ISSN 2616-7433 Vol. 8, Issue 2: 46-55, DOI: 10.25236/FSST.2026.080207

A Study on South Asian Media Language Strategies Based on Artificial Intelligence

Yang Qiaoyu

Mianyang Polytechnic, Mianyang, China
30130@mypt.edu.cn

Abstract: *This article asks how artificial intelligence can be used to study the language strategies of mainstream media in South Asia. The focus is methodological. AI is treated here not as a broad social backdrop, but as a practical tool that can assist discourse analysis. Drawing on work in agenda-setting, framing, critical discourse analysis, AI and media communication, and South Asian media studies, the article outlines a framework for examining mainstream media texts in India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and Nepal. Four dimensions are highlighted: lexical, narrative, emotional, and positional strategies. The article also points to simplification and labeling as a tendency that runs across them. AI is useful because it can help trace repetition, group similar textual patterns, and make recurring tendencies easier to observe across a wider body of texts.*

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence; Mainstream Media; Language Strategies; South Asia*

1. Introduction

Language has long been a central concern in media studies. News does not simply report facts in a transparent form. It selects, names, frames, and orders events, and these choices shape what becomes visible, what appears important, and how a given issue is understood [1]. This is particularly true of mainstream media. Their discourse usually carries institutional authority, and for that reason even small differences in wording or emphasis may influence public interpretation in ways that are not immediately obvious.

Research on media language strategies has produced a substantial body of work. Agenda-setting studies have shown how media shape public attention [2]. Framing research has further explained how interpretation is guided through selection and emphasis [1]. Critical discourse analysis, meanwhile, has drawn attention to the links between media language, power, and ideology [3]. These approaches remain valuable. They are sensitive to context and often strong in interpretation. Yet they also face practical limits. Mainstream media discourse is now produced in large volume and often marked by recurring lexical choices, familiar narrative structures, repeated emotional cues, and indirect signals of stance. When such patterns appear across broad sets of texts, close reading alone may not always be enough to trace them in a systematic way. This is where artificial intelligence becomes methodologically relevant.

In recent years, AI has received growing attention in journalism and communication research, especially in discussions of automation, newsroom change, and human-machine interaction [4]. Much less attention, however, has been given to a different question: how AI may function as an analytical tool in the study of media discourse itself. Used carefully, AI can support the identification of repeated lexical patterns, the grouping of similar narrative forms, the tracing of emotional tendencies, and the detection of recurring positional signals across larger bodies of texts [5]. It does not replace interpretation, nor does it remove the need for theoretical judgment. What it offers is analytical assistance.

This issue is worth examining in the South Asian context. The mainstream media systems of India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and Nepal differ in language, institutional history, and communicative tradition, yet they also share a broader regional relevance [6]. In these major South Asian national contexts, mainstream media continue to shape public attention and public meaning in significant ways. Their discourse therefore deserves closer study, especially when the concern is not only what they say, but how recurring strategies are formed and sustained.

Against this background, the present article treats AI not as a mere technological backdrop, but as a methodological entry point. It asks how AI can be introduced into the analysis of mainstream media language strategies in major South Asian countries and what such an approach may contribute to media

ISSN 2616-7433 Vol. 8, Issue 2: 46-55, DOI: 10.25236/FSST.2026.080207

and communication studies. To address this question, the article first reviews the relevant literature and clarifies its main concepts. It then discusses the major dimensions of mainstream media language strategies, explains the analytical functions and limits of AI, and finally considers the broader methodological and theoretical value of this approach.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Foundation

2.1. Studies on AI and Media Communication

Research on AI and media communication has expanded quickly over the past few years. Much of the early discussion focused on automation in journalism [7]. Scholars were concerned with newsroom routines, machine-assisted writing, and the changing relation between journalists and technical systems. In that stage, AI was usually treated as an object of inquiry. The main questions were practical: what kinds of media work could be automated, how professional roles might change, and whether machine systems would weaken or strengthen journalistic authority.

Later work became broader. Researchers began to move beyond the narrow issue of automated production and started to examine AI in relation to communication more generally [4]. This shift matters. Once AI is discussed within a communication framework, the conversation no longer stops at tools or efficiency. It begins to include mediation, meaning, visibility, and interaction. Some recent studies go further and argue that AI should be understood as a conceptual category within communication research rather than as a purely technical label [8]. That move has methodological consequences. It opens the possibility of using AI not only to study media institutions, but also to study media texts and discourse.

