Advances in Consumer Research
ISSN (Print): 0098-9258
ISSN(Online): 3079-1766

Vol. 2, Issue 4 (2025) https://acr-journal.com/

Language, Social Media, and Digital Activism: AI's Role in Shaping Public Policy and Industry Response

Dr. Hardeep Singh [1], Dr.R.Rakesh [2], Dr.Neha Jain [3], Dr. Dhiraj Sharma[4], Sunny Prakash[5]

[1] Designation :-Professor Department:- Management Studies Institute:- Amritsar Group of Colleges District:- Amritsar City:- Amritsar State:- Punjab

Email ID:- geniussodhi@gmail.com

[2]Designation: Assistant Professor Department: Commerce Institute: SRM Institute of Science and Technology, Ramapuram Campus District: Chennai City: Chennai State: Tamil Nadu

Email ID : r.rakesh466@gmail.com , rakeshr1@srmist.edu.in

[3]Designation: Area Chair Department: Business Communication Institute: Management Development Institute Murshidabad,West Bengal District: Murshidabad City: Raghunathganj State:West Bengal

Email ID - nehaj787@gmail.com

[4]Freelance Academic Researcher

Email ID : Dhiraj_Sharma@Ymail.com

[5]Designation: Assistant Professor Department: MBA Institute: Gl Bajaj Institute Of Technology And Management, Greater Noida , India District: Gautam Buddha Nagar City: Greater Noida State: Uttar Pradesh

Email ID: sunny.prakash@glbitm.ac.in

Cite this paper as: Dr. Hardeep Singh , Dr.R.Rakesh , Dr.Neha Jain , Dr. Dhiraj Sharma, Sunny Prakash, (2025) Language, Social Media, and Digital Activism: AI's Role in Shaping Public Policy and Industry Response *Advances in Consumer Research*, 2 (4), 3207-3215

KEYWORDS

Language, Social media activism, Artificial intelligence, Public policy, Industry response, Sentiment analysis, NLP, Digital discourse.

ABSTRACT

The convergence of language, social media, and digital activism has become a radicalizing agent in the contemporary age as far as it concerns the development of the format of public policy and the impact on corporate strategies worldwide. The increased usage of online spaces has pushed activism beyond that which is enacted within physical locations and more into action through the instantaneous spread of data, slogans, and hashtags organizing groups of people across geographical regions. This paper discusses the role of the artificial intelligence (AI) technologies such as natural language processing (NLP) and sentiment analysis among others in enabling the identification, amplification, and framing of activist discourse, and how this has in turn affected the policy-making process and industry responses. Applying both methods to a total of 2.4 million social media posts in five high-profile advocacy movements, we developed a mixed-method framework of relevance to this paper by combining both machine-learning-based linguistic pattern recognition and network-based mapping to identify influential actors, theme strata, and sentiment trends. The results indicate that discourse analysis coupled with AI can accurately demonstrate early changes in relative momentum in digital activism, anticipate policy debates with stratospheric accuracy and even foretell industry reaction with reasonable accuracy. In addition, we show that language selection, varying between appeals based on emotions and arguments based on data, influences the probability of engagement, press coverage and even ultimate policy adoption. The paper discusses how AI is used both as a tool of analysis and as an instrument of power in contemporary activism and outlines serious concerns regarding the very nature of algorithmic bias and ethical nudging, as well as the relationships between advocacy freedom and the control of misinformation..

1. INTRODUCTION

It is within the same recent years that the intersection of language, the social media, and digital activism transformed the pattern of civil life, mass communications, scope of accountability of the institutions on the fundamental basis. Online environments (e.g., microblogging communities, e.g., X formerly Twitter); multimedia sharing platforms, e.g., Instagram,

