

Reinterpreting Pierre Bourdieu's Theory of Linguistic Domination in the Era of Digital Capitalism: *Language as Symbolic Power*

Dr. Syed Azeem Ali

Assistant Professor, Department of English, ACE Engineering College,
Hyderabad, Telangana. India.

Paper Received on 09-06-2026, Accepted on 11-07-2026
Published on 12-07-26; DOI:10.36993/RJOE.2025.11.07.135

Abstract:

Although language has traditionally been thought of as a communication tool, Pierre Bourdieu rethought it as a means of establishing, legitimising, and reproducing social hierarchies. Bourdieu contends that every linguistic encounter is simultaneously an economic and political transaction taking place within uneven relations of symbolic power, rejecting structuralist and generative methods that separate language from its social conditions. In light of the changes brought about by digital capitalism, artificial intelligence, algorithmic governance, and platform-mediated communication in the twenty-first century, this essay revisits Bourdieu's thesis of symbolic dominance. While Bourdieu created his framework in reaction to state power, bureaucratic authority, and educational institutions, modern language practices increasingly take place in corporate-controlled digital environments where visibility, legitimacy, and symbolic worth are determined by algorithms. This article argues that symbolic power has moved from institutional monopolies toward algorithmically mediated infrastructures without losing its basic logic of domination through an interdisciplinary synthesis of Bourdieu's concepts of linguistic capital, symbolic violence, legitimate language, habitus, and linguistic markets with the works of Michel Foucault, Judith Butler, Norman Fairclough, Teun A. van Dijk, Wendy Brown, Shoshana Zuboff, Nick Couldry, Ulises A. Mejias, and recent research on digital discourse. While digital platforms have increased communication opportunities, they have also given rise to new forms of language inequality, monitoring, commodification, and epistemic authority. By converting language into computational capital and altering authorship, credibility, and communicative legitimacy, artificial intelligence further complicates these trends. The study concludes that although Bourdieu's theory needs to be reinterpreted to accommodate the growing relationship between symbolic dominance, data capitalism, and algorithmic control, it is still essential for comprehending current language battles. By doing this, the study shows that in the digital age, language continues to be one of the most important platforms for the exercise, contestation, and reproduction of power.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Digital Capitalism, Language, Linguistic Capital, Pierre Bourdieu, Symbolic Power and Symbolic Violence.

Introduction

Power is rarely based solely on coercion, as the history of political thinking repeatedly shows. Language has continuously served as an equally important but frequently imperceptible technique of dominance, even if military force, legal authority, and economic power have historically been seen as the main tools used to manage society. Every civilisation creates mechanisms that give some speech patterns legitimacy while marginalising, stigmatising, or making them unheard. Thus, language functions as an institutional tool that reproduces social inequality, determines truth, and distributes authority in addition to being a means of communication. The words people use, their accents, their vocabulary, and even the situations in which they are permitted to talk all serve as markers of larger power dynamics ingrained in the social system (Bourdieu 37). By focusing on the social circumstances that determine whose speech is considered legitimate rather than grammar and linguistic proficiency, Pierre Bourdieu's *Language and Symbolic Power* (1991) radically changed sociological understandings of language. Bourdieu contended that language cannot be comprehended apart from the domains in which it is used, challenging the presumptions of generative grammar and structural linguistics. Communication and dominance are inextricably linked since every language exchange takes place amid unequal distributions of economic, cultural, and symbolic capital. According to this interpretation, language serves as a tool for symbolic power to normalise social structures under the guise of common sense (Bourdieu 66).

This realisation marked a significant break from the prevailing twentieth-century linguistic paradigms. Noam Chomsky's theory of universal grammar placed linguistic competency within innate cognitive structures, while Ferdinand de Saussure's structuralism stressed language as an independent system of signals controlled by internal relations. Despite the fact that these methods transformed linguistic research, Bourdieu contended that they overlooked the social processes that give linguistic practices legitimacy. The fact that identical statements have varied effects depending on the speaker's institutional position, educational background, class location, or symbolic prestige cannot be explained by competence alone. Only because societies create unfair conditions where certain speakers are accepted as genuine while others are marginalised or silenced does language work effectively (Bourdieu 43). This argument's importance in the modern day has increased rather than decreased. Communication in the twenty-first century is increasingly taking place on digital infrastructures owned by global technology companies, whose algorithms control visibility, engagement, and legitimacy. Through recommendation

systems, moderation standards, popularity measurements, and algorithmic amplification, platforms like X, Facebook, Instagram, YouTube, TikTok, and LinkedIn actively alter the symbolic worth of discourse rather than just facilitating communication. Once controlled by traditional media, governmental bureaucracy, and educational institutions, authority is now entwined with digital architectures that decide whose voices are heard worldwide and whose are not. As a result, symbolic power increasingly works through computational systems that reproduce existing inequities while making decisions that seem objective.

This change is made more difficult by the development of artificial intelligence. Language has become a computational resource thanks to large language models, generative AI, automated translation systems, and predictive writing tools. These days, data extraction, machine learning, and algorithmic prediction are used to continuously analyse, commodify, and monetise human communication. In this context, linguistic capital encompasses digital visibility, algorithmic ranking, online reputation, and platform participation in addition to academic credentials and institutional recognition. According to Shoshana Zuboff, surveillance capitalism creates new kinds of social control while converting human experience into behavioural data that produce commercial value (Zuboff 94). Digital capitalism uses language as both a medium and a commodity to gain power. These advancements imply that Bourdieu's theory has gained fresh analytical importance. Despite their democratic rhetoric, his ideas of habitus, symbolic capital, language markets, and symbolic violence offer a potent lexicon for analysing how digital infrastructures perpetuate inequality. Digital literacy, algorithmic visibility, cultural legitimacy, and unequal access to technology resources are all necessary for involvement in social media platforms, which often portray themselves as places of uninhibited expression. Digital platforms transform symbolic recognition into quantifiable forms of political and economic wealth by rewarding some communicative styles while marginalising others, much like old linguistic marketplaces.

These continuities have been recognised more and more in recent studies. Discourse both reflects and creates social relations of dominance, as demonstrated by Norman Fairclough's work on critical discourse analysis (Fairclough 18). In a similar vein, Teun A. van Dijk contends that language is essential to the upkeep of social inequality since discourse structures replicate ideological formations through regular communication (van Dijk 27). Michel Foucault demonstrates how discourse controls the creation of knowledge through institutional regimes of truth, whereas Judith Butler expands on this idea by stressing that language performs social reality rather than just expressing it (Butler 25; Foucault 52). When taken as a whole, these viewpoints support Bourdieu's main claim that language is constantly involved in larger power structures rather than being politically neutral. Simultaneously, new digital capitalism theories have broadened the scope of symbolic dominance.

According to Nick Couldry and Ulises A. Mejias, modern capitalism is becoming more and more reliant on the extraction and colonisation of human data, leading to new imbalances between digital businesses and communicative subjects (Couldry and Mejias 73). According to Wendy Brown, neoliberal rationality uses economic logic to change citizenship by turning democratic engagement into market rivalry (Brown 41). Language becomes more intertwined with engagement, visibility, and computational optimisation measures during these changes, indicating that symbolic power now functions concurrently through discourse and digital infrastructures.

This essay contends that although Bourdieu's theory of symbolic power is still one of the most useful frameworks for comprehending linguistic inequality in the modern era, it needs to be revised in light of artificial intelligence and digital capitalism. The basic mechanisms that Bourdieu outlined continue to shape communicative practices, even though the institutional structures through which symbolic domination occurs have changed. Instead of democratising language, digital platforms have shifted its control from established institutions to algorithmic systems that use computing rather than bureaucracy. As a result, symbolic power is still incredibly unequal but has gotten more dispersed. The article first looks at Bourdieu's theoretical framework about language, habitus, and symbolic domination in order to develop this thesis. After examining his criticism of structural linguistics, the ideas of linguistic capital, acceptable language, and symbolic violence are examined. The conversation then looks at how platform governance, artificial intelligence, and monitoring are used by digital capitalism to change language markets. The article concludes by assessing Bourdieu's theory's ongoing relevance for comprehending current conflicts over speech, legitimacy, and democratic communication in a society that is becoming more and more algorithmic.

Bourdieu's Theory of Language, Habitus, and Symbolic Power

By moving language from the autonomous domain of grammar to the contested arena of social power, Pierre Bourdieu's contribution to the sociology of language profoundly changed our understanding of linguistic activities. Bourdieu maintained that every linguistic act is enmeshed inside historically constructed relations of domination, in contrast to classical linguistics, which primarily saw language as a neutral system controlled by internal norms or universal cognitive structures. As a result, language cannot be comprehended apart from the social contexts in which it is created, shared, and assessed. Every word negotiates power and conveys meaning at the same time. As a result, language exchanges serve as symbolic transactions whose value is based on the unequal distribution of social, cultural, and symbolic capital rather than just acts of communication (Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power* 66). Bourdieu's larger theoretical framework of habitus, field, and capital gives rise to his sociology of language. Together, these ideas explain how people internalise social institutions while also perpetuating institutional injustices. Bourdieu views social practice as the interplay between embodied

dispositions and historically constructed social settings, in contrast to deterministic theories that depict people as passive objects of structural forces. Within this framework, language has a special place since speaking both reproduces communal hierarchies and expresses individual agency.

Bourdieu's sociological theory is based on the idea of habitus. The term "habitus" describes the enduring tendencies that people use to view, assess, and react to the social environment. These tendencies develop through extended engagement in certain social contexts rather than being biologically innate or deliberately selected. An individual's linguistic habits, accent, vocabulary, communicative confidence, and rhetorical choices are shaped by a variety of factors, including family upbringing, educational institutions, professional experiences, class status, and cultural contexts. As a result, language becomes a social legacy that is embodied in everyday speech (Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice* 72). Crucially, habitus does not dictate that every member of the same social class should behave in the same way. Rather, it creates what Bourdieu refers to as a "feel for the game," which allows people to negotiate certain social circumstances in accordance with dispositions that have been developed through experience. Therefore, linguistic competence encompasses not just grammatical correctness but also an intuitive knowledge of when, how, and before whom certain types of communication are legitimate. People with affluent educational backgrounds frequently exhibit verbal assurance that seems natural but is actually the result of cumulative cultural advantages. On the other hand, because their speech deviates from socially acceptable norms, speakers from marginalised communities sometimes suffer from linguistic insecurity. These disparities show that language is always deeply social rather than just expressive.

According to Bourdieu, habitus functions within comparatively independent spheres of social contact that are regulated by certain norms, hierarchies, and competitive structures. Different forms of capital determine legitimacy in a variety of domains, including academic disciplines, media organisations, political systems, religious organisations, legal courts, and educational institutions. Each discipline sets standards for identifying speech that is authoritative while also rejecting speech that is considered improper or unlawful. As a result, depending on the institutional setting in which they take place, similar verbal accomplishments may be evaluated very differently. For example, legal speech draws its authority from the institutional legitimacy of the judicial realm as well as from linguistic accuracy. Because academic institutions jointly approve specific verification techniques and standards of proof, scientific language gains legitimacy. Instead of relying solely on linguistic sophistication, political speech develops impact through election institutions and media prominence. These illustrations show that language and the institutional frameworks that support its efficacy are inextricably linked. Because speech acts are

anchored in fields that acknowledge particular speakers as legitimate representatives of authority, they become socially important.

Another key idea in Bourdieu's sociology is the many forms of capital that mediate the relationship between habitus and field. Bourdieu broadens the definition of capital to encompass cultural, social, and symbolic aspects, notwithstanding classical economics' primary recognition of financial resources. Material riches are referred to as economic capital, whereas educational credentials, linguistic proficiency, intellectual knowledge, and artistic tendencies are all considered cultural capital. Networks, connections, and institutional ties that make opportunities easier to obtain make up social capital. However, because it symbolises the socially accepted legitimacy associated with these other types of money, symbolic capital holds a unique position. Symbolic capital expressions that allow people to exert influence without resorting to overt coercion include prestige, honour, credibility, reputation, and authority (Bourdieu, *The Forms of Capital* 252).

