interview data with types of evidence such as writing samples or use logs from interactions with AI systems to more directly investigate how users engage with language generated by AI within real-world communicative situations. Such approaches would provide us with avenues to better understand how AI innovation, language practices and sociolinguistic identity are evolving in contemporary classroom spaces.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization, R. (Rugaiyah) and N.G.; methodology, R. (Rugaiyah) and A.I.; formal analysis, A.I.; writing—original draft preparation, R. (Rugaiyah); writing—review and editing, R. (Roziyah); supervision, R. (Roziyah); funding acquisition, N.S. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

This research received no external funding. The study was conducted independently and did not receive financial support from any government agency, university, commercial organization, or other funding body.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Ethical review and approval were waived for this study because it involved voluntary interviews with adult participants, posed minimal risk, collected no sensitive personal data, and ensured participant anonymity and confidentiality throughout the research process.

Informed Consent Statement

Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement

The data presented in this study are not publicly available due to ethical considerations and the need to protect participants' privacy. Anonymized qualitative data may be made available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request and with appropriate ethical safeguards.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

AI Use Statement

The authors used QuillBot and DeepL solely for grammar checking, sentence structure refinement, and improving the readability of the English text in this manuscript. The authors take full responsibility for all academic content, including all ideas, data, analyses, and conclusions presented in this study.

References

1. Zhao, D. The impact of AI-enhanced natural language processing tools on writing proficiency: an analysis of language precision, content summarization, and creative writing facilitation. *Educ. Inf. Technol.* **2025**, *30*, 8055–8086. [[CrossRef](#)]
2. Fitzek, S.; Bârgăoanu, A. Introducing Large Language Models in Communication and Public Relations Education: A Mixed-Methods Pilot Study. *Int. J. Artif. Intell. Educ.* **2025**, *35*, 2478–2494. [[CrossRef](#)]
3. Li, B.; Tan, Y.L.; Wang, C.; et al. Two years of innovation: A systematic review of empirical generative AI research in language learning and teaching. *Comput. Educ. Artif. Intell.* **2025**, *9*, 100445. [[CrossRef](#)]

4. Wang, P.; Jing, Y.; Shen, S. A systematic literature review on the application of generative artificial intelligence (GAI) in teaching within higher education: Instructional contexts, process, and strategies. *Internet High. Educ.* **2025**, *65*, 100996. [CrossRef]
5. Law, L. Application of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) in language teaching and learning: A scoping literature review. *Comput. Educ. Open* **2024**, *6*, 100174. [CrossRef]
6. Wang, Y. Cognitive and sociocultural dynamics of self-regulated use of machine translation and generative AI tools in academic EFL writing. *System* **2024**, *126*, 103505. [CrossRef]
7. Lee, S.; Jeon, J.; Mckinley, J.; et al. Generative AI and English language teaching: A global Englishes perspective. *Annu. Rev. Appl. Linguist.* **2025**, *45*, 85–108. [CrossRef]
8. Hu, T.; Kyrkychenko, Y.; Rathje, S.; et al. Generative language models exhibit social identity biases. *Nat. Comput. Sci.* **2024**, *5*, 65–75. [CrossRef]
9. Ayoub, N.F.; Balakrishnan, K.; Ayoub, M.S.; et al. Inherent Bias in Large Language Models: A Random Sampling Analysis. *Mayo Clin. Proc. Digit. Health* **2024**, *2*, 186–191. [CrossRef]
10. Maly, I. AI, power and sociolinguistics. *J. Sociolinguistics* **2024**, *28*, 11–15. [CrossRef]
11. Park, S. AI Chatbots and Linguistic Injustice. *J. Univers. Lang.* **2024**, *25*, 99–119. [CrossRef]
12. Grieve, J.; Bartl, S.; Fuoli, M.; et al. The sociolinguistic foundations of language modeling. *Front. Artif. Intell.* **2024**, *7*, 1472411. [CrossRef]
13. Muawanah, U.; Marini, A.; Sarifah, I. The interconnection between digital literacy, artificial intelligence, and the use of E-learning applications in enhancing the sustainability of Regional Languages: Evidence from Indonesia. *Soc. Sci. Humanit. Open* **2024**, *10*, 101169. [CrossRef]
14. Creswell, J.W.; Creswell, J.D. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*; Sage: Los Angeles, CA, USA, 2018.
15. Woolard, K.A. Language Ideology. *Int. Encycl. Linguist. Anthropol.* **2020**, 1–21. [CrossRef]
16. McGrath, C.; Palmgren, P.J.; Liljedahl, M. Twelve tips for conducting qualitative research interviews. *Med. Teach.* **2019**, *41*, 1002–1006. [CrossRef]
17. Jarrahi, M.H. Interviewing AI: Using qualitative methods to explore and capture machines' characteristics and behaviors. *Big Data Soc.* **2025**, *12*. [CrossRef]
18. Guest, G.; Bunce, A.; Johnson, L. How Many Interviews Are Enough? An Experiment with Data Saturation and Variability. *Field Method.* **2006**, *18*, 59–82. [CrossRef]
19. Malterud, K.; Siersma, V.D.; Guassora, A.D. Sample Size in Qualitative Interview Studies: Guided by Information Power. *Qual. Health Res.* **2016**, *26*, 1753–1760. [CrossRef]
20. Raees, M.; Meijerink, I.; Lykourantzou, I.; et al. From explainable to interactive AI: A literature review on current trends in human-AI interaction. *Int. J. Hum. Comput. Stud.* **2024**, *189*, 103301. [CrossRef]
21. Gal, S. Language Ideologies. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*; Aronoff, M., Ed.; Oxford Academic: New York, NY, USA, 2023. [CrossRef]
22. Blodgett, S.L.; Barocas, S.; Daumé, H.; et al. Language (Technology) is Power: A Critical Survey of 'Bias' in NLP. In Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 5–10 July 2020; pp. 5454–5476. [CrossRef]
23. Shin, D. Automating epistemology: how AI reconfigures truth, authority, and verification. *AI Soc.* **2025**, *41*, 1553–1559. [CrossRef]
24. Benk, M.; Kerstan, S.; von Wangenheim, F.; et al. Twenty-four years of empirical research on trust in AI: a bibliometric review of trends, overlooked issues, and future directions. *AI Soc.* **2025**, *40*, 2083–2106. [CrossRef]
25. Helm, P.; Bella, G.; Koch, G.; et al. Diversity and language technology: how language modeling bias causes epistemic injustice. *Ethics Inf. Technol.* **2024**, *26*, 8. [CrossRef]
26. Ilbury, C.; Grieve, J.; Hall, D. Using social media to infer the diffusion of an urban contact dialect: A case study of Multicultural London English. *J. Sociolinguistics* **2024**, *28*, 45–70. [CrossRef]



Copyright © 2026 by the author(s). Published by UK Scientific Publishing Limited. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Publisher's Note: The views, opinions, and information presented in all publications are the sole responsibility of the respective authors and contributors, and do not necessarily reflect the views of UK Scientific Publishing Limited and/or its editors. UK Scientific Publishing Limited and/or its editors hereby disclaim any liability for any harm or damage to individuals or property arising from the implementation of ideas, methods, instructions, or products mentioned in the content.