Still, there is an imbalance in the literature. A good number of studies remain centered on platform governance, professional adaptation, responsible AI, and the wider democratic implications of technological change in journalism [10]. These themes are clearly significant. Yet they do not fully answer a different question, namely how AI may be introduced into the analysis of language itself. Existing research tells us much about how AI affects media systems, but less about how AI can assist the study of recurring discourse patterns inside mainstream media texts.

This gap matters for the present study. If AI is understood only as a social or industrial phenomenon, then its role in media research remains incomplete. But if it is also treated as an analytical resource, a different path becomes visible. AI can support the identification of repeated lexical choices, recurrent narrative structures, emotional tendencies, and positional signals across larger bodies of media texts [5]. Used in this way, it does not replace interpretation. It extends it. For a study concerned with language strategies, this methodological function is especially relevant.

2.2. Studies on Media Language Strategies

The study of media language strategies has a long intellectual background. Agenda-setting research showed that media influence public attention by determining what becomes prominent in public discussion. Framing research developed this line further. It demonstrated that media do not simply make issues visible; they also shape how those issues are understood by highlighting certain aspects, suppressing others, and organizing meaning in particular ways. Critical discourse analysis added another dimension by emphasizing that media language is tied to ideology, power, and social control, even when it appears neutral or routine [3].

These traditions differ in emphasis, but they share a common assumption: language in media discourse is strategic. A text does more than describe. It names, orders, evaluates, and signals. Sometimes the strategy is obvious. Sometimes it is subtle. A term may recur across reports until it appears natural. A frame may become dominant because alternative descriptions are not given equal visibility. Emotional force may be built not through explicit opinion, but through repeated cues, selective quotations, or asymmetrical narrative structure. Because of this, the study of media language cannot be reduced to style alone. It also involves meaning, influence, and discursive positioning.

Recent research has continued to work within this broad tradition, though often with more varied vocabulary. Some studies emphasize evaluative language. Others stress narrative patterning, affective cues, or the indirect construction of stance. The terminology shifts, but the underlying concern remains similar. Researchers want to understand how media discourse guides interpretation and narrows or expands the space of public meaning. What remains less developed, however, is the methodological question of how these strategies can be tracked with greater consistency when the textual material

ISSN 2616-7433 Vol. 8, Issue 2: 46-55, DOI: 10.25236/FSST.2026.080207

becomes large or repetitive.

This is where the current study places its emphasis. Traditional close reading remains valuable, especially when nuance and context matter. Yet it may not be sufficient on its own when researchers aim to detect recurring discursive tendencies across broad sets of mainstream media texts. The problem is not that classical theories have become outdated. The problem is that their analytical application can become difficult when the scale of the material grows. AI offers one possible response to this difficulty. It can help make some of the concerns already present in agenda-setting, framing, and discourse analysis more operational without reducing them to crude technical procedures [5].

2.3. Studies on South Asian Media

Research on South Asian media has often moved in two broad directions. One is national in focus. It looks at particular countries, specific media systems, or distinct political and cultural settings. The other is regional. It treats South Asia not simply as a collection of separate national cases, but as a broader media and communicative space shaped by overlap, uneven development, circulation, and exchange [6]. For the present study, the second direction is more useful.

A regional perspective is necessary for at least two reasons. First, the mainstream media environments of India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and Nepal are clearly different, but they are not wholly disconnected. They share a number of structural pressures, including digital transition, intensified competition for attention, and the continued public influence of mainstream news organizations. Second, a purely country-by-country approach would not fit the present paper, which is methodological rather than comparative in a strict empirical sense. The aim here is not to establish a ranked comparison among national media systems. It is to consider how the language strategies of mainstream media in major South Asian contexts can be studied through an AI-based analytical approach.

Existing studies of South Asian media and communication provide helpful background for this move. They show that the region should not be treated as homogeneous. South Asia is marked by linguistic plurality, different institutional histories, and uneven media infrastructures [9]. This means any discussion of media language in the region must avoid simple generalization. At the same time, these studies also suggest that there is analytical value in thinking regionally. Media forms circulate, discursive tendencies travel, and institutional practices can be examined within a broader South Asian frame rather than only within rigid national boundaries.

What is still less developed in the literature is a sustained methodological discussion of how mainstream media language in South Asia can be analyzed more systematically. Existing work often centers on politics, cultural production, television, or digital change. These are important fields of study, but they do not fully address the question raised in this paper. That question is narrower and more technical in a methodological sense. It asks how AI can assist the analysis of mainstream media language strategies in major South Asian countries. In this respect, the present study does not replace existing regional scholarship. It builds on it, while shifting the focus toward analytical method and discourse structure.

3. Major Dimensions of Mainstream Media Language Strategies in South Asia

3.1. Lexical, Narrative, Emotional, and Positional Strategies

The language strategies of mainstream media do not operate on a single level. They work through words, but also through structure, tone, and implication. A report may appear neutral in form, yet its choices are rarely neutral in effect. What is named, what is emphasized, what is connected, and what is left unsaid all matter. For this reason, the present study approaches mainstream media language in South Asia through four closely related dimensions: lexical strategy, narrative strategy, emotional strategy, and positional strategy. This framework draws on earlier work in framing and discourse analysis while adapting it to the present methodological discussion [1].

The first dimension is lexical strategy. At the most visible level, mainstream media shape meaning through word choice. This includes naming, labeling, repetition, and evaluative vocabulary. A term may look descriptive, yet it can still carry orientation. A recurring phrase may gradually narrow interpretation by making one description appear natural and others less available. Lexical choice is therefore not a minor stylistic matter. It is one of the clearest ways in which discourse directs attention and sets the boundaries of public understanding [3]. In mainstream news texts, such choices often appear disciplined

ISSN 2616-7433 Vol. 8, Issue 2: 46-55, DOI: 10.25236/FSST.2026.080207

rather than dramatic. They work through regularity. A label repeated across headlines or lead paragraphs can be more influential than an openly polemical sentence because it normalizes a particular way of seeing.

This is especially important in mainstream media environments, where institutional credibility often gives lexical selection greater force. Readers may not pause over a familiar term, but repeated exposure still shapes perception. That is one reason lexical strategy deserves systematic attention. It also marks one of the points at which AI-assisted analysis becomes useful. Repetition, clustering, and evaluative patterning are difficult to trace consistently through impressionistic reading alone, especially when the textual material is broad. AI does not interpret such patterns by itself. What it can do is help detect them with greater consistency [8].

The second dimension is narrative strategy. Media do not simply state facts one by one. They arrange them. Events are linked through sequence, causality, contrast, and emphasis. This is where framing becomes especially important [1]. A narrative strategy shapes not only what is reported, but also how a development is made intelligible. It can define what counts as the beginning of an issue, what is treated as its turning point, and who appears central to its meaning. In mainstream media, narrative construction often works through a limited number of repeated formats. Certain actors are regularly foregrounded, certain developments are cast as conflict or crisis, and certain explanations are made more available than others.

In the South Asian context, this dimension deserves particular attention because mainstream media often work within dense institutional and linguistic settings [9]. Narrative order matters there. It can stabilize uncertainty, intensify urgency, or channel public attention toward a preferred line of interpretation. A media text may not state a conclusion directly, yet its narrative arrangement can still guide readers toward one. This is why narrative strategy should not be reduced to storytelling alone. It is also a mechanism of discursive organization. For researchers, however, recurrent narrative structures are not always easy to identify across a large body of texts. Similar storylines may appear in different verbal forms. Themes may recur without identical wording. Here again, AI can be helpful, especially in grouping related textual structures and tracing repeated discursive sequences [5].

The third dimension is emotional strategy. Media discourse is often discussed in terms of information and interpretation, but emotion also matters. It enters through lexical intensity, rhetorical contrast, selective quotation, and tonal patterning. Sometimes it appears openly. At other times, it is carried by repeated cues that build unease, urgency, sympathy, or distance without becoming fully explicit. Emotional strategy is important because it helps shape response. It does not only tell audiences what to think about; it also affects how an issue feels within public discourse.

This does not mean that mainstream media always operate through overt emotionality. In fact, they often work through controlled emotional signaling. A text may remain formally restrained while still producing a strong affective effect. That effect can emerge from what is highlighted, what is omitted, and how actors are represented. Emotional strategy therefore does not sit outside institutional news discourse. It is often embedded within it. From a methodological point of view, this dimension is also open to AI-assisted analysis, though not in any simple way. Emotional tendencies in news discourse are not always reducible to positive or negative sentiment. They are often more layered than that. Even so, AI can assist in tracing recurring affective cues, tonal clusters, and patterns of emotional emphasis across a wider textual field [11].

The fourth dimension is positional strategy. This is perhaps the least obvious, but it is no less important. Media stance is not always stated directly. Mainstream news discourse often signals orientation through indirect means: the placement of quotations, the ordering of information, the amount of space given to certain voices, the asymmetry of description, or the contrast between what is treated as factual and what is treated as debatable [3]. A report may look balanced because it includes more than one side, yet its structure can still tilt interpretation. Position is often constructed quietly.

This dimension is especially relevant to mainstream media because explicit partisanship is not the only way in which discourse carries orientation. Institutional news often gains authority precisely by appearing measured. Yet a restrained tone does not remove position; it may simply relocate it. Positional strategy can therefore be harder to identify than lexical repetition or overt framing, especially when the signals are dispersed across many texts. Here again, AI-assisted analysis can help, not by replacing close reading, but by tracing recurring asymmetries and patterns of emphasis that might otherwise remain scattered [5]. The interpretive step still belongs to the researcher. What AI contributes is pattern visibility.

These four dimensions are analytically distinct, but in actual media discourse they overlap. A lexical

ISSN 2616-7433 Vol. 8, Issue 2: 46-55, DOI: 10.25236/FSST.2026.080207

label may support a narrative frame. A narrative frame may intensify emotional response. Emotional emphasis may strengthen an implicit position. This overlap is not a weakness in the framework. It reflects how mainstream media language actually works. Discourse rarely moves in neat compartments. It tends to operate through layered coordination. That is why a multidimensional approach is more useful than a narrow focus on wording alone. It also helps explain why the study of language strategies benefits from tools that can track recurrence without flattening complexity.

3.2. Discursive Simplification and Labeling as a Cross-Dimensional Tendency

Alongside the four dimensions discussed above, one broader tendency also deserves attention: discursive simplification and labeling. This is not treated here as a fully separate category equal to lexical, narrative, emotional, and positional strategy. It works across them. That is precisely why it matters.

Simplification appears when complex developments are reduced to a limited number of recognizable terms, oppositions, or explanatory formulas. Labeling appears when these reductions are stabilized through repeated naming. In mainstream media discourse, this tendency can be quite powerful. It makes communication faster. It increases recognizability. It also helps maintain consistency across reports, headlines, and editorial routines. Yet simplification has a cost. When recurring labels take the place of fuller description, they can narrow interpretive range and make alternative framings less visible [3].

This tendency can be seen first at the lexical level. Repeated labels compress complexity into a short and usable form. That may improve communicative efficiency, but it also fixes meaning in advance. Simplification also operates narratively. Complicated developments may be organized into stable storylines that emphasize conflict, causality, or moral contrast while leaving out ambiguity. Emotionally, simplification may intensify response by reducing mixed situations to a more immediate affective register. Positional strategy is involved as well. Once a reduced label or frame becomes routine, stance no longer needs to be declared directly. It is built into the structure of discourse itself.

This is one reason simplification and labeling should be treated as a cross-dimensional tendency rather than as an isolated fifth type. They move through the whole discursive field. They shape wording, reinforce framing, sharpen tone, and stabilize positional signals. In practical terms, they are also among the phenomena most suited to AI-assisted analysis. Recurrent labels, condensed semantic clusters, and repeated simplification patterns are precisely the kinds of features that become easier to observe when textual materials are examined with computational support [5]. That does not remove the need for judgment. Researchers still need to decide what kind of simplification is being produced, what is being left out, and how the discursive effect should be understood. But the analytical reach becomes wider.

For mainstream media in South Asia, this issue is particularly important. Mainstream outlets in the region continue to function as visible public actors, and the language they use can shape broader patterns of understanding [9]. When simplification and labeling become embedded in institutional news discourse, their influence may be stronger than in more fragmented communicative spaces. They carry the weight of legitimacy. They also travel more easily across reports because mainstream media tend to reproduce stable editorial language.

Taken together, the dimensions outlined in this chapter offer a workable basis for analysis. Lexical, narrative, emotional, and positional strategies help identify the main levels at which mainstream media discourse operates. Discursive simplification and labeling help explain how these levels are often pulled toward compression and regularity. The next chapter turns to method more directly. It asks why AI can be introduced into the study of these strategies and what it can realistically do in this field.

4. AI as an Analytical Approach to Media Language Strategies

4.1. The Analytical Functions of AI in Media Language Research

If AI is introduced into the study of media language strategies, its value does not lie in replacing interpretation. That point should be made clear at once. Media discourse still needs to be read, situated, and judged by the researcher. AI does something else. It helps with recognition. It helps with sorting. Above all, it makes recurring patterns easier to see than they might be under manual reading alone.

This is especially relevant when the object of analysis is mainstream media. Such discourse is rarely random. It tends to be institutionally shaped, stylistically controlled, and relatively stable in form. That stability matters. Lexical repetition, framing regularity, tonal preference, and positional bias often appear

ISSN 2616-7433 Vol. 8, Issue 2: 46-55, DOI: 10.25236/FSST.2026.080207

not in isolated texts, but across many reports over time. A researcher may sense these tendencies while reading. Still, sensing is not the same as tracing. AI becomes useful at precisely this point.

One clear function of AI lies in the identification of lexical patterns. Mainstream media often rely on repeated naming practices, favored labels, fixed descriptive clusters, and evaluative terms that may look ordinary because they appear so often. Close reading can notice this. Yet when the material grows, consistency becomes difficult. AI-assisted analysis can help group repeated expressions, detect high-frequency labels, and identify semantic patterns that might otherwise remain scattered across a large textual set [8]. This does not mean the machine explains the meaning of a label on its own. It does not. But it can show where certain lexical choices recur, how often they appear, and what kinds of associations they tend to form. That is already analytically valuable.

A second function concerns narrative structure. News stories are not built word by word alone. They are built through patterned sequences. Events are linked. Causes are implied. Turning points are marked. Some actors are placed at the center, while others remain peripheral. These decisions shape the story before any open comment is made [1]. AI can assist here by grouping similar story forms, detecting recurring thematic clusters, and tracing repeated narrative pathways across texts. This matters because narrative strategies are often less visible than lexical ones. They do not always depend on identical wording. A storyline may be reproduced in slightly different language and still perform the same framing work. Human reading remains necessary, but AI can make such recurrences easier to detect [5].

The same applies to emotional patterning. Mainstream media are often assumed to be less emotional than more fragmented forms of public discourse. That assumption is only partly true. Institutional news discourse may avoid open sensationalism, yet it can still produce strong affective effects through selective emphasis, tonal shading, and repeated cues of alarm, sympathy, distrust, reassurance, or urgency [3]. These signals are not always obvious in a single report. They become clearer when seen as a pattern. AI-assisted analysis can help trace such tendencies across a body of texts by detecting clusters of affective vocabulary, tonal regularities, or recurrent semantic fields associated with emotional charge [11]. Again, this does not solve interpretation by itself. It supports it.

A fourth function lies in the analysis of positional signals. This may be the most difficult area of all. Position in mainstream media discourse is often indirect. It may emerge through quotation patterns, asymmetrical description, differential visibility, or the order in which information is presented [3]. A report may appear balanced and still guide readers toward a preferred orientation. Because such positioning is often dispersed and understated, it is not always easy to identify systematically. AI can help by revealing repeated asymmetries, detecting recurring associations, and marking patterns of emphasis that a researcher might otherwise notice only after prolonged reading [8]. The machine does not determine stance in any final sense. That would be too strong a claim. What it can do is help the researcher see where positional regularities are forming.

For this reason, the role of AI in media language research should be understood in practical terms. It is not there to replace theory. It is not there to make close reading unnecessary. Nor is it a shortcut to certainty. Its main function is more modest, but still important. It helps the researcher move from isolated textual impressions toward a more systematic view of recurring discourse patterns. In a study concerned with the language strategies of mainstream media in major South Asian contexts, that kind of support is worth taking seriously.

4.2. The Advantages and Limits of AI-Assisted Analysis

The attraction of AI-assisted analysis is easy to see. It offers scale. It offers speed. It can also provide a degree of internal consistency that is difficult to sustain through manual reading alone. When a researcher is trying to trace repeated labels, parallel narrative forms, tonal clusters, or dispersed signals of stance, AI can reduce some of the practical burden. It can help organize a large set of texts into patterns that are easier to inspect and compare [5]. In that sense, its first advantage is not theoretical brilliance. It is analytical reach.

There is a second advantage as well. AI can make some discursive regularities harder to ignore. A researcher reading by hand may have a strong intuition that certain labels recur, that some actors are routinely foregrounded, or that emotional pressure is being built through repeated cues. Intuition matters, but intuition alone can remain vulnerable to inconsistency. AI-assisted analysis can strengthen the evidential basis of such observations by showing that they are not merely impressionistic [11]. It helps shift the argument from “this seems to happen” toward “this pattern appears with identifiable recurrence.” That is a meaningful gain.

ISSN 2616-7433 Vol. 8, Issue 2: 46-55, DOI: 10.25236/FSST.2026.080207

A third advantage is comparative clarity. Mainstream media texts often differ in surface detail while repeating deeper discursive habits. One article may not resemble another in wording, yet both may rely on the same framing logic or the same positional structure. AI can assist in drawing these connections by grouping similar textual tendencies that would not always stand out through reading one text at a time [8]. This matters for discourse research, especially when the object is not a single article but a patterned style of communication.

Still, the limits are just as important. The first limit is interpretive. AI can identify patterns, but it does not fully understand the social and political weight of those patterns. A repeated word is not meaningful simply because it repeats. Its significance depends on context, usage, and relation to broader discursive structures [3]. The same is true of emotional signals and positional cues. A machine may detect tonal similarity, but it does not by itself explain why that similarity matters in one case more than another. Interpretation remains a human task.

A second limit concerns reduction. The very strength of AI—its ability to classify and group—can also become a weakness. Media discourse is often layered, ironic, unstable, or context-sensitive. Not every lexical repetition indicates a strategic pattern. Not every semantic cluster reflects a coherent frame. If the researcher leans too heavily on computational grouping, there is a risk of flattening complexity and turning discourse analysis into mere textual sorting [8]. That would weaken the study rather than strengthen it.

There is also a problem of methodological temptation. Once AI enters a project, it can create the impression of precision even where interpretive uncertainty remains. This is dangerous. It may encourage researchers to overstate what the method can deliver. In the study of language strategies, such overstatement is especially risky because discourse rarely yields clean or final results. Framing, tone, and position are often open to dispute. They require judgment. Responsible use of AI therefore depends on restraint as much as on innovation [10]. The method should support analysis, not dominate it.

For a study of South Asian mainstream media, this caution is especially necessary. The region is marked by linguistic diversity, institutional variation, and uneven media conditions [9]. That means AI-assisted analysis cannot be treated as a universally self-sufficient solution. The same pattern may carry different weight in different national media settings. Similar labels may not have identical force across contexts. A method that appears robust at one level may still require careful regional interpretation at another. So the value of AI here lies not in methodological sovereignty, but in methodological support.

Taken together, the advantages and limits point to the same conclusion. AI can strengthen the study of media language strategies, but only when it is used with theoretical discipline and interpretive caution. It is useful because it helps reveal recurrence. It is limited because recurrence is not the same thing as meaning. The most productive approach, then, is neither rejection nor overconfidence. It is a more balanced view: AI should be treated as an auxiliary analytical method that expands the reach of discourse research without displacing its interpretive core.

5. Analytical Value and Theoretical Implications

5.1. Analytical Value for Mainstream Media Discourse Studies

The value of introducing AI into the study of mainstream media discourse is not difficult to see, though it should also be stated with care. AI does not solve the central problems of discourse research. It does not remove ambiguity. It does not tell the researcher what a text finally means. Still, it can change the conditions under which analysis is carried out. In some cases, that change is substantial.

One clear value lies in scale. Mainstream media discourse is rarely made up of isolated texts. It tends to move through routines. The same terms return. Similar frames reappear. Emotional cues may shift slightly from one report to another and still remain recognizable when viewed together. In traditional close reading, such repetition can be noticed, but not always tracked with consistency, especially once the material grows large. AI can assist at this point. It can help sort texts, identify recurring lexical items, group related semantic patterns, and highlight textual regularities that might otherwise remain scattered [5]. This does not make the analysis automatic, but it does make it more manageable.

A second value lies in pattern visibility. Discourse research often depends on sensitivity to repetition. Yet repetition is not always obvious. Sometimes a frame is repeated without identical wording. Sometimes a position is signaled through contrast, sequencing, or uneven emphasis rather than through overt claims. These are precisely the cases in which AI becomes useful. It can help bring dispersed textual

ISSN 2616-7433 Vol. 8, Issue 2: 46-55, DOI: 10.25236/FSST.2026.080207

tendencies into view and make certain recurrent habits easier to trace. A researcher may already suspect that a label, a narrative line, or a tonal pattern is doing more work than it first appears to do. AI does not create that suspicion. But it can give the researcher a firmer basis for pursuing it.

There is also the matter of comparative consistency. Manual reading is often rich, but it can be uneven. Some texts stand out immediately; others do not. Some formulations appear memorable; others pass unnoticed. This is one reason discourse studies can sometimes drift toward selective illustration. AI does not eliminate that risk, but it can reduce it. By making it easier to compare larger sets of reports, it allows the researcher to move beyond a few striking examples and toward broader textual tendencies [11]. For mainstream media discourse studies, that is an important gain.

Another point deserves emphasis. AI-assisted analysis may help reconnect surface features and discursive structure. In many readings of mainstream news, word choice is treated as one thing and framing as another. In practice, they are tied together. Lexical repetition can stabilize a frame. Narrative arrangement can strengthen an emotional tone. Positional signals may appear through something as small as a repeated descriptive contrast. When AI is used carefully, it can help the researcher observe these links across multiple texts rather than in only one or two close readings. This is not a minor advantage. It encourages a more relational way of studying discourse.

That said, the analytical value of AI does not rest only on what it can process. It also rests on how it is used. If it is treated as a shortcut to final conclusions, its value quickly weakens. If it is used as an aid to structured observation, it becomes more persuasive. In this sense, AI is most useful when it remains methodologically modest. It should support the analysis of discourse, not displace the conceptual tools that make such analysis meaningful in the first place.

There is a further benefit, and it is practical rather than theoretical. AI can help researchers ask more precise questions. Instead of saying that a discourse "seems repetitive" or that a frame "appears dominant," the researcher can move toward a more disciplined inquiry into what is repeated, where it is repeated, and in what form. This does not make discourse research mechanical. But it can make it less impressionistic. For studies of mainstream media language, that shift is valuable.

5.2. Theoretical and Regional Implications

The use of AI in this field also carries broader implications. These implications are not only methodological. They are theoretical as well.

To begin with, an AI-assisted approach encourages a somewhat different way of thinking about media language strategies. In earlier work, such strategies were often discussed as qualities that became visible through careful reading of selected texts. That remains important. Yet once AI enters the analysis, strategies begin to appear less as isolated textual features and more as recurring discursive formations. This shift matters. It moves the discussion away from anecdotal example and toward patterned observation. In that sense, it gives earlier work on framing a different practical horizon. The theory does not disappear. It becomes easier to apply across a wider body of material.

This has consequences for discourse research more broadly. Framing has always involved selection and salience, but those processes are not always easy to trace beyond a limited number of examples. An AI-assisted approach makes it easier to see how repetition, emphasis, and regularity operate across many texts rather than only within a few familiar cases. A similar point can be made about critical discourse analysis. Work in that tradition has long stressed the relation between language, ideology, and power [3]. AI cannot settle those questions. It can, however, help reveal the repeated textual habits through which such relations are sustained. In that respect, the method does not replace theory. It gives some theoretical claims a broader field of observation.

The regional implications are equally important. South Asian media studies have often developed through concerns with politics, television, digital change, and cultural circulation [6]. Those lines of work remain valuable. Even so, the methodological question of how mainstream media language in the region can be studied in a more systematic way has been less fully developed. This paper enters at that point. By focusing on the major mainstream media contexts of India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and Nepal, it brings methodological reflection into a regional field that still has room for it.

This does not mean that South Asia should be treated as uniform. Quite the opposite. The region is marked by linguistic plurality, uneven infrastructures, and different media histories [9]. These differences matter, and any serious analysis has to keep them in view. Yet regional work does not require homogeneity. It requires a framework capable of handling similarity and difference at the same time. An

ISSN 2616-7433 Vol. 8, Issue 2: 46-55, DOI: 10.25236/FSST.2026.080207

AI-assisted approach can help here. It allows researchers to track repeated discourse patterns across a broad regional field while still leaving room for context-sensitive interpretation. In this respect, it is especially suitable for a region where national media systems are distinct but not wholly disconnected.

There is also a larger implication for non-Western media research. A good deal of methodological discussion in communication studies still takes Western media settings, English-language corpora, or highly institutionalized data environments as its implicit norm. That habit can narrow the field without saying so directly. A study centered on South Asian mainstream media does not overturn that pattern by itself, but it does push against it. It suggests that methodological innovation does not belong only to one set of cases. It can also be developed through regional contexts that have often remained secondary in theoretical debate.

At the same time, caution remains necessary. The use of AI in a regional setting does not remove the need for local knowledge. Similar discourse patterns may carry different meanings across different South Asian media contexts. A repeated label, a familiar narrative structure, or an affective cue may not work in the same way in every national setting. This is why AI, however useful, cannot become a stand-alone authority. It has to remain tied to contextual reading and theoretical judgment. Without that connection, the method risks becoming technically impressive but analytically thin.

Taken together, these implications point in one direction. The introduction of AI into mainstream media discourse studies should not be understood as a break with earlier theory, nor as a simple technical upgrade. It is better understood as a methodological extension. It broadens what can be observed, sharpens what can be compared, and gives established theoretical concerns a wider field of application. For research on South Asian mainstream media, that extension is worth pursuing.

6. Conclusion

This paper has argued that artificial intelligence can be introduced into the study of mainstream media language in a way that is methodologically useful and theoretically defensible. The point is not that AI replaces interpretation, nor that it offers a shortcut to final conclusions. The point is narrower. When mainstream media discourse is marked by repetition, patterned framing, controlled emotional cues, and indirect signals of position, AI can help make those patterns more visible and more comparable across a wider body of texts. In that sense, it should be treated not only as an object of media research, but also as a possible analytical method.

The discussion has also shown that the language strategies of mainstream media in major South Asian contexts can be approached through several linked dimensions. Lexical choice matters because naming is never innocent. Narrative arrangement matters because events do not speak for themselves. Emotional cues matter because institutional discourse can shape response even when it appears restrained. Positional signals matter because stance is often embedded in emphasis, ordering, and selective visibility rather than stated directly. These dimensions are distinct, but they often work together. A repeated label may support a familiar frame; a familiar frame may strengthen a preferred orientation. This is one reason mainstream media discourse requires more than surface description.

Another point emerging from the paper is that South Asia is not simply a backdrop for the argument. It matters as a regional field of analysis. The mainstream media systems of India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and Nepal differ in language, history, and institutional structure, yet they can still be discussed within a broader regional frame when the concern is methodological rather than narrowly comparative. That regional focus does not erase difference. It helps define a workable scale. For a study interested in recurring discourse patterns, that scale is useful.

At the same time, the limits of the present paper should be kept in view. It is a conceptual and methodological study, not a full empirical demonstration. It has outlined what AI can do in the analysis of media language strategies, but it has not implemented a large corpus-based procedure or tested a fixed analytical model on a defined body of texts. That work still remains to be done. Future studies could move in that direction by building clearer corpora of mainstream media reports in major South Asian contexts and examining how far AI can assist the analysis of lexical repetition, narrative clustering, emotional patterning, and positional asymmetry in practice.

What this paper has tried to do, then, is not to overstate a method, but to clarify its place. If mainstream media discourse is patterned, layered, and institutionally shaped, methods capable of tracing those qualities deserve serious attention. Artificial intelligence, used carefully and without exaggeration, is one of them.

ISSN 2616-7433 Vol. 8, Issue 2: 46-55, DOI: 10.25236/FSST.2026.080207

Acknowledgments

Fund Project: General Project of Research Center for China's Neighboring Countries in 2025 "Research on the Language Strategies of India's Official Discourse Related to China Based on AI Text Analysis from the Perspective of Non-traditional Security" (25ZBGJ-B012)

References

[1] Entman, R.M. (1993) Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. Journal of Communication, 43(4), 51-58.
[2] McCombs, M.E. and Shaw, D.L. (1972) The agenda-setting function of mass media. Public Opinion Quarterly, 36(2), 176-187.
[3] Fairclough, N. (1995) Media discourse. London: Edward Arnold.
[4] Guzman, A.L. and Lewis, S.C. (2020) Artificial intelligence and communication: A human-machine communication research agenda. New Media & Society, 22(1), 70-86.
[5] Gil de Zúñiga, H., Goyanes, M. and Durotoye, T. (2024) A scholarly definition of artificial intelligence (AI): Advancing AI as a conceptual framework in communication research. Political Communication, 41(2), 317-334.
[6] Punathambekar, A. and Chirumamilla, P. (2023) Televisual drag: Reimagining South Asian film and media studies. Television & New Media, 24(2), 123-138.
[7] Lewis, S.C., Guzman, A.L. and Schmidt, T.R. (2019) Automation, journalism, and human-machine communication: Rethinking roles and relationships of humans and machines in news. Digital Journalism, 7(4), 409-427.
[8] Fehér, K. (2024) Exploring AI media: Definitions, conceptual model, research agenda. Journal of Media Business Studies, 21(4), 340-363.
[9] Sriramesh, K. (2020) Virtual theme collection: Journalism and media research in South Asia and Southeast Asia. Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 97(3), 581-585.
[10] Porlezza, C. (2023) Promoting responsible AI: A European perspective on the governance of artificial intelligence in media and journalism. Communications, 48(3), 370-394.
[11] Dodds, T., Zamith, R. and Lewis, S.C. (2026) The AI turn in journalism: Disruption, adaptation, and democratic futures. Journalism, 27(3), 530-544.