Language serves as both symbolic and cultural capital at the same time. Gaining proficiency in prestigious language forms opens doors to political engagement, professional work, and further education. However, language proficiency by itself does not imply authority. Despite having the same content, statements made by university professors, cabinet ministers, corporate executives, and manual labourers are often evaluated differently. This disparity results from the fact that symbolic capital gives speakers legitimacy instead of just words. According to Bourdieu's well-known observations, language's efficacy is more dependent on the social authority of its speakers than on its intrinsic qualities (*Language and Symbolic Power* 109). This realisation calls into question liberal presumptions about the right to free speech. Democratic societies frequently assume that everyone has an equal chance to engage in public discourse. Bourdieu shows how significant disparities in the allocation of symbolic resources are hidden behind this seeming equality. Although people have the legal right to speak, their ability to be heard, believed, or acknowledged varies greatly depending on where they are in the social hierarchy. Therefore, symbolic power functions by converting historically contingent disparities into seemingly inherent variations in skill, intelligence, or eloquence.

According to Bourdieu, symbolic power is the ability to impose meanings while hiding the power dynamics that make it possible (166). Symbolic power operates through recognition rather than force, in contrast to physical coercion. Because dominated groups usually accept dominant classifications as valid, it is successful. Instead of being directly coerced, institutional authority, professional titles, academic expertise, standardised languages, and educational qualifications all gain validity through widespread societal acknowledgement. People obey because

dominating classifications seem self-evidently normal rather than because they are physically forced to.

Michel Foucault's view of power as generative rather than merely oppressive aligns with Bourdieu's approach. According to Foucault, disciplinary procedures that govern identity, behaviour, and knowledge are how contemporary institutions create subjects (Foucault 170). In a similar vein, Bourdieu highlights how symbolic power creates the categories that make reality understandable, so influencing perception itself. However, there are still significant distinctions between the two theorists. Bourdieu emphasises the unequal distribution of capital that allows certain actors to monopolise legitimate discourse, whereas Foucault focuses on institutional regimes of knowledge. As a result, his study continues to place a greater focus on social stratification, education, and class.

Language plays a key role in this process due to the structure and social perception of linguistic classification. Rarely do terms like "educated," "professional," "civilised," "standard," or "proper" serve as impartial descriptions; instead, they carry assessments of legitimacy and worth. While speakers who deviate from institutional norms sometimes face marginalisation, those who adhere to formally recognised linguistic standards gain symbolic value. Linguistic nationalism, accent discrimination, dialect prejudice, and educational elitism are examples of how symbolic power functions through seemingly objective language standards. The persistence of symbolic dominance is further explained by the idea of misrecognition. Misrecognition refers to the social process by which arbitrary dominance relations are accepted as normal, inevitable, or natural rather than just plain ignorance. People often neglect the structural advantages that support language achievement in favour of attributing it to human talent. By rewarding language associated with dominant social groups and portraying these standards as universal indicators of excellence, educational institutions perpetuate this notion. As a result, historical privilege-based disparities are perceived as personal accomplishments (Bourdieu and Passeron 154). According to Bourdieu's thesis, the educational system plays a particularly important role since schools serve as establishments that transform cultural privilege into credentials that are recognised by the government. Pupils from wealthy homes frequently arrive at school already acquainted with the linguistic norms that educational establishments appreciate. Their acquaintance with academic discourse, vocabulary, pronunciation, and communicative confidence all closely match institutional requirements. However, students from marginalised backgrounds sometimes find themselves in classrooms where their regular language use is subtly discounted. As a result, success depends not just on intelligence but also on having the linguistic capital that the educational community has already acknowledged.

This process is referred to as "cultural reproduction" by Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron, who contend that educational establishments justify current class disparities by portraying socially acquired skills as measures of personal achievement (*Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* 71). One of the main ways that this reproduction takes place is through language. Exams, interviews, participation in class, and academic writing all work together to reward dominant linguistic norms while hiding the unfair circumstances that lead to the acquisition of these competencies. Therefore, rather than through overt prejudice, symbolic violence acts through educational evaluation. These insights remain relevant today, as evidenced by recent occurrences. For example, language hierarchy in scientific publishing, international business, and higher education have been exacerbated by the globalisation of English. Despite having significant intellectual expertise, scholars from non-English speaking regions can face institutional obstacles. Academic rankings, citation networks, publication standards, and peer-review procedures all favour specific language forms connected to powerful organisations in the Global North. As a result, linguistic capital increasingly interacts with geopolitical disparities, turning language into a mechanism that maintains the unequal distribution of global knowledge creation.

Furthermore, rather than eradicating existing hierarchies, digital communication has increased them. Communicative approaches that optimise visibility, interaction, and algorithmic amplification are rewarded by online platforms. New types of linguistic capital include audience control, computational visibility, digital literacy, and platform familiarity. People who can successfully navigate these circumstances gain symbolic influence outside of regular institutional settings. Therefore, even though technology advancements seem to democratise communication, Bourdieu's ideas are nevertheless essential to comprehending how modern cultures perpetuate inequality through language. Rather from making Bourdieu obsolete, the digital age validates his main thesis, which is that language derives its power from the uneven social conditions under which speech is permitted, distributed, and acknowledged rather than from linguistic patterns alone. The struggle for acceptable language continues to be one of the defining features of contemporary society, even though the forms of domination may change from classrooms and state bureaucracies to algorithms and internet platforms.

Criticising Structural Linguistics: Bourdieu's Argument Against Chomsky and Saussure

One of the most important criticisms of twentieth-century linguistics is contained in Pierre Bourdieu's theory of language, which questions the fundamental premise that language can be studied apart from the social contexts in which it is created and understood. Bourdieu argues that structuralism and generative linguistics ignore the political economy of speech, despite the fact that these paradigms transformed linguistic research by highlighting systematic laws regulating language.

Their explanations clarify how language works as a system of signs or cognitive ability, but they are unable to explain why certain speakers are socially inaudible while others have power. As a result, Bourdieu shifts linguistic analysis from abstract systems to the uneven social connections that establish the legitimacy of communication.

The influence of Ferdinand de Saussure, whose structural linguistics revolutionised contemporary language studies, is inextricably linked to the intellectual framework of Bourdieu's contribution. According to Saussure, language should be viewed as a structured system of signals whose meaning develops by relational distinctions as opposed to direct correspondence with the outside world. By emphasising the systematic order of language over its everyday application, his distinction between *langue* (the abstract linguistic system) and *parole* (particular speaking acts) laid the methodological groundwork for structural linguistics. According to Saussure's conception, language is a relatively autonomous structure that is controlled by internal norms as opposed to external factors like politics or the economy (Saussure 65). Because it moved linguistic research away from historical philology and toward the scientific study of language as an ordered system, this conceptual breakthrough had a huge impact. Later, structuralism influenced anthropology through Claude Lévi-Strauss, psychoanalysis through Jacques Lacan, literary criticism through Roland Barthes, and semiotics in several fields. However, Bourdieu contends that this focus on linguistic structure creates an abstraction that hides the social injustices present in real-world communication practices. Structuralism unintentionally treats all speakers as possessing equal positions within the communicative order by isolating language from the circumstances of its usage.

Instead of rejecting Saussure's linguistic discoveries, Bourdieu's critique highlights their sociological shortcomings. Although structural linguistics effectively explains how relational systems give rise to linguistic meaning, it says very nothing about the unequal allocation of authority among speakers. The distinction between *langue* and *parole* hides the reality that grammatical correctness is never the only criterion used to judge speech activities. Rather, institutional assumptions about class, education, race, gender, nationality, and professional standing are used to interpret every statement. As a result, it is impossible to separate linguistic meaning from the social identities of its producers.

In postcolonial and multilingual countries, where several languages coexist within hierarchical political frameworks, this criticism is particularly apparent. Colonial governments often marginalised indigenous linguistic traditions while elevating European languages to positions of official power. Similar to this, state institutions that favoured some dialects over others gave rise to standardised national languages. These procedures show that linguistic legitimacy arises from past conflicts

over political authority rather than from inherent grammatical supremacy. Bourdieu argues that because structural linguistics' analytical framework ignores the social construction of linguistic authority, it is unable to sufficiently describe these dynamics.

A similar criticism of Noam Chomsky's generative grammar theory is extended by Bourdieu. Chomsky's differentiation between performance and competence refocused linguistic research on the natural cognitive abilities that allow people to learn language. According to Chomsky, universal grammar is a biologically based system that all people share, regardless of cultural differences (Chomsky 3). By highlighting creativity, cognition, and the universal structures that underlie linguistic variation, this viewpoint transformed linguistics. But according to Bourdieu, Chomsky's notion of competence separates language from the social contexts that shape its usefulness. Although linguistic competence may be a universal human trait, social recognition rather than just cognitive ability is what determines communicative efficacy. Because their speech is valued differently by institutions, people with similar grammatical proficiency often have quite varied communicative results. Therefore, Bourdieu makes a distinction between symbolic and linguistic ability, arguing that the latter is socially constructed through power dynamics rather than being inherited physiologically.

Take the courtroom as an example. Even if several participants are equally proficient in grammar, only the judge's statement has legal force behind it. Judicial language is effective because of institutional legitimacy rather than grammatical structure. A president's executive order, a doctor's diagnosis, or a lecture by a university professor all get performative power because society as a whole acknowledges their authority. The same words would not have the same impact if they were said by somebody without institutional credibility. Therefore, societal approval rather than linguistic structure itself is the source of language's power. This realisation sets Bourdieu's sociology apart from generative linguistics and structuralism. Bourdieu examines language as social activity, while Chomsky examines language as cognition and Saussure examines language as a system. Because speech takes place in historically constructed fields with uneven distributions of symbolic capital, it acquires significance. As a result, every language exchange reflects what Bourdieu refers to as a symbolic economy, wherein utterances gain value via relationships of legitimacy, authority, and recognition (*Language and Symbolic Power* 77).

Bourdieu's idea of the linguistic market is essential to this symbolic economy. Bourdieu contends that cultures create marketplaces where language performances are assessed in accordance with prevailing criteria of legitimacy, using the metaphor of economic trade. In language markets, utterances gain symbolic value, much as

commodities acquire exchange value in economic markets. However, language markets function through institutional norms, cultural expectations, and symbolic hierarchies rather than only financial transactions, in contrast to traditional economic markets. As a result, the context affects the value of linguistic capital. In local communities, a regional dialect may be highly esteemed, yet in national bureaucracies, it may have minimal power. Although academic language has a lot of validity in academic settings, it might come out as arrogant or unapproachable in casual conversation. Similarly, rather than adhering to conventional norms of rhetorical elegance, digital communication increasingly values conciseness, emotional intensity, visual symbolism, and algorithmic engagement. The norms governing each specific field continue to determine linguistic value.

This process is further explained by the concept of "legitimate language." According to Bourdieu, every society creates an officially accepted linguistic standard connected to government, education, the law, and cultural authority. Seldom is this acceptable language impartial. Rather, it represents the historical hegemony of specific social groups whose language customs are codified as universal norms. While those whose speech deviates from institutional standards frequently face exclusion or devaluation, speakers who are naturally adept at these forms get symbolic advantages. Crucially, "legitimate language" is prescriptive rather than just descriptive. Standardised vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation are taught at educational institutions, yet alternative linguistic forms are subtly discouraged. National exams convert linguistic conformance into academic achievement by evaluating pupils in accordance with officially approved norms. The economic relevance of prevailing linguistic norms is further reinforced by employers' associations of standardised speech with professionalism and competence. Language is used to perpetuate class differences under the pretence of objective merit through these techniques.

This procedure exemplifies what Bourdieu refers to as "symbolic violence," which is the covert imposition of dominant cultural standards that causes marginalised people to internalise their own marginalisation. Symbolic violence functions by consent as opposed to coercion, in contrast to physical violence. Because dominating organisations define legitimacy according to standards they have created, people sometimes start to view their own language practices as inferior. As a result, speakers may suppress indigenous languages, give up on regional dialects, or mimic prestigious accents in an effort to advance in society.

The phenomena is still quite noticeable in today's international communication. An example of how a lawful language functions globally is the predominance of English in higher education, international business, diplomacy, and scientific publishing. English certainly makes it easier to communicate

internationally, but its institutional dominance also benefits academics, professions, and businesses that are already part of Anglophone knowledge institutions. Before their intellectual contributions are given equal credit, researchers from Latin America, Africa, Asia, and the Middle East frequently devote significant efforts to linguistic adaptation. Thus, in the creation of global knowledge, linguistic disparity interacts with geopolitical imbalances.

Bourdieu's thesis has been strengthened by recent critical sociolinguistics research that shows how language policies often perpetuate social inequality under the pretence of neutrality. According to Monica Heller, language has evolved into an economic resource under neoliberal capitalism, marginalising linguistic communities with no commercial value while simultaneously turning multilingualism into a type of marketable capital (Heller 109). Similarly, Jan Blommaert argues that linguistic hierarchies that circulate communicative resources unevenly across transnational networks have become more complex as a result of globalisation (Blommaert 7). Rather than diminishing Bourdieu's initial ideas, these advancements expand upon them. These dynamics are made more intense by the rise of digital communication. Instead of just serving as educational institutions, online platforms are increasingly acting as global linguistic markets controlled by algorithmic systems. Language proficiency is only one factor that affects visibility; other others include audience engagement, platform optimisation, digital literacy, and computational ranking. Together, search engines, generative AI, automated moderation systems, and recommendation algorithms create new standards for communicative legitimacy. As a result, symbolic power is now found in digital infrastructures that control modern discourse as well as in educational institutions and government agencies.

Thus, in the twenty-first century, Bourdieu's criticism of structural linguistics has fresh relevance. His emphasis that language analysis must take into account its social, institutional, and political contexts offer a compelling paradigm for comprehending why communicative disparity has not been eradicated by technical advancement. Rather, the processes by which symbolic power functions have been altered by digital capitalism, shifting authority from established institutions to algorithmic systems whose functions are frequently obscure. Even while the linguistic market has grown more computational, its underlying logic still favours individuals who already have symbolic capital. This theoretical shift paves the way for a more thorough analysis of Bourdieu's ideas of "performative authority," "symbolic violence," and "linguistic capital," which are still crucial for comprehending how language functions in the modern digital economy. These ideas show how power adjusts to new communication contexts while maintaining established systems of dominance, far from being replaced by technology advancements.

Symbolic violence, legitimate language, linguistic capital, and performative authority

According to Bourdieu, institutional recognition rather than inherent linguistic superiority is the source of legitimate language's efficacy. Prestigious accents are not inherently more expressive than local dialects, and standard grammar is not intrinsically more logical than regional dialects. The symbolic power of the institutions that give them permission determines their authority. Schools, colleges, courts, media outlets, and governmental bodies all work together to determine which linguistic forms are acceptable. Despite their historical contingency, these standards seem objective and self-evident until they are institutionalised. This realisation has significant ramifications for postcolonial settings and multilingual societies. Indigenous languages were often relegated to informal or domestic spheres while European languages were imposed as official media of governance, education, and commerce by colonial authorities. Linguistic hierarchies frequently endure even though political decolonisation has changed these relationships in many areas. The international languages of diplomacy, higher education, international business, and scientific publication are still English, French, Portuguese, and Spanish. Significant symbolic and economic benefits result from having access to these languages.

One particularly instructive example is the dominance of English in modern academia. English-language scholarship is given preference by the majority of internationally renowned journals, citation databases, research funding organisations, and university rating systems. Before their study is given the same respect, researchers whose first language is not English frequently invest a significant amount of intellectual effort in linguistic adaptation. This asymmetry demonstrates how unequal language capital distributions continue to shape the production of knowledge globally. Scholarly visibility is rarely determined just by intellectual brilliance; mastery of internationally dominant linguistic standards is increasingly necessary for communicative legitimacy. At the same time, what Bourdieu refers to as "symbolic violence" results from the institutionalisation of acceptable language. Symbolic violence functions through internalisation, recognition, and permission as opposed to physical compulsion. Because dominating classifications are presented by institutional authority as natural rather than historical, dominated communities often accept them. Despite the linguistic complexity of their native variety, speakers whose language deviates from officially recognised standards may eventually view their own communication patterns as inferior, ignorant, or socially unsuitable (Bourdieu 170).

Subtle yet ubiquitous, symbolic violence takes many forms. Linguistic inequalities become normalised in everyday interactions, as seen by accent discrimination during job interviews, preconceptions about ability based on pronunciation, mockery of regional dialects, and the devaluation of minority

languages. In order to escape social stigma, people frequently alter their speech patterns and repress their linguistic identities in an effort to advance in their education or careers. Even though this kind of adaptation seems free, it actually reflects structural forces brought forth by unequal symbolic power distributions.

These processes have been repeatedly validated by critical sociolinguistic research. According to Rosina Lippi-Green, accent discrimination is still one of the most socially acceptable types of bias since dominating societies still view linguistic variety as a sign of weakness and link standardised speech with intelligence, competence, and honesty (Lippi-Green 69). In a similar vein, Deborah Cameron shows how public discussions about "correct language" can mask larger ideological conflicts over gender, class, and cultural authority (Cameron 52). These findings support Bourdieu's contention that linguistic evaluation frequently takes into account speakers' social identities rather than just language.

Another significant aspect of symbolic violence is gender. Women's language practices are often assessed in accordance with conflicting expectations that demand simultaneous confidence and modesty, power and submission, as feminist researchers have demonstrated. According to Judith Butler's theory of performativity, language actively creates gender identities through repeated social performances rather than just describing them (Butler 34). Both theorists acknowledge that language serves as a vehicle through which social norms gain legitimacy, even though Butler stresses the fragility of these performances more than Bourdieu. Therefore, gendered subjectivities as well as class identities are governed by dominant linguistic expectations.

By contesting solely linguistic explanations of performative speech, Bourdieu's notion of "performative authority" enriches this study. Famously, J. L. Austin contended that some words do more than just describe reality. "I promise," "I apologise," and "I pronounce you married" are examples of statements that use language to accomplish social activities (Austin 5). Although Bourdieu acknowledges Austin's finding, he contends that institutional legitimacy, not language form, is the primary determinant of performative force. Only when spoken by socially acceptable people in accepted institutional settings can words have transforming force. Because judicial institutions as a whole acknowledge the court's authority, a judge can find a person guilty. Because academic qualification is seen as genuine by society, universities provide degrees. Because executive discourse is permitted by constitutional structures, a government may declare a national emergency. These statements are successful because symbolic capital gives institutional stances legitimacy rather than because of their grammatical structure. Thus, larger power dynamics are the source of language's performative efficacy.

This argument foreshadows current discussions about false information, knowledge, and public confidence. For instance, formal declarations from reputable medical organisations typically carry more weight during public health emergencies than similar assertions made through unauthorised sources. However, conventional institutional legitimacy mechanisms are becoming more and more unstable due to digital communication. Through follower networks, algorithmic amplification, and viral awareness, social media platforms enable people with minimal formal competence to amass substantial symbolic influence. As a result, in today's communicative contexts, performative authority is being contested more and more. The growth of digital communication has increased symbolic competitiveness and democratised participation at the same time. In algorithmically organised contexts, where institutional credentials are rapidly being replaced by engagement measures, individuals now vie for exposure. Recommendation systems, likes, reposts, comments, and followers are new types of symbolic capital that can produce cultural status, political influence, and commercial opportunity. Thus, rather than taking the place of traditional institutional authority, digital recognition enhances it. However, rather than doing away with Bourdieu's framework, these advancements show how versatile it is. New language markets regulated by computational systems that continuously assess communicative performances based on engagement, relevance, and commercial worth have been made possible by digital platforms. Language is still a tool whose usefulness depends on its acceptance in certain domains. The alteration of those fields themselves is the main distinction. Twenty-first-century symbolic power increasingly flows through algorithmically controlled digital infrastructures, whereas twentieth-century symbolic power predominantly operated through schools, universities, newspapers, and state organisations.

Digital media theorists of late have started to overtly use Bourdieusian terminology to conceptualise these changes. According to José van Dijck, platform ecosystems create new visibility architectures that marginalise less lucrative kinds of public discourse while favouring commercially useful communication (van Dijck 43). In a similar vein, Nick Couldry and Ulises A. Mejias argue that by turning language contact into commodified data, digital infrastructures derive value from daily communication (Couldry and Mejias 115). According to these assessments, language capital has grown more computational. Algorithmic computation and institutional authority now act as simultaneous mediators of visibility, credibility, and influence. As a result, symbolic violence also takes on new digital manifestations. Automated moderation disproportionately impacts marginalised communities, recommendation systems favour dominant languages, and algorithmic bias often perpetuates historical injustices under the guise of technological neutrality. In order to maximise visibility and avoid algorithmic penalties, users adjust their communication habits to conform to platform logics. The mechanisms of symbolic

violence that Bourdieu first discovered in educational institutions are reflected in the internalisation of these computational rules.

Digital communication has increased language's strategic value rather than lessening its political significance. Linguistic performances that circulate across interconnected networks of institutional authority, computational evaluation, and commercial commodification are becoming more and more important to modern society. Therefore, Bourdieu's theories of performative authority, legitimate language, symbolic violence, and linguistic capital continue to be essential analytical tools for comprehending how inequality endures in quickly changing communicative contexts.

Digital Capitalism, AI, and the Prospects of Linguistic Domination: From Symbolic Power to Algorithmic Authority

During a time when institutions like schools, colleges, courts, media, publishing firms, and governmental bureaucracy held the majority of language authority, Pierre Bourdieu established his theory of symbolic power. These organisations served as gatekeepers, deciding which languages were acceptable and what views might gain symbolic power. Even if communication's institutional environment has changed significantly since the late 20th century, Bourdieu's fundamental mechanisms are nonetheless extremely durable. Through algorithmic systems, platform infrastructures, artificial intelligence, and data-driven economies, the modern digital world has shifted and reconfigured symbolic dominance rather than destroyed it. Symbolic power in the twenty-first century increasingly functions through computational systems that control communicative legitimacy, visibility, and credibility.

One of the biggest changes in the political economy of language is the rise of "digital capitalism." Digital capitalism commodifies information, communication, and human connection, in contrast to industrial capitalism, which mainly derived profit from physical work. Data that can be analysed, predicted, monetised, and sold is produced by every online search, social media post, comment, message, and language exchange. Language is become a useful economic resource in and of itself. Consequently, communicative behaviours are now at the core of capitalism accumulation rather than its periphery.

Shoshana Zuboff uses the concept of "surveillance capitalism" to conceptualise this change, contending that digital companies translate human experience into behavioural data that can be utilised to forecast and impact future actions (Zuboff 94). Language is no longer just expressive under surveillance capitalism; it is also used as a raw material for algorithmic analysis. Each digital voice adds to large databases that are used to train artificial intelligence models, advertising algorithms, and recommendation systems. As a result, human contact gains previously unheard-of economic value while also subjecting people to novel types of behavioural control and surveillance.

According to Bourdieu, surveillance capitalism extends the idea of "linguistic capital" into an economy mediated by algorithms. Symbolic value in conventional language markets was mostly determined by institutional recognition granted by professional associations, governmental bodies, or educational institutions. However, algorithmic visibility is becoming a more important source of symbolic value in digital networks. Together, followers, engagement rates, search results, verification badges, recommendation engines, and platform analytics serve as new types of symbolic capital. Regardless of its intellectual or political importance, these indicators decide whose language is widely used and whose speech is marginal. As a result, the "linguistic market" that Bourdieu envisioned has changed into what could be called an "algorithmic linguistic market." Modern digital platforms assign these judgements to computer systems, whose workings are frequently opaque, in contrast to traditional organisations where human authority assessed linguistic authenticity. Content is ranked by algorithms based on interaction data, business goals, personalisation tactics, and predictive analytics. By controlling visibility, recommendation, and discoverability, these systems actively influence the flow of debate even though they portray themselves as technologically neutral.

According to Nick Couldry and Ulises A. Mejias, this change represents a new phase of capitalist growth that they refer to as "data colonialism." Through ongoing data extraction, modern digital capitalism appropriates human existence in the same way that historical colonialism plundered land, labour, and natural resources (Couldry and Mejias 112). Because communication produces the behavioural data required for algorithmic prediction, language plays a crucial role in this process. As a result, everyday speech becomes both a means of communication and a source of financial gain. In these digital spaces, Bourdieu's notion of "symbolic violence" takes on new meaning. In order to normalise unequal linguistic hierarchies, traditional symbolic violence depended on bureaucratic power, cultural norms, and educational institutions. Through algorithmic optimisation, digital symbolic violence functions more covertly. Dominant languages, economically successful content, emotionally compelling discourse, and communicative styles that maximise user retention are all given preference by recommendation algorithms. Meanwhile, because they provide lower levels of algorithmic interaction, minority languages, regional dialects, and politically marginalised viewpoints often receive less prominence.

These dynamics show that algorithmic systems frequently perpetuate and magnify societal injustices rather than just reflecting them. Search engines perpetuate racialised and gendered preconceptions while portraying computational results as objective information, according to Safiya Umoja Noble's seminal work on algorithmic bias (Noble 3). Similarly, Ruha Benjamin contends that seemingly neutral technical infrastructures often include historical disparities encoded via automated decision-making processes (Benjamin 41). By showing that symbolic domination

increasingly functions through software rather than just through governmental or educational institutions, their findings support Bourdieu's sociology. Large Language Models (LLMs), which include systems like ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, and other generative AI technologies, radically change the production, circulation, and authority of language. In contrast to earlier communication technologies that mainly transmitted human speech, generative AI actively produces linguistic content, making language both the object and the instrument of computational intelligence. This is another change brought about by artificial intelligence that expands Bourdieu's framework beyond its original historical context.

Significant sociological problems about authorship, expertise, and symbolic authority are brought up by this development. According to Bourdieu, acknowledging the speaker's social legitimacy is essential for language efficiency. This relationship is complicated by generative AI since more and more language is produced without identifiable human authors. The link between language and institutional authority is drastically altered when AI-generated texts are used in media, education, marketing, administration, and scientific research. Artificial intelligence is designed, trained, and governed by corporate infrastructures, computational systems, and human expertise. AI redistributes symbolic power instead than eradicating it. Because they control training data, moderation procedures, linguistic outputs, and computational resources, the companies that create foundational language models have unparalleled control over international communication. Every day, their choices influence billions of language exchanges, thereby establishing tech firms as key institutions of symbolic authority alongside governments and academic institutions. Legitimate language production is becoming more and more dependent on proprietary algorithms whose workings are still hidden from the public.

According to Byung-Chul Han, systems of self-optimization, transparency, and continual performance are gradually replacing disciplinary institutions in modern digital societies (Han 18). By creating material that is optimised for visibility, engagement, and audience retention, people deliberately modify their communication methods to meet algorithmic expectations. Speakers' internalisation of computational standards is demonstrated by hashtags, search engine optimisation, popular terms, and platform-specific rhetorical patterns. People alter their own behaviour because prevailing standards seem natural, desirable, and economically necessary. This phenomenon is quite similar to Bourdieu's notion of symbolic violence. The term "algorithmic habitus" has emerged, expanding Bourdieu's theoretical lexicon. The term "habitus" initially described socially acquired attitudes that direct behaviour and perception in specific domains. Algorithmic recognition-oriented dispositions are becoming more prevalent in today's digital contexts. Users naturally pick up on the best times to publish, the vocabulary that draws attention, the best ways to organise digital storylines, and the communication styles that maximise visibility. These

behaviours eventually develop into embodied dispositions that are formed by ongoing engagement with computing systems rather than by family or educational institutions. Digital technologies actively modify communicative subjectivities rather than only mediating communication, as demonstrated by algorithmic habitus. Just as employers anticipate professional review or students anticipate educational assessment, people start anticipating algorithmic evaluation before producing words. By anticipating algorithmic judgement, the platform turns into an unseen interlocutor that influences language development. Consequently, even though digital involvement appears to be open, communicative freedom is nonetheless limited by symbolic power systems. The link between democracy and public discourse is likewise altered by these developments. According to liberal democratic ideology, intelligent discussion among equal citizens is facilitated by free communication. By showing how unequal distributions of symbolic capital hinder communicative involvement, Bourdieu challenged this presumption. Because algorithmic amplification favours emotional intensity, polarisation, and sensationalism over thoughtful discourse, digital capitalism exacerbates these issues. Instead of reflecting democratic principles, public discourse increasingly follows platform incentives.

According to Wendy Brown, neoliberal rationalism encourages people to view themselves as entrepreneurial actors rather than democratic citizens, turning political engagement into market rivalry (Brown 83). This shift is best illustrated by social media platforms, which promote communicative entrepreneurship through the acquisition of followers, personal branding, and monetised visibility. In competitive attention economies, language itself is used as entrepreneurial capital. Thus, commercial profitability blends with symbolic recognition, making it harder to distinguish between market performance and democratic participation.

This convergence is further demonstrated by the emergence of the "attention economy." Herbert Simon made the well-known observation that a lack of attention results from an abundance of information. By using increasingly complex recommendation systems to compete for user engagement, modern digital platforms institutionalise this idea. One of the most important types of symbolic capital in these settings is visibility. The ability to catch algorithmically measured attention is more important for communicative effectiveness than argumentative rigour. Therefore, Bourdieu's concept of symbolic capital needs to be expanded to incorporate "algorithmic capital," which is the accumulation of computational legitimacy, discoverability, visibility, and recommendation produced by digital infrastructures. Because algorithmic capital grants power through recognition, it operates similarly to symbolic capital. However, recognition today depends on computational evaluation carried out by opaque technology systems in addition to institutional prestige.

The production of knowledge and higher education will be significantly impacted by this change. When assessing academic success, universities are depending more and more on digital indicators like citation indices, download statistics, altimetric, and online exposure. Algorithmic circulation in digital databases and search engines becomes an aspect of academic influence. As a result, digital infrastructures that control academic exposure are increasingly interacting with symbolic capital in academia. Thus, Bourdieu's examination of academic disciplines is still very important for comprehending the current changes in the production of global knowledge. Digital communication does, however, also present chances for opposition. Social media platforms have been used by marginalised populations to oppose dominant narratives, mobilise international solidarity, preserve endangered languages, and challenge institutional monopolies over public discourse. Algorithmic settings continue to be contested domains rather than tools of unilateral dominance, as seen by movements like "#BlackLivesMatter, #MeToo," indigenous language revitalisation projects, and digital feminist activism. According to Bourdieu, symbolic spaces are constantly places of conflict where rival players try to reinterpret acceptable discourse. As a result, established hierarchies are both reproduced and undermined by digital platforms.

In the end, Bourdieu's theory is still essential since it shows that language is never only a means of communication but rather a component of social power. The means by which symbolic domination functions have changed as a result of the shift from institutional authority to algorithmic rule, but its underlying logic has remained intact. Symbolic power is at the heart of today's conflicts over artificial intelligence, platform governance, data extraction, digital surveillance, disinformation, and computational legitimacy. Language is still the main tool used to create, challenge, and reproduce authority. The main distinction is that symbolic power now increasingly resides in both the institutions that permit speech and the algorithms that decide whether or not speech may be heard at all.

Conclusion

Pierre Bourdieu's *Language and Symbolic Power* remain one of the most influential interventions in the sociology of language because it fundamentally reorients linguistic inquiry from the analysis of grammar toward the investigation of power. Bourdieu shows that every linguistic encounter is enmeshed within historically constructed patterns of domination, as opposed to viewing language as a neutral means of communication or an independent cognitive system. Speech gains legitimacy because specific speakers, accents, vocabularies, and discursive practices are accepted by institutions rather than just because it is grammatically correct. As a result, language and symbolic power are inextricably linked, and linguistic proficiency serves as a type of capital whose worth is determined by the unequal distribution of social recognition. In order to comprehend the political economy of communication in the twenty-first century, this essay has claimed that Bourdieu's

theoretical framework is still essential. The fundamental processes of symbolic domination continue to function through new technical infrastructures, notwithstanding the significant changes in the institutional landscape since the publication of *Language and Symbolic Power*. Communicative legitimacy is no longer solely within the jurisdiction of schools, colleges, courts, and governmental agencies. These days, search engines, artificial intelligence, digital platforms, and algorithmic recommendation systems actively influence whose discourse is seen, trusted, and influential. Instead of vanishing, symbolic authority has moved into the computational systems that control modern public discourse.

One of the key features of digital capitalism is the shift from institutional authority to algorithmic governance. Modern communication takes place in platform ecosystems that regularly assess language performance based on commercial priorities, engagement metrics, personalisation algorithms, and predictive analytics. Visibility has evolved into a limited symbolic resource that is dispersed via opaque computational mechanisms. In this setting, linguistic capital and computational capital are increasingly interacting to produce new types of inequality that go beyond conventional class structures while still perpetuating preexisting hierarchies. Together, recommendation systems, automatic moderation, platform verification, and search rankings create new ways to grant or deny legitimacy. These dynamics are further altered by artificial intelligence, which turns language into computational infrastructure. Large language models now create, organise, and increasingly mediate communication rather than just transmitting it. Conventional notions of authorship, competence, and institutional authority are being challenged by the partial automation of discourse production. However, these technologies do not go beyond power dynamics. They continue to be influenced by political laws, corporate ownership, proprietary databases, and commercial motivations. Therefore, AI should be viewed as a new sphere where symbolic power is accumulated, challenged, and exerted rather than as an independent technological force.

Additionally, the article has shown how Bourdieu's ideas of "habitus, field, linguistic capital, symbolic violence, legitimate language, and performative authority" still have a significant amount of explanatory power when combined with modern theories of data colonialism, platform governance, and surveillance capitalism. Bourdieu's sociology is extended rather than replaced by the writings of Shoshana Zuboff, Nick Couldry, Ulises A. Mejias, Wendy Brown, Byung-Chul Han, Judith Butler, Michel Foucault, Norman Fairclough, and Teun A. van Dijk. When taken as a whole, these viewpoints show that one of the main ways that modern capitalism structures social life is through communication. At the same time, language serves as a technological infrastructure, a political tool, an economic commodity, and a cultural resource. However, it is important to recognise that Bourdieu's theory is not wholly deterministic. Dominant classifications are constantly

contested in symbolic sectors, which continue to be arenas of contestation. Through digital media, marginalised people have been able to challenge institutional monopolies on public discourse, revitalise minority languages, build transnational solidarity, and reveal hitherto undetectable forms of symbolic violence. Symbolic power is never total, as these developments show. There are opportunities for resistance, change, and the reconfiguration of legitimacy in every field. However, these conflicts need acknowledging that communication is inextricably linked to larger systems of technological, political, and economic power.

In light of the new realities of algorithmic governance, future studies should keep extending Bourdieu's sociology. Theoretical frameworks that can integrate sociology, linguistics, media studies, political economy, and critical data studies are necessary to address issues related to artificial intelligence, computational authorship, digital multilingualism, automated content moderation, platform regulation, and synthetic language generation. Because it maintains that language cannot be isolated from the institutions, technologies, and power dynamics that give it meaning, Bourdieu's relational sociology offers an essential basis for such multidisciplinary research.

In the end, the fundamental idea of *Language and Symbolic Power* is still incredibly pertinent: language is never just spoken; it is authorised. Symbolic power controls not just who can talk but also whose speech is deemed significant, whether it is used by educational institutions, governmental bureaucracy, the media, or algorithmic platforms. This realisation becomes even more important in the era of digital capitalism and artificial intelligence. In addition to increasing avenues for expression, the future of democratic communication will require a critical analysis of the institutional and technological frameworks that control language production, dissemination, and validity.

Works Cited:

- Austin, J. L. *How to Do Things with Words*. 2nd ed., Harvard UP, 1975.
- Benjamin, Ruha. *Race After Technology: Abolitionist Tools for the New Jim Code*. Polity, 2019.
- Blommaert, Jan. *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge UP, 2010.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Translated by Richard Nice, Harvard UP, 1984.
- Language and Symbolic Power*. Edited by John B. Thompson, translated by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson, Harvard UP, 1991.
- Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge UP, 1977.
-

- "The Forms of Capital." *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, edited by John G. Richardson, Greenwood Press, 1986, pp. 241–58.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, and Jean-Claude Passeron. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. 2nd ed., Sage, 1990.
- Brown, Wendy. *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution*. Zone Books, 2015.
- Butler, Judith. *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. Routledge, 1997.
- Gender Trouble: *Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Routledge, 1990.
- Cameron, Deborah. *Verbal Hygiene*. Routledge, 2012.
- Chomsky, Noam. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. MIT Press, 1965.
- Couldry, Nick, and Ulises A. Mejias. *The Costs of Connection: How Data Is Colonizing Human Life and Appropriating It for Capitalism*. Stanford UP, 2019.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Language and Power*. 3rd ed., Routledge, 2015.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan, Vintage Books, 1977.
- The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Routledge, 2002.
- Han, Byung-Chul. *Psychopolitics: Neoliberalism and New Technologies of Power*. Verso, 2017.
- Heller, Monica. *Paths to Post-Nationalism: A Critical Ethnography of Language and Identity*. Oxford UP, 2011.
- Lippi-Green, Rosina. *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology and Discrimination in the United States*. 2nd ed., Routledge, 2012.
- Noble, Safiya Umoja. *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism*. NYU Press, 2018.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Course in General Linguistics*. Translated by Wade Baskin, McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- van Dijk, Teun A. *Discourse and Power*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- van Dijk, José. *The Culture of Connectivity: A Critical History of Social Media*. Oxford UP, 2013.
- Zuboff, Shoshana. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*. PublicAffairs, 2019.