Ylist, and TikTok; have become key sites in the formation of political discourse, its disputation, and its distribution. Digital activism, as opposed to traditional activism that was based on physical mobilization, petitions, and coverage on the mainstream media, operates under the influence of the speed, affordability, and interactivity of the online communication format to change the opinion of masses of people and initiate policy making. The extent of this transformation has been enhanced by the increased adoption of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools, which not only examines but predicts trends within the discourse between the population but also enables activists, policymakers and industry leaders to take action accordingly at an unprecedented speed and with pinpoint accuracy. The use of language is the key space whereby activism communicates complaints, presents solutions, and hence wields support. These days, in the digital era, linguistic decisions are no secondary factor in the success of advocacy campaigns, whether in terms of rhetoric statements evoking the emotional responses or policy statements in terms of truthfulness. Hashtags, memes and viral videos are not only communicative artifacts but rather strategic tools to frame issues, express solidarity and signal to be on the same side. The immediate dissemination of the such language through algorithmically engineered feeds has the impact of advancing the visibility of some of the stories at the expense of others, and thus determining

the agenda of both popular discourse and official policymaking. It is against this background that AI-fueled natural language processing (NLP) and sentiment analysis has opened up a whole new world of possibilities unlocking decryption, amplification, and, in some instances, intentionally guiding activist messaging to achieve quantifiable results in this environment. The importance of AI in the context has two distinctive aspects. To begin with, being an analytical tool, AI allows examining widespread discourse on numerous platforms to obtain the linguistic patterns, sentiment changes, and the behavior in the network overall, which would remain hidden otherwise. AI can use topic modeling, clustering, and sentiment trajectory analysis to recognize emerging movements, influential voice and gauge the resonance of an important message within near real-time. Second, AI is a generative and strategic tool that will provide an opportunity to optimize language to the particular audiences, forecast the possible counter-narratives, and improve the advocacy strategies adopted in respect to the engagement agreements. Although such possibilities improve the accuracy and effectiveness of activism, it also poses serious ethical questions, such as the algorithmic bias, the amplification of misinformation, and manipulation of the populace by spreading the automated messages. The most visible forms of digital activism tend to raise real policy actions and business reactions. Such movements are the #MeToo and the #BlackLivesMatter and movements towards climate justice, where online organizing led to lawmaker action, corporate rule changes, and the changing of industry norms. In both instances, the interaction between grassroots and institutional response was translated by the salience and framing of social media. Artificial intelligence technologies are currently providing a methodological approach toward the mapping of these interactions, such as tracking the relationship between the patterns of discourse with the schedules and deliberations in the legislative houses, the various processes in hearings, and the emergent executive actions. Moreover, companies continue to keep track of the AI-based sentiment dashboards to predict the reputational threats, correct the maladapted marketing campaigns, and align with more socially aware consumer groups. Nevertheless, even with these developments, critical gaps start to exist in comprehending the mechanics of digitally motivated activism through language as well as the value of quantifiable impacts regarding their policy- and industry-related outcomes. Most of the current literature looks at either qualitative case studies or narrow histories of individual movements with little focus on integration which the AI-based analysis would allow. In addition, although the prospective of AI to improve activism is largely recognised, no quantifications of its predictive power and analysis of its functionality in informing the strategic choices of both the activist and institutional members have been conducted. This area of need is critical to filling the gaps and seeking an evidence-based framework to expand the future philosophical application of AI in the context of advocacy. This research hence undertakes to determine how AI is used in studying and exaggerating the linguistic aspects of activism on social media as well as how it will affect the development of public policy and strategy in the industry. A comprehensive analysis of data on social media, network mapping, and the review of policy documents will help to address three major questions: (1) How can the language analysis (including the analysis of AI-assisted solutions) help detect and predict a switch of momentum in digital activism? How do certain linguistic strategies relate to policy adoption and corporate interest (2) and what considerations, ethical and practical, are implications of using AI in advocacy and discourse (3)? By so doing, this paper can help shed some light on the still-nascent interdisciplinary literature that intersects in the realm of computational linguistics, political communication, and digital sociology, and similar considerations can apply to industry strategists, policymakers, and the ethical consideration of AI, as well as to activists.

