Educational Administration: Theory and Practice
2024, 30(1), 6473-6479
ISSN: 2148-2403
https://kuey.net/

Research Article

Mitigating Into the Social Chaos and Delivering Social Justice Through Ai: A Theoretical Approach in Developing Content Creation for Media

Chandramouly Pandey[1], Teli Yami[2], Sunil Koijam[3*]

[1]PhD Scholar, Department of Mass Communication, Rajiv Gandhi University, Arunachal Pradesh, India
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Mass Communication, Rajiv Gandhi University, Arunachal Pradesh, India.
[3*]Assistant Professor, Department of Mass Communication, Rajiv Gandhi University, Arunachal Pradesh, India.

***Correspondence Author:** Sunil Koijam
*Assistant Professor, Department of Mass Communication, Rajiv Gandhi University, Arunachal Pradesh, India.

Citation: Sunil Koijam, et.al (2024), Mitigating into The Social Chaos and Delivering Social Justice Through Ai: A Theoretical Approach in Developing Content Creation for Media, *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice. 30(1), 6473-6479*
Doi: 10.53555/kuey.v30i1.9799

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Development and social justice are the two wheels which balances each other in smooth functioning of a democracy. Imparting social justice especially in sensitive issues where many stakeholders are involved becomes crucial. One such sensitive issue is the construction of mega-dams in the state of Arunachal Pradesh, India, where there is an on-going deadlock between the local tribal communities and the authorities on the construction of upcoming series of dams which is expected to produce in-total 12,723 Mega-Watt of power on Siang river and its tributaries. Social deadlocks like this, presents an opportunity for advanced technologies like Artificial Intelligence (AI) to step in. Using the theoretical method, the present research article tried to delves into the realm of AI models which can be used as a negotiator by overcoming the limitations that humans possess, mainly the cultural bias which further exacerbates other issues like cognitive biases, a lack of awareness regarding effective negotiation strategies, and emotional factors that impede communication, rational decision-making, and overall negotiation effectiveness. This minimization of cultural bias will enhance the assurance, approachability and accessibility of AI models among the users. Further, the article tried to understand how AI models can navigate the negotiation process on social issues and at the same time can balance the information, misinformation and disinformation while communicating with the users in an objective manner so that social justice can be generated rather than generalized in a culturally diverse society. The contents generated will help in bringing a balance in the society which will strengthen our democratic practices.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Social Justice, Negotiation, Biasness, Misinformation, Disinformation, Big Dam issues

Introduction

In the age of fourth industrial revolution, there is a rapid development and discussions on the Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Large Language Models (LLMs) like Chat GPT and its usage in various field including media and communications. The significance of these advanced models, distinguished by their extensive neural architectures and remarkable language generation abilities, is paramount in current AI research. Their pervasive integration into daily digital interactions, ranging from virtual assistants to online content creation, highlights their potential impact on the formation of narratives, perceptions, and cognitive processes. AI has become part of the daily routine and transforming how an individual is accessing any information. One such potential use AI technologies is its integration in the process of mediation which can facilitate social justice. In a developing country like India, where there is an continuous booming economic development, it aids the necessity of social development and social justice on the same page along with the economic development. In the complex framework of democratic governance of the country, the dual foundations of development and social justice are crucial for attaining societal balance. Development serves as a catalyst for economic advancement and modernization, while social justice guarantees inclusivity, equity, and fairness in the

allocation of its advantages. Nevertheless, the convergence of these objectives can pose significant challenges, particularly in culturally heterogeneous areas where diverse interests may conflict and create chaos in the society.

The situation surrounding the construction of mega-dams in Arunachal Pradesh, India, serves as a pertinent illustration of such a conflict, where the anticipated benefits of substantial energy production clash with the cultural, ecological, and social concerns of indigenous tribal populations. This stalemate emphasizes the necessity for innovative approaches that can reconcile differences, promote dialogue, and yield equitable results. Arunachal Pradesh, endowed with abundant natural resources and rich biodiversity, has emerged as a centre-stage for the hydroelectric development in the recent years. Government plans to harness the Siang River and its tributaries to produce an estimated 12,723 megawatts of electricity, the potential for economic gain is substantial. However, this progress is not without any drawbacks. Local tribal communities, who depend on these rivers for their livelihoods and regard them as sacred within their cultural framework, express concerns over displacement, the erosion of their cultural identity and most important the environmental harm. The ensuing deadlock between these communities and development authorities highlights the intricacies involved in negotiating sensitive matters that engage diverse stakeholders with conflicting priorities.

In contemporary contexts, sophisticated technologies such as Artificial Intelligence (AI) present novel avenues for resolving conflicts. In contrast to humans, who frequently face limitations imposed by cultural prejudices, emotional factors, and cognitive constraints, AI systems are capable of delivering objective, data-informed analyses. The ability of AI to process extensive datasets, evaluate cultural nuances, and produce impartial narratives positions it as a valuable asset in mediating social disputes. The capacity to address human limitations, leverage the efficiencies of machines, and potentially transform negotiation processes is significant. Although AI systems are developed using historical data, they inevitably acquire biases; however, mitigating these biases in machines appears to be more feasible than in humans, even if complete elimination is not achievable. AI systems, while not omniscient, can be trained at a significantly faster pace than humans as the volume of available data increases. Furthermore, while large language models (LLMs) can simulate emotional responses, they do not possess genuine feelings. Consequently, they are often more adept at maintaining rationality and adhering to mediation principles, thereby promoting social justice through best practices, compared to human mediators. AI can act as a mediator between the different stakeholders and facilitate content moderation.

In a world that is becoming more interconnected, the importance of diversity and cultural sensitivity cannot be overstated. Grasping the subtleties of this relationship is essential for AI researchers as well as for society as a whole. This research explores the potential of AI to reduce cultural biases, improve accessibility, and combat misinformation and disinformation in contentious social matters, exemplified by the mega-dam conflict in the state. As society becomes increasingly shaped by technological progress, the incorporation of AI into conflict resolution strategies through content moderation signifies a valuable transformation. This study not only enriches the academic dialogue surrounding AI and social equity but also provides actionable recommendations for developing AI systems that can reconcile societal differences, harmonize conflicting interests, and bolster democratic practices within culturally heterogeneous communities.

Review of Literature

Large Language Models (LLMs), characterized by their advanced linguistic skills and generative functions, have significantly transformed various fields, particularly in natural language comprehension and content creation (Thoppilan et al., 2022). Nevertheless, these models also carry the potential to reinforce societal biases and preconceived notions embedded within their training datasets (Bender et al., 2021). Research indicates that individuals often place greater trust in content produced by machines. In this context, Araujo et al. (2020) highlight a tendency for people to perceive machines as more objective and rational compared to human judgment. Similarly, Logg et al. (2019: 90) demonstrate through six experiments that individuals are more likely to follow advice they believe originates from an algorithm rather than from a human source. Additional instances of AI-LLMs generating problematic representations of cultural groups can be observed in AI-driven image generation tools that reinforce racial, gender, and other cultural stereotypes (Bianchi et al., 2023). Moreover, many AI tools focused on language and communication are based on a narrow range of linguistic data, which may incorporate criteria or competence models that favour standardized language forms. This type of algorithmic bias can sustain the notion that there exists only one correct method of language use (Schneider, 2022). Efforts to address cultural bias have been explored through various strategies. One such approach involves using specific languages in prompts to elicit culturally relevant values associated with those languages; for instance, asking a question in Korean to draw out responses that reflect Korean cultural values from the language model. However, findings from a study conducted across 14 countries and languages indicate that this method does not yield responses that align with data obtained from nationally representative values surveys (Arora et al., 2023). In this context, (Von Eschenbach 2021) highlights the issue arises from the lack of transparency surrounding the algorithms employed in AI-LLM systems, which are often not disclosed to the public, it is termed as ‘black-box problem’

AI serves as a mediator with numerous advantages, including its capacity to communicate fluently and persuasively. Additionally, it possesses the capability to retain user inputs and comprehend contextual

nuances, enabling it to engage in autonomous conversations (Bergman, 2023; Lamiroy, 2023). Moreover, AI can efficiently and rapidly process and analyze vast amounts of data (Melamed, 2023). However, alongside these benefits, there are significant challenges, particularly concerning privacy issues that must be addressed, especially in light of the confidentiality demands inherent in mediation (Weisheit & Salger, 2023). Furthermore, AI systems are inherently limited by the datasets they rely upon. If these datasets contain inaccuracies or biases, the AI lacks the ability to identify such flaws independently (Lamiroy, 2023). CloudMoyo (2023) emphasizes the critical role of empathy in mediation, often regarded as the "soul of mediation." A fundamental aspect of empathy is the capacity to recognize and interpret emotions; however, AI generally falls short in possessing the emotional intelligence that is characteristic of human mediators.

European Commission on AI (European Commission 2024), states that trustworthy AI should not only be lawful, ethical, and robust, but also give humans the ability to have control over its use, draw from and provide reliable data, offer security and privacy to its users, and be transparent, accountable, and inclusive in every domains. Further, Global Risk Report (World Economic Forum, 2024) recognizes misinformation and disinformation as significant threats anticipated in the near future, emphasizing the possible increase in domestic propaganda and censorship and demanded for the multi-pronged approach to deal with the threat. In the similar context, (Vicari & Komendatova, 2023) highlighted the need of collaborative gatekeeping in order to tackle this misinformation in the society which can be achieved through the help of AI. Ng et al. (2018) conduct a comparative analysis of traditional media and social media, emphasizing that social media exerts a more significant influence on enhancing readers' perception of risk. Tsoy et al. (2021) propose that social media can influence individuals' experiences of hazards in two distinct manners: by either heightening or diminishing risk perception. In a related discussion, Fard and Lingeswaran (2020) argue for the necessity of a more comprehensive approach, asserting that while artificial intelligence presents valuable tools for addressing misinformation, it should not be regarded as an isolated remedy. Instead, it ought to be integrated into a wider strategy that encompasses design solutions and collaboration among diverse stakeholders.

The literature review provides important perspectives on the current research regarding the AI and its impact on cultural bias but how these biases can be robustly eliminated is still a concern. Further, previous researches have focused on AI has a mediator but no profound work has been articulated on the role of AI as a mediator in social chaos which comes up with foes like misinformation and disinformation and how AI can facilitate the mitigation process.

Objectives

1. To study how AI models can be used as a mediator by eliminating the cultural biases
2. To understand how AI models can be made more approachable and accessible in imparting information on social issues and challenges.
3. To analyze how AI models can tackle the menace of misinformation and disinformation in the society.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of this research is grounded in two principal theories: Social Responsibility Theory and Framing Theory. These frameworks serve as a basis for exploring the capacity of Artificial Intelligence (AI) to confront cultural biases, alleviate social tensions, and promote social justice within the realm of media content production.

Social Responsibility Theory is particularly pertinent when examining the role of AI as a responsible intermediary in complex social issues, such as the mega-dam controversy in Arunachal Pradesh. By utilizing AI, models can produce content that surpasses human cultural and cognitive limitations, thereby ensuring equitable and inclusive representation of diverse stakeholder viewpoints. Moreover, by improving access to accurate and culturally relevant information, AI systems enhance the media's function as a promoter of informed public discourse, thereby reinforcing democratic principles.

The framing theory is utilized to investigate how AI can effectively organize narratives surrounding contentious topics to mitigate conflict, emphasize cultural sensitivities, and promote constructive dialogue. AI systems possess the capability to analyze the cultural and emotional contexts of various stakeholders, enabling them to create narratives that diminish polarization. For instance, by framing sensitive topics such as the mega-dam dispute in terms of collective advantages—such as sustainable development and environmental conservation—AI can facilitate consensus-building. Moreover, Framing Theory underscores the necessity of delivering accurate and balanced information to counteract misleading narratives. In this capacity, AI systems can function as gatekeepers, prioritizing truthful content and reframing misinformation to lessen its adverse effects.

Research Methodology

To address the objectives specified in the study, the research adopts a theoretical framework that combines qualitative analysis with contextual illustration. This methodology aims to investigate the capacity of Artificial Intelligence (AI) to alleviate social problems by addressing cultural biases and promoting social justice, particularly through its application in media content creation. To understand the research problem, the case of the Siang River mega-dam construction impasse serves as a contextual illustration to anchor the theoretical

discourse. A thorough examination of the existing literature concerning AI, cultural biases, negotiation tactics, and the issues of misinformation and disinformation within democratic settings has been conducted to gain insights into the research problem.

Discussion

The persistent social impasse regarding the establishment of large-scale dams in Arunachal Pradesh highlights the intricate relationship between cultural values, governance issues, and developmental needs within a multifaceted democracy such as India. This research explores the capacity of Artificial Intelligence (AI) to function as a negotiator and mediator in these disputes, focusing on its ability to mitigate algorithmic biases, including cultural biases, thereby providing information from a neutral standpoint. The incorporation of Artificial Intelligence (AI) as a facilitator in imparting social justice necessitates the creation of models capable of transcending the cultural and cognitive biases that are often present in human mediators. It is essential for AI models to be extensively trained on a wide array of datasets that reflect the socio-cultural intricacies of diverse culture and communities. In the case of the Siang River mega-dam dispute, AI systems should be designed in such a way that it acknowledge and honour tribal ecological wisdom along with integrating the innovative technical and sustainable developmental considerations. The process of eliminating cultural biases should be examined from various lens so that the AI models become more approachable. The journey for creating such models are not free from challenges. One such challenge is the availability of data. The majority of data that are available are generated by the OECD countries. According to Internet Society (Internet Society, 2024), approximately half of the population that is 3.6 billion people are still not connected with the internet across the globe and maximum of these resides in the global south countries primarily in Africa, Asia and South America. So the hurdle here is not only the from which part of the globe (north or south) data is getting generated but also the which data are being used by the AI models for the learning process through the feedback mechanism. Another challenge is the question of accountability and transparency. Transparency and accountability play a crucial role in addressing cultural bias in large language models (LLMs). Transparency involves the obligation of developers to reveal their data sources, training processes, and any inherent biases present in their models. Accountability, on the other hand, signifies that developers must take responsibility for the performance and consequences of their models. By embracing transparency and accountability, developers can cultivate user trust and facilitate informed decision-making when users engage with content generated by LLMs. So it's very important here to understand that the training data must strictly include datasets from the cultural contexts of the tribal people, oral histories, and local traditions to promote inclusivity and equitable distribution of social justice. Through the help of deep-learning and analysis of these datasets, AI can identify patterns and construct balanced narratives that represent the viewpoints of all involved stakeholders in the deadlock, thereby freeing it from the impact of cultural biases that human possesses. Also sometimes data which is available on the internet is itself misrepresent and ignore the nuances of the diverse communities. So it is equally important to go through the process of filtration and augmentation of the data so that it can be trained for proper responses. The development of such models requires collaboration with cultural anthropologists, linguists, and regional specialists to ensure that the datasets are both representative, inclusive and free from bias. Sophisticated Natural Language Processing (NLP) techniques extensively trained on the tribal dialects can be utilized to identify and mitigate culturally biased language, thereby promoting fairness, equity and level playing field in dialogue exchange. Furthermore, AI systems can be engineered to emulate empathy by recognizing the emotional nuances in communications from different stakeholders. This ability can help bridge understanding gaps and cultivate trust among disputing parties. Ultimately, AI's capacity to mediate without cultural biases can contribute to conflict resolution and the advancement of solutions that are both just and culturally attuned.

The approachability and accessibility of AI models are fundamentally linked to their capacity to engage with a wide range of audiences, especially those from diverse backgrounds. in the context of the Siang River dams, AI technologies can craft narratives that reflect the values, traditions, and environmental concerns of indigenous communities. By producing content in local dialects, employing culturally relevant metaphors, and addressing particular issