INTERNATIONAL PREMIER JOURNAL OF LANGUAGES & LITERATURE (IPJLL)
VOLUME 3, ISSUE 1, 2025 p-ISSN: 3007-2336 e-ISSN: 3007-2344

AI AND LINGUISTIC NORMS: A CRITICAL REVIEW OF LANGUAGE CHANGE IN THE AGE OF CONVERSATIONAL TECHNOLOGIES

Ammara Fatima ammarafatima412@gmail.com	Visiting Lecturer, Department of English, University of Jhang, Jhang, Punjab, Pakistan.
Saba Akmal sabaakmal@cuilahore.edu.pk	Visiting Lecturer, Department of Humanities, COMSATS University Islamabad, Lahore Campus, Punjab,Pakistan,
Zahid Ali poetzahidijaz112@gmail.com	Principal, Iqra Public School, Kamalia, Punjab, Pakistan.

Abstract

This study provides a comprehensive review of the influence of AI-mediated communication on sociolinguistics. It emphasizes the standardization of language, its diversity, and its pragmatic collaboration. By focusing on sociolinguistic theory, the current study uncovers AI language models that most predominantly represent standardized language varieties. It is because of their drilling on the large corpora of formal and edited descriptions. This research employs a qualitative critical review technique to examine how AI-activated conversational technologies impact linguistic standards. In place of collecting new empirical data, the research methodically examines present scholarly literature, reports, and theoretical debates that intersect with sociolinguistics, computational linguistics, and AI ethics. The study investigates the limitations of AI in capturing pragmatic functions. Some functions are important for human communication, such as creativity, humor, and socio-cultural situations. This study focuses on the need for ethical design of AI. It collaborated with diverse linguistic data. It illustrates the clear sociolinguistic changes that promote inclusive communication. After the establishment of interdisciplinary insights, it uncovers the complex role of AI as both a preserver and transformer of linguistic traditions. The study addresses the ongoing research and collaborative efforts.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence, Computer-Mediated Discourse, Linguistic Norms, Language Change, Technology*

Corresponding Author: Ammara Fatima (Visiting Lecturer, Department of English, University of Jhang, Jhang, Punjab, Pakistan).
Email: uoszakirali@gmail.com

1. Introduction

The expansion of artificial intelligence (AI) innovations has completely affected language practices, specifically with the development of conversational agents like ChatGPT, Siri, Alexa, and Google Assistant. These programs, which work on large language models (LLMs), can make contextually applicable, coherent, and continual human-like responses over different fields. Therefore, AI is not only replacing the processes of communication but also transforming views on linguistic appropriateness, correctness, and standardization (Herring, 2020).

Historically, language changes have been determined by a mix of social, cultural, and technological components. At the same time, the present digital environment produces a new influencer of change, AI, which connects with users in different situations, from temporary conversations to scholarly writing. These innovations use comprehensive datasets of human language and probabilistic algorithms to produce feedback, usually reinforcing general syntactic patterns, formal styles, and standardized lexicons (Floridi, 2019). Therefore, conversational AI can perform as both a guardian of linguistic standards and an unintended prompter for modification.

The comprehensive adoption of AI-generated language provokes particular questions concerning linguistic authority, creativity, and inclusivity. Such as which language does AI represent, and what linguistic differences are neglected? To what degree do these mechanisms modify users' language preferences and either reinforce or dispute prominent standards? Furthermore, in what way does AI-moderated discourse impact established sociolinguistic foundations such as variation, identity, and prestige?

This study utilizes a significant review methodology to analyze the impacts of AI-activated conversational innovations on current linguistic standards. Using theoretical structures from sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, and computational linguistics, it examines the methods in which AI encourages language consistency, impresses pragmatic connection, and inspires sociolinguistic variation. In doing so, the research focuses on the wider implications of these modifications for digital communication, language teaching, and linguistic investigation. The current study has the following research questions:

1. How do AI-powered conversational technologies influence contemporary linguistic norms and standards of correctness?
2. How far does conversational AI promote standardized language and marginalize linguistic diversity?
3. What are the sociolinguistic implications of AI-mediated communication for language diversity?

2.Literature Review

The intersection of artificial intelligence and human language has garnered considerable scholarly attention across linguistics, computer science, and media studies. Researchers have long documented the influence of digital technologies on language change, beginning with early internet-mediated communication (IMC) studies that examined how emails, chat rooms, and text messaging altered traditional language norms (Crystal, 2006). With the advent of conversational AI, the stakes have changed: machines are no longer passive channels but active generators of language, contributing to linguistic norm formation and dissemination.

David Crystal (2006) described the internet as a "linguistic revolution," emphasizing its role in accelerating informal and hybrid forms of communication. However, current AI systems diverge from this early informality. Tools like ChatGPT and Siri are trained on large datasets containing standardized, grammatically formal language, and their output often reinforces dominant linguistic norms, potentially at the expense of variation and creativity (Floridi, 2019). It is noted that such technologies encode certain philosophical assumptions about clarity, efficiency, and objectivity, all of which privilege particular modes of expression over others.

Additionally, from a discourse analytical perspective, Herring (2020) outlines how computer-mediated discourse analysis (CMDA) must evolve to accommodate AI-generated interactions. While human discourse is shaped by social context, intention, and identity, AI discourse is shaped by algorithmic patterns and training data. This creates a unique communicative environment in which traditional sociolinguistic variables, such as age, gender, and region, are absent or artificially constructed. Consequently, AI models tend to reproduce a neutral, decontextualized register that, while seemingly inclusive, may erase cultural and dialectal specificity (Bender et al., 2021).

Sociolinguists have also warned about the potential homogenizing effect of AI on global language use. Trudgill (1986) and Labov (1972) emphasized the importance of variation and community-based linguistic norms in the natural evolution of language.

However, AI tools trained primarily on standardized English, particularly American and British variants, risk sidelining localized and minority linguistic forms.

Moreover, Bender et al. (2021) argue that large language models, while powerful, pose risks in reinforcing biases and perpetuating exclusionary practices. The critique of "stochastic parrots" highlights that AI models. It can replicate harmful patterns present in their training data, including stereotypical representations of language, identity, and culture.

On the analysis of social communication, include traditions such as Luhmann's (1995) system theory, Latour's (2007) actor-network theory, and Cameron's (1992) feminist analysis of linguistic theory. Due to limitations of space, we do not engage with these views directly and acknowledge that they might offer a different interpretation of the norms governing conversation between humans and language technologies. Second, we would like to acknowledge that the primary focus of our paper is on ideal speech for the English language. We do not discuss how our arguments carry over to other languages or different modes of communication, such as oral, rather than written, linguistic traditions. We believe it is an important open question, and one for further research, whether and in what way other languages, language varieties, and cultural traditions may generate different interpretations of the normative ideals that inform speech and communication.

Furthermore, the human ability to communicate via sound and other means is understood not as based on internal grammatical systems but rather as an activity in which humans coordinate their behavior with their human and nonhuman environment: "Language can be traced to how living bodies co-ordinate with the world. On this perspective, far from being a synchronic "system," language is a mode of organization that functions by linking people with each other, external resources and cultural traditions" (Cowley, 2011).

The development of novel language-learning applications can be traced back to the first dialogue system, ELIZA. ELIZA was developed by Joseph Weizenbaum at the MIT Artificial Intelligence Laboratory between 1964 and 1966 as the first natural language processing computer software. Eliza was built to highlight the superficiality of human-machine interaction via the use of pattern matching to imitate conversation (Weizenbaum, 1976).

In short, the review of literature reveals both the transformative potential and the normative pressures introduced by AI technologies. While they offer efficiency and accessibility, conversational AI systems also present challenges to linguistic diversity, pragmatic nuance, and equitable representation. These issues underscore the need for a

critical examination of AI's role in shaping contemporary language norms and for the development of more inclusive, context-sensitive AI language models.

3. Methodology

This research employs a qualitative critical review technique to examine how AI-activated conversational technologies impact linguistic standards. In place of collecting new empirical data, the research methodically examines present scholarly literature, reports, and theoretical debates that intersect with sociolinguistics, computational linguistics, and AI ethics.

The choice of sources was based on their significance to the research questions, concentrating on studies that examine language variation, standardization, and the sociolinguistic impacts of AI language representations like ChatGPT and voice assistants. The study concentrated on recognizing common themes, theoretical arguments, and critical aspects concerning the influence of AI on the latest language use. By embodying aspects from different fields, this process provides a detailed perception of the normative and transformative impacts of conversational AI on language usage, at the same time also referring to the areas and the challenges for further examination.

3.1. Research Objectives

1. To investigate the influence of conversational AI on the development of linguistic norms.
2. To examine how AI-generated language affects the representation and promotion of linguistic diversity.
3. To explore the broader sociolinguistic implications of AI integration into everyday language use.

4.Theoretical Framework

The study focuses on the basic principles of sociolinguistics and computer-mediated discourse analysis (CMDA). It is used to critically examine the linguistic customs of conversational AI technologies. The theoretical model is multidisciplinary, coordinating the human perspectives on language change. It also associates the comprehension of the change with computational language modeling. The basic lens of this study is sociolinguistic theory. This theory illustrates the concept of language diversity, normativity, and identity (William Labove, 1972 & Peter Trudgill, 1986). These frameworks are helpful to comprehend that language is not rigid. They illustrate that

language is a multidisciplinary approach that is anchored in society and exercised by diversity across regions, ethnicities, and contexts.

These frameworks highlight that linguistic customs are not unvarying rules but arranged mutual conventions. They are constructed by power, status, and community. Therefore, the use of standardized English by Artificial Intelligence systems raises questions, such as linguistic authority and exclusion. In addition, non-standard varieties are not prominent in this data.

In the contemporary situation, this framework modifies Computer-Mediated Discourse Analysis (CMDA) that was proposed by Susan Herring (2004, 2020). CMDA supplies tools for the analysis of how discourse is constructed and examined in AI technologies. It suggests a platform for researchers to manage AI technologies as a part of digital discourse. The model of Herring is helpful to acknowledge the human and non-human nature of AI discourse. Thus, Bender et al. (2021) illustrate that this study adopts a critical lens in AI ethics and philosophy of language. The metaphor "stochastic parrot" investigates how AI technologies seem intellectual. It establishes the dominant ideologies that are connected with the sociolinguistic theories.

In the end, the study highlights an in-depth theoretical analysis that is shaped by conversational AI. It is not only a technological achievement. It is a sociolinguistic theory that examines how language is used and adopted in digital discourse.

5.Analysis and Findings

Conversational AI tools like ChatGPT, Siri, and Alexa depend on huge data files. These data files mostly consist of formal and edited sources, such as newspapers, academic texts, and general references. As a result, standardized English is reflected by their constructed language. It comprises conventional grammar, vocabulary, and sentence patterns. Such standardization improves the clarity of a language. It assists in global communication and reduces vagueness. For many customers, it allows consistent and professional interaction. But this interaction also causes a lot of expense. AI reconstructs only a limited range of languages. It often eliminates informal, regional, and non-standard varieties of a language. This process of elimination matters a lot. Language is not only a system of rules; it also represents the culture, identity, and community of individuals. As Labov (1972) mentioned, language changes are natural and socially meaningful. People express different words based on their region, class, ethnicity, and group. The AI system shows a failure to capture all such diversities. They enhance one version of English, such as American or British, at the expense of others.

Repetitive exposure to AI-generated language can have an impact on the users. When people start to use Standard English as the correct or "proper" form, they may feel pressure to change their language. With the passing of time, this could minimize the acceptance of local or minority dialects, which is a precise process to construct linguistic orders. Standard forms will become prestigious. Non-standard forms will be at the level of dishonor or disregard. The power of AI reinforces its impact. In reality, AI is not neutral, but buyers often regard it as neutral and intellectual. It represents the data on which they become trained. Trudgill (1986) illustrated that renowned linguistic varieties construct beliefs about certainty, while AI magnifies this construct by strengthening the concept that formal English is the standard.

This process is specifically threatened in multilingual or postcolonial societies. In these situations, local languages already face exclusion. If AI does not play a role in their connection, digital tools will assist in their decline. Natives may leave their native forms in favor of standard ones, which leads the way to the loss of linguistic diversity and cultural ancestry.

AI constructors must think again about how they establish language models. They require making more diverse datasets that illustrate different dialects, informal speech, and non-dominant languages. Practicing demonstrates not only the reality of how people speak but also how they write in formal circumstances.

Furthermore, AI systems should indicate their limitations. Users must know that the output of AI is not always neutral or complete. It is constructed by choices, such as whose language is included and whose is excluded. Clarity in this process assists the users to remain critical. Sooner or later, AI must be reformed. There would be no other way than technology to shelter human variability. At that time, only AI could work as a fair and responsible agent in constructing how we demonstrate language.

5.1. AI and the Erosion of Pragmatic Richness in Communication

AI-generated discourse may be fluent and logical, but it has no pragmatic depth inherent in human communication. Pragmatics does not just rely on the apparent meaning, but it also focuses on how meaning is constructed in specific situations. Pragmatics reflects how language works in real life. It consists of basic terms, such as humor, irony, politeness, and emotional indications. These characteristics rely on cultural situations and human instinct. However, AI depends on probabilities, and it does not understand situations as humans do.

Current conversational AI is incompatible with removing this dimension with accuracy or originality. As Herring (2020) highlights, AI-mediated discourse is cleaned

out of multimodal and socio-contextual signs that demonstrate meaning in natural communication. These signs assist in comprehending politeness, contention, and humor in human behaviors. This destruction has real results. People can copy the simplified styles of AI if they start relying on AI for their writing and speaking purposes. Over time, customers can lose connection with more delicate forms of communication. This could reduce their situational competence, as the ability to use language effectively in contextual situations.

Learners of a Second language are specifically in a risky situation. Frequently, they use AI to produce speech and writing. If they continue learning from AI, they can learn only the literal and standardized use of language. They cannot understand how to adjust tone, how to respond in answers, and how to adjust politeness according to specific situations. These are the key components of cooperative communication.

The problem becomes more severe across cultures. Pragmatic rules are not the same everywhere. For example, politeness in Japanese culture differs widely from politeness in American English culture. Frequently, AI users of Western culture may misunderstand or neglect non-Western customs. This reflects pragmatic prejudice, where particular ways of speaking are favored, and other ways are neglected. This bias has an impact on social communications. Users from different cultures may feel isolated or misunderstood. They may change how they speak to "fit" the AI's expected style. This weakens cultural authenticity and linguistic identity. They might alter their speech to 'fit' the selected phrasing of AI. Linguistic recognition and cultural clarity become weakened in its result.

5.2. Language, Identity, and Power in AI Communication

Language does more than convey vivid information. It represents who we are and connects us to our communities, culture, and history. When AI systems generate language, they also construct how to illustrate identity and belonging. Technically, it constructs the authority of a language in a society.

Most of the AI tools use standardized English, such as ChatGPT or voice assistants. It consists of ordinary, common grammar and vocabulary that exist in formal writing. These tools are unbiased as they represent the customs found in their practices. Frequently, they strengthen the dominant language structures.

Bender et al. (2021) declare that large language models hold covered biases. These models replicate the outlooks in the data from which they learn the language. If marginalized voices are misplaced, AI cannot represent them. It will magnify what is already overcome and known.

It emphasizes the problems of linguistic equity. AI systems promote neglected dialects, creoles, and indigenous languages. Such diversities hold the connotations of culture. When AI gives over to them, it gives the opinion that they are not valid or helpful. This form of prohibition can determine how people speak. Users may change their language to match the system. They may stop using their native narratives. With passing time, this can show a way of loss of language. People may feel stressed about conforming to which version of AI speech is correct. Trudgill (1986) and Phillipson (1992) notified about this problem. They represented how specific language varieties acquire power; on the other hand, some lose their power. AI keeps up with this process. These days, it does not occur in specific institutes, but it takes place through the help of algorithms. Reputation is now computerized rather than just social.

This change affects how people achieve their own identity. A speaker who uses a regional dialect may feel unseen in AI coordination. This is a big reason to construct distance between speakers and their languages. It lowers their confidence in their language. It can establish a wrong sense of what is "normal" in language use. The problem is greater in multilingual or postcolonial situations. In such contexts, politics in a language is already sensitive. When AI tools fail to assist local languages, they are involved in the present cultural disempower. It is not just a technical gap; it is just a social danger.

At the same time, AI is assisting in vital areas like education, employment, and healthcare. In these positions, language matters a lot. AI can create access barriers if it does not comprehend or respect various ways of speaking. In this process, people do not get fair treatment or proper support.

5.3. AI and the Shifting Negotiation of Language Norms

Language norms are not fixed; they always change through interaction and communication within communities. The involvement of AI in daily routines introduces a new, inhuman participant into this consensus process. As Herring (2020) recommends, AI systems have no consciousness; they act as discourse members. It is shaped by the environment in which they are placed. The results are a minute but consequential reconstruction of linguistic power and norm-setting processes. These days, algorithms assist in constructing how language is used and acquired.

When people speak to AI, they manage their speech according to it. They may simplify words, prohibit slang, or use formal vocabulary. Furthermore, Users try to be understood by the system. As a result, AI starts to have an impact on how people write and speak, as it happens with other humans. Users interacted with AI in very imaginative ways. Some place local illustrations or jokes by using dialects or mixed languages. These

functions are tested by the ability of adaptation of system's ability to adapt. They represent the identity of users; if AI breaks down to respond properly, users observe the gap.

5.4. Ethical Challenges and Future Directions in AI-Language Use

These days, the use of language by people is demonstrated with the help of AI technologies. Such situations face ethical challenges. The models of languages do not directly represent how people talk. They cast an impact on it and enhance specific customs. These choices have social consequences, such as mostly leaving others out.

Large language models (LLMs) are trained on massive datasets. Most of these consist of standardized English in which Informal speech, dialects, and minority languages are represented. It is not only representing a data issue, but there is also a deeper social inequality. Bender et al. (2021) illustrate this as a framework problem, not only a technical issue.

Ethical AI design is not only about getting protection from danger. It is about doing better. It means the establishment of a system that has a strong impact on linguistic diversity. It represents the construction of tools that are easily accessible to people. This theory respects language as a living and dynamic force.

If AI keeps up to frame how we speak, we must instruct it carefully. We must take care of the space of all voices, not only the dominant ones. It is only a way through which AI becomes a fair and comprehensive part of our linguistic future.

6. Conclusion

This study explored how AI constructs the use of modern language. It reflects that conversational technologies enhance the standard forms of English. These systems often neglect linguistic diversity. As a result, they pose a threat to the enforcement of dominant customs while prohibiting the non-standard varieties. There is an absence of human communication in AI, as it cannot understand emotion, intention, or cultural possibilities. This has an impact on how people write, speak, and illustrate identity. The influence is light but strong. Users may start variations in their speech to connect it with the output of the system. Such changes in speech have real consequences. From digital spaces, local dialects, creative language, and minority voices may vanish. AI is constructed not just as a tool but also as a model of what is seen as “correct.” This enhances the questions about linguistic vivacity and reliability.

The investigation also found that language norms are now constructed in new ways. AI is part of everyday communication, so it helps to set levels. However, these levels

are constructed on restricted data. They do not represent the full variety of human speech and must be built with incorporation in mind to make changes in this concept. Constructors should get help from diverse data. They should involve communities in designing such systems. Users must also comprehend what AI can and cannot do. It is easy to use ethical language technology, but it demands care, vivacity, and cooperation. It should not only respect language as a technical problem but also as a social and cultural practice.

AI will progressively evolve, and its role in language will also develop. If instructed well, it can support equity and diversity, which is crucial for protecting the sociolinguistic structure of communication in a digitally moderated world. On the other hand, if it remains unchecked it may restrict the way we speak, and learn and if left unchecked, it may limit how we speak, learn, and associate. The future of language is not relying on machines alone; it belongs to the people who speak it, in all their forms, voices, and ways of existence.

References

Andersen, G. (2006). *Language Change and Variation*. Routledge.

Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 610–623).

Cowley, S. (2011). Distributed language. In S. Cowley (Ed.), *Distributed language* (pp. 1–14). John Benjamins.

Crystal, D. (2006). *Language and the Internet* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Floridi, L. (2019). *The Logic of Information: A Theory of Philosophy as Conceptual Design*. Oxford University Press

Herring, S. C. (2020). The coevolution of computer-mediated communication and computer-mediated discourse analysis. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 25(1), 3–14.

Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Luhmann, N. (1995). *Social systems*. Stanford University Press.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford University Press.

Trudgill, P. (1986). *Dialects in Contact*. Blackwell.

Weizenbaum, J. (1976). *Computer power and human reason: From judgment to calculation*. W.H. Freeman.