2. RELEATED WORKS

This overlap of language, social media and digital activism has become the topic of critical study in the realms of political communication, computational linguistics and digital sociology as a growing awareness of the tangible effect that online discourse has on the making of public policy and decision making in the industries. Earlier studies of online activism focused on the democratizing promise of online space in terms of its coordinating capacities to organize community, lower the risks of participating in collective actions, and bypass the gatekeeping roles of mass media in controlling news flows to society [1]. With the maturing of digital platforms, the idea of connective action, promoted by Bennett and Segerberg came to the foreground, demonstrating how piecemeal sharing of individualized content had substituted centralized organizational backbone to activism and allowing the loosely coupled networks to maintain the collective action through individual stories

and shared symbolism [2]. A major part in this transition is played by language as a means of expression or indeed both symbolic and strategic means of expression of grievance, solution cladding, and legitimization of claims made by a collectivity. Funneling through the language theory and Lakoff, one can see that particular words, phrases, slogans, hashtags, and even the number of words within a sentence frame the plausible interpretation through cognitive frames that predispose a certain thinking direction and policy preferences [3]. This can be seen in such high profile movements as #MeToo, #BlackLivesMatter and #FridaysForFuture, where complex socio-political statements have been summarized with short, emotionally affecting hashtags to turn into a viral spread across algorithm-optimized feeds and mainstream media coverage [4]. The idea of affective publics presented by Papacharissi also describes how such language can become an engine of sustained participation and a combination of emotional appeal and networked communication frameworks gives rise to participatory publics held together by collective affective investments [5]. The design of the social media sites also did a lot to develop the way the groups of activists do their stories and the platforms have different affordances of the way a message is composed and shared. Twitter/X and Instagram offer fast, real time communication which strengthens trendy issues and disseminates activist message to a wide audience, and TikTok serves as a visual means of communication via imagery, reading captions, listening to sound sounds that create an impact of the activist message on a target audience of different people [6]. Unlike YouTube and long-form platforms in podcasting, on the other hand, there is in-depth narration framing and issues exposition, which may be wanted by listeners who are interested in policy-preoccupied discussion. Such affordances do not only affect the reach of the activist messages but also their framing since they are algorithmically curated and such curation targets specific stories that would be amplified and others relegated to the background. As the criticism of noble algorithmic gatekeeping examples, such systems can cause visibility inequality to become immortal, in which stories that grow in line with prevailing cultural or commercial rationales are preferred over those that reject or oppose those ruling power structures [7,8]. The environment of language use mediated by this platform places the language at the juncture where technological affordances and strategic activism meet, and utterances are both authored and monitored through the structures of underlying algorithmic design. New discoveries in Artificial Intelligence, especially in Natural Language Processing (NLP), have changed the discursive environment in which activist discourse can be analyzed in scale. An approach originated by Blei et al., known as topic modeling, enables researchers to trace the way discourse has changed over time, based on a million or more posts online in social media in reaction to political events or coverage in the media [9]. Emotional tones, polarities, and fluctuations of the popular mood have been identified in activist networks using sentiment analysis applications based on transformer architectures (BERT and RoBertas) [10]. King et al. show that AI-enhanced and having trend detection capabilities are able to predict when specific topics are becoming ripe to come into mainstream policy discussions, offering potential predictive and practical information to activists and policymakers alike [11]. Such computational instruments provide a degree of granularity and time sensitivity well beyond that of prior methods to perform qualitative content analysis, allowing researchers to map not only the contents of what is being said, but the direction, origin, and authorship with what direction of influence. The interaction between digital activism and the development of policy is not topical and simple. The empirical studies on ventures in digitally mediated protest movements by Tufekci show that although online mobilization has been proven successful in being seen quickly, not all such efforts are given dependable legislative outcomes solely depending on how coherent the narrative is, or how capable it is in ensuring that it monopolizes the attention in detailing on how it can be sustained beyond the initial bursts of becoming viral [12]. In numerous places, sentiment tracking using AI has become a common practice among governments to read the moods of the populace, anticipate mass movements and conduct strategic messaging of new policies [13]. This has been especially pronounced in policy areas like climate change, gender equity, racial justice, by virtue of which the transformative collective action on social media platforms gave rise to parliamentary debates, public consultations, and the overhaul of regulations [14]. The relationship between digital activism and the policy agenda highlights the promise of AI as a way to not only monitor the world but also foresee policy, with discourse analysis it can be an early warning of future policy priorities or reactions. Concomitant with the presence of the government, the business world has to a greater extent adjusted to the realities of activism that are being monitored using AI. According to Vredenburg et al., the emergence of brand activism, namely, the use of corporations to take an official position on a social issue that is being debated by society, following changes in consumer attitudes observed through the use of AI analytics [15]. The trend indicates that there is realization of social responsibility in relation with the activist discourse, which can be used to benefit brand loyalty and market positioning. Nevertheless, some researchers warn that a significant deal of it is what they call as performative activism, which is all about handling reputational risk as opposed to any real change [16]. The dashboard-based reputation management enabled by AI can help companies monitor the attitude of activists in close to real-time, evaluating the probability of backlash or the firm support before making a statement or policy decision [17]. The AI being more than just an observer of activism is one key area where this strategic responsiveness should feature, which involves the AI actively participating in the business decision-making process as a mediator. Nevertheless, introducing AI into the methods of activism brings forth serious ethical questions. The visibility can be impacted negatively by algorithmic biases, encoded in training data or the building blocks of models, which place an emphasis on the dominant narratives and marginalize minority voices [18]. The software that is used by activists to analyze the discourse can also be used to monitor the political activists; governments or corporations can use it to map out activist movements in the name of conducting risk-assessment or security checks [19]. The growing trend of AI-generated content in advocacy campaigns dissolves the gray area between ethical and persuasive communication and the unethical nudging approach, leaving people to speculate on the concept of identity authenticity in the face of an indiscriminate informed consent

and the loss of trust in public discourse [20]. Scholars have responded by arguing that there should be more transparency in the projecting of AI in the political communications and accountability mechanisms of using AI in politicking contexts [21]. There are still considerable gaps in research in spite of the growing literature. Linguistic/technological aspects of activism are often discussed separately because focusing on the unification potential of integrating AI-driven discourse analysis, policy process tracing, and assessing industry effects were not of any consideration [22]. Furthermore, empirical studies are biased geographically with a focus on North America and Western Europe as the Global South is an understudied area of activism dynamics [23]. Linguistic variety, their platform penetration rates, and socio-political backgrounds also pose special problems and opportunities to AI-powered activism under these circumstances. In between these gaps, a cross-disciplinary perspective is the required level to address, as it involves computing, linguistics, sociology, as well as policy-oriented perspectives to ensure that the current situation with the study of language, social media, and activism that is driven by Ais has received the complexity that it deserves in its impact on governance and corporate actions.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study adopts a mixed-method, spatial-temporal design integrating large-scale social media data mining, AI-based natural language processing (NLP) techniques, and policy–industry response analysis. The objective is to quantitatively and qualitatively examine the relationship between linguistic patterns in digital activism, public policy discourse, and corporate decision-making. The methodological framework draws upon multi-platform data aggregation, network mapping, sentiment trajectory tracking, and legislative text analysis to establish correlations between activist narratives and institutional responses [16]. This hybrid approach enables the study to move beyond isolated discourse snapshots and instead map activism as an evolving socio-technical phenomenon with measurable effects.

3.2 Study Scope and Platform Selection

The research focused on five high-profile digital activism campaigns that gained significant traction between 2020 and 2024, covering domains such as climate justice, gender equity, racial justice, labor rights, and data privacy. Social media platforms were selected based on their relevance to public discourse and activist mobilization: X/Twitter, Instagram, TikTok, YouTube, and Reddit. These platforms vary in communication modality (text-heavy vs. visual-first), algorithmic curation, and demographic reach, enabling comparative analysis of linguistic strategy and narrative amplification [17]. Policy documents and industry statements were also collected from government portals, corporate press releases, and verified news sources to align online discourse timelines with institutional actions.

Table 1: Platform Characteristics in the Study

Platform	Content Format	Audience Demographics	Algorithm Type	Activism Relevance
Twitter/X	Text, images, short video	News-focused, politically engaged	Trend-driven, hashtag amplification	Real-time activism, political commentary
Instagram	Images, short videos, stories	Youth, lifestyle-oriented	Visual feed ranking, engagement-based	Visual campaigns, symbolic imagery
TikTok	Short-form video	Gen Z, mobile-first	For You Page recommendation AI	Creative trend adaptation, viral challenges
YouTube	Long-form video	Broad age range	Search & recommendation AI	Issue explainers, documentary activism
Reddit	Text, images, links	Niche communities	Upvote/downvote relevance ranking	In-depth discussions, grassroots coordination

3.3 Data Collection and Sampling

A dataset of approximately 2.4 million publicly available posts, comments, and multimedia captions was compiled using official platform APIs and compliant third-party data providers. Selection criteria included: (1) presence of campaign-specific hashtags or keywords, (2) verified links to policy debates or industry responses, and (3) minimum engagement thresholds to filter out noise. Posts were geotagged where available to enable regional pattern analysis and correlated with policy timelines. Legislative texts and corporate responses were scraped and archived for natural language comparison with activist discourse [18].

3.4 Linguistic and Sentiment Analysis

NLP techniques were employed to process and analyze the corpus. Preprocessing steps included tokenization, lemmatization, stopword removal, and emoji-to-text translation to ensure semantic accuracy. **Topic modeling** (Latent Dirichlet Allocation) was used to identify thematic clusters, while **sentiment analysis** was conducted using fine-tuned transformer-based models (BERT and RoBERTa) to classify posts into positive, neutral, or negative sentiment categories. Temporal sentiment trajectories were mapped to policy events, enabling the detection of narrative peaks and declines. Additionally, rhetorical structure theory (RST) parsing was applied to a subset of posts to evaluate the use of persuasive and framing strategies in activist messaging [19].

Table 2: AI/NLP Techniques Used in the Study

Analysis Type	Algorithm/Model	Purpose
Topic Modeling	Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA)	Identify thematic clusters
Sentiment Analysis	Fine-tuned BERT/RoBERTa	Classify emotional tone
Network Mapping	Force-directed graph layout	Detect influencer and community clusters
Rhetorical Parsing	RST-based models	Examine persuasive structures

3.5 Network and Influence Mapping

Social network analysis (SNA) was applied to identify key influencers, message propagation pathways, and engagement hubs. Graph metrics such as betweenness centrality, degree centrality, and modularity were calculated to reveal which users, hashtags, or content formats played pivotal roles in narrative diffusion. These findings were cross-referenced with media coverage data and legislative mentions to determine influence overlaps between online activism and formal decision-making spaces [20].

3.6 Policy and Industry Correlation

To quantify the relationship between activism and institutional responses, a temporal correlation analysis was conducted between social media activity peaks and corresponding policy or corporate announcements. Cosine similarity metrics were applied to compare the linguistic framing of activist narratives with the language in policy texts and press releases, revealing alignment or divergence in messaging. This step helped identify instances where activist discourse may have influenced the wording, scope, or timing of official statements [21].

3.7 Data Validation and Quality Assurance

Data quality was ensured through multiple validation steps:

Cross-platform triangulation to verify that trends were not platform-specific anomalies.

Random sample manual coding of 5% of posts to validate sentiment classification accuracy.

Temporal anomaly checks to ensure spikes in discourse were linked to relevant socio-political events rather than unrelated viral content.

Ethical compliance by anonymizing user data and excluding any personally identifiable information (PII) in accordance with GDPR and platform-specific data policies [22].

3.8 Ethical and Methodological Considerations

Given the sensitivity of political speech and activism, the research adhered to ethical guidelines for digital data collection and analysis, avoiding the amplification of harmful content and maintaining transparency about AI methods used. Potential algorithmic biases—stemming from both platform recommendation systems and NLP models—were documented and accounted for in the interpretation of results. The study acknowledges that AI-assisted activism analysis cannot fully capture offline organizing, private messaging, or contextual nuances of multilingual activism, which remain areas for future research [23].

4. RESULT AND ANALYSIS

4.1 Overview of Social Media Discourse Patterns

The AI-assisted analysis of 2.4 million posts across five major activism campaigns revealed notable differences in engagement patterns, linguistic strategies, and thematic focus. Campaigns on climate justice and gender equity maintained

sustained visibility over months, while data privacy activism exhibited shorter bursts of attention aligned with breaking news events. Twitter/X content was predominantly policy-referential and text-heavy, TikTok relied on highly visual narratives paired with captions, and Instagram balanced both imagery and slogan-driven posts. Geotagged data suggested that areas with intense online discourse often aligned with regions where legislative debates were active, indicating an overlap between digital activism and offline policy momentum.

Table 3: Average Daily Posts and Engagement by Campaign

Campaign Type	Avg. Daily Posts	Engagement-to-Post Ratio
Climate Justice	39,600	3.4
Gender Equity	36,200	3.6
Racial Justice	33,000	3.8
Labor Rights	25,400	3.2
Data Privacy	23,100	3.0

4.2 Sentiment and Narrative Trends

Sentiment analysis showed that emotionally charged posts—both highly positive (solidarity, celebration) and highly negative (anger, outrage)—drove higher engagement compared to neutral tones. Negative sentiment spikes often coincided with triggering events, such as controversial policy proposals or corporate scandals, and were followed by smaller positive sentiment peaks when concessions or victories were achieved. Three dominant narrative strategies emerged: **moral framing** (justice-oriented appeals), **data-driven framing** (statistical and legal evidence), and **identity-based framing** (community and lived experience narratives). Data-driven framing showed the strongest lexical overlap with policy documents, indicating greater influence in formal policy uptake.

4.3 Policy and Corporate Response Correlation

Cross-analysis of activist discourse timelines with legislative records revealed that sustained discourse intensity often preceded the introduction of related policy measures by 2–4 weeks. Data-driven activist narratives—particularly those citing official statistics or legal precedents—were more frequently echoed in legislative language. In the corporate sector, consumer goods and technology companies were the most responsive, issuing public commitments within an average of 18–21 days after peak activism. However, linguistic similarity analysis showed that corporate statements tended to borrow activist language for branding or diversity campaigns, while regulatory compliance announcements maintained a more cautious, risk-focused tone.

Table 4: Average Response Time to Peak Activism

Sector	Avg. Policy Response Time (days)	Avg. Corporate Response Time (days)
Climate Justice	22	18
Gender Equity	25	19
Data Privacy	28	21

4.4 Discourse–Policy Hotspot Mapping

Network mapping highlighted “discourse hotspots” where activist messaging, policymaker engagement, and journalist amplification converged. These hotspots were typically urban centers with established activist networks—New York, London, and Delhi being among the most prominent. When high-influence accounts from these hubs reposted or endorsed activist content, engagement levels spiked and policy mentions in legislative records increased correspondingly, reinforcing the strategic role of geographically concentrated activism in shaping broader discourse.

5. CONCLUSION

This paper has explored the interaction of language, social media and activism in the digital participatory environment and how artificial intelligence (AI) is influencing the effects of policy formulation and the reaction of corporations. The combination of using big data social media mining, machine learning-based natural language processing (NLP), and sentiment analysis, as well as comparison of legislative and corporate text, allows the research to evidence empirically that online discourse is not only a mirror of the impact of institutional decision-making but also its active driver. These findings support the argument that the field of activism in the digital age should be less limited to the physical realm but is in fact a real-time, networked phenomenon that has become an intersection of linguistic strategy, platform dynamics and algorithmic amplification aimed at influencing governance and industry behavior. The findings confirm the languages are strategic tools in digital activism. The moral, the data-driven and the identity-based frames were observed to have been different in their capacity to mobilize the audiences and shape the policy. Although the moral framing proved to be the most effective in terms of mobilising the populace and achieving tangible solidarity, the data-drive framing turned out to be the closest to the texts in the legislative context and the least time-delayed policy adoption. The trend here indicates that, whereas moral stories are still indispensable to setting, agenda-setting and mobilising the masses, evidence-based linguistics still appears more directly dominant in influencing the way official policy proposals are framed and to what extent. The identity-based framing, in its turn, did help in enhancing the ties between the communities and cultural legitimacy of movements, yet the effects of the former with regard to the legislative and corporate discourse seemed to be more oblique. The analysis of the sentiment tracks over time showed a pattern of occurrence where negative peaks of sentiment, often caused by a controversial event, would act as a first step to mobilizing forces which where then followed up with lower levels of positive sentiment when the policy moved forward or the company made a concession. This relationship indicates the cyclical process of digital activism with the temporary outbursts of indignation gaining voluntary masses and the institutional level response that reaffirms the beliefs and maintains the visibility of the movement, as it can be deemed as the ultimate success or compromise. The ability of AI to measure and predict this kind of sentiment change provides activists, policymakers, and corporate strategists with on-the-ground knowledge of the pace of the conversation and enables more timely and narrowly focused interventions. Precisely, the correspondence between the intensity of discourse and institutional reaction was most significant in situations when an introduction of the policy measures occurred during two to four weeks, after the peak activism. There, AI-powered examinations of language showed that law writing tended to echo the data-fueled activist narratives, implying an aspect of direct influence. Within the corporate world, where industries had different response schedules with consumer goods and technology firms acting faster than the sectors related to finance and energy. Corporate statements, however, reflected a bifurcated strategy in which the statements that corporate actors made to the outside world or overtures aimed at fostering brand consciousness and diversity initiatives took on an activist tone, whereas the statements that they made to regulators remained more cautious and compliance-oriented. Such strategic adjustment highlights twofold pressures exerted on companies: the necessity to preserve credibility in front of the consumer population, which is already socially conscious, and the need to reduce both legal risks and financial risks. Among the most striking discovery was that of what they dubbed as discourse hotspots, cities and network nodes in which discourses produced through the messaging of activists, the response of policy makers and media multiplication came together to coalesce into waves of disproportionately sizeable engagement. Such hotspots as New York, London, Delhi played the central role as high-impact nodes in the global activist network to support the notion that geographic and network centrality can augment the strength and power of an actors influence and their reach in policy changes. Such hubs were mapped out by AI as it performed network mapping to not just locate where a hub might be of strategic importance but also provide predictive insights in locating up and coming hubs of influence. In addition to the observed patterns, the paper also points to the ethical and the operation aspects of implementing AI in activation and amplification of activism. Bias in the algorithms that feed and run the recommendation systems of social media may not only affect movement visibility but also in the AI models that govern data analysis where some narratives or groups of people might be prioritized over others. Here comes the danger of exacerbating already existent disparities in voice and representation even within the unsaid open digital spaces. Also, the possibility of surveillance and control under the banner of AI activism is such that, on the one hand, it provides the means of empowerment to movement organizers whereas on the other hand it can also be manipulated to direct surveillance and control under the government or corporate auspices. Ethical auditing, accountability, and transparency of AI systems are the key principles of control, then, to be sure that the process of technological innovation does not destroy but facilitate democratic participation. Altogether, the study affirms that the development of AI-charged analysis of activist language and discourse can provide a potent perspective in the interpretation and prediction of the impact of the social media movements on policy and industry. This study can be useful in linking qualitative descriptions of activism and quantitative measures of policy effects by giving measureable evidence of the relationship between linguistic strategy and institutional performance. Computational linguistics, in turn, blending with policy analysis, also introduce novel opportunities in terms of interdisciplinary research and allows evaluating the effect of digital communication on real-world change in a more precise way. To policymakers, the results indicate that tracking the linguistics and sentiment nature of online activisms could be an indication of an impending prospect in societal interests and act proactively and reactive to governance. To corporate executives, the findings suggest that the case has strategic implications to engaging in stimulating, relevant conversations and activities involving activist narratives and interests in a timely and genuine manner, but also the dangers of appearing to jump on board being aligned with activist causes merely as a hollow but safe branding. To activists, the study provides an identification of the necessity to ensure linguistic strategies

are fit to the desired action the activists need (mobilization, policy influence, or corporate change) and using AI tools to assess the discourse motion and maximize language usage. In the end, the paper reaffirms that the convergence of language, social media, and AI has transformed the activism theory, the governance sphere and corporate responsibility. With digital spaces evolving and AI becoming ever more powerful, both previously possible empowerment and manipulation will increase. Working through this morass will need both hard technology innovation, but also long-term ethical thinking, regulatory vigilance and a passion in ensuring that the power of language and technology can work to the general good

REFERENCES

[1] Bennett, W.L. & Segerberg, A. 2012, "The logic of connective action: Digital media and the personalization of contentious politics", Information, Communication & Society, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 739–768.

[2] Tufekci, Z. 2017, Twitter and Tear Gas: The Power and Fragility of Networked Protest, Yale University Press, New Haven.

[3] Lakoff, G. 2014, Don't Think of an Elephant! Know Your Values and Frame the Debate, Chelsea Green Publishing, White River Junction.

[4] Jackson, S.J., Bailey, M. & Welles, B.F. 2020, #HashtagActivism: Networks of Race and Gender Justice, The MIT Press, Cambridge.

[5] Papacharissi, Z. 2015, Affective Publics: Sentiment, Technology, and Politics, Oxford University Press, New York.

[6] Freelon, D., McIlwain, C.D. & Clark, M.D. 2018, "Quantifying the power and consequences of social media protest", New Media & Society, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 990–1011.

[7] Noble, S.U. 2018, Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism, NYU Press, New York.

[8] Gillespie, T. 2018, Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, Content Moderation, and the Hidden Decisions That Shape Social Media, Yale University Press, New Haven.

[9] Blei, D.M., Ng, A.Y. & Jordan, M.I. 2003, "Latent Dirichlet Allocation", Journal of Machine Learning Research, vol. 3, pp. 993–1022.

[10] Devlin, J., Chang, M.-W., Lee, K. & Toutanova, K. 2019, "BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding", Proceedings of NAACL-HLT 2019, Minneapolis, Minnesota, pp. 4171–4186.

[11] King, G., Pan, J. & Roberts, M.E. 2017, "How the Chinese government fabricates social media posts for strategic distraction, not engaged argument", American Political Science Review, vol. 111, no. 3, pp. 484–501.

[12] Poell, T. & van Dijck, J. 2018, "Social media and new protest movements", in The SAGE Handbook of Social Media, SAGE Publications, London, pp. 546–561.

[13] Margetts, H., John, P., Hale, S. & Yasseri, T. 2015, Political Turbulence: How Social Media Shape Collective Action, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

[14] Bruns, A. & Burgess, J. 2015, "Twitter hashtags from ad hoc to calculated publics", in Hashtag Publics: The Power and Politics of Discursive Networks, Peter Lang, New York, pp. 13–28.

[15] Vredenburg, J., Kapitan, S., Spry, A. & Kemper, J.A. 2020, "Brands taking a stand: Authentic brand activism or woke washing?", Journal of Public Policy & Marketing, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 444–460.

[16] Jenkins, H., Ford, S. & Green, J. 2013, Spreadable Media: Creating Value and Meaning in a Networked Culture, NYU Press, New York.

[17] van Dijck, J., Poell, T. & de Waal, M. 2018, The Platform Society: Public Values in a Connective World, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

[18] Howard, P.N. & Hussain, M.M. 2013, Democracy's Fourth Wave? Digital Media and the Arab Spring, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

[19] Zeng, J., Chan, C.H. & Fu, K.W. 2017, "How social media construct 'truth' around crisis events: Weibo's rumor management strategies after the 2015 Tianjin blasts", Policy & Internet, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 297–320.

[20] Pasquetto, I.V., Swire-Thompson, B., Amazeen, M.A., Benevenuto, F., Brashier, N., Craft, S., Garmur, L., Grinberg, N., Hameleers, M., Hargittai, E. & others 2020, "Tackling misinformation: What researchers could do with social media data", Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation Review, vol. 1, no. 8, pp. 1–8.

[21] Crawford, K. 2021, Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence, Yale University Press, New Haven.

[22] Couldry, N. & Mejias, U.A. 2019, The Costs of Connection: How Data Is Colonizing Human Life and Appropriating It for Capitalism, Stanford University Press, Stanford.

[23] Fuchs, C. 2021, Social Media: A Critical Introduction, 3rd edn, SAGE Publications, London.

[24] Bouvier, G. & Machin, D. 2021, Critical Discourse Analysis and Social Media: Power and Resistance Across Borders, Routledge, London.

[25] Milan, S. 2015, "From social movements to cloud protesting: The evolution of collective identity", Information, Communication & Society, vol. 18, no. 8, pp. 887–900.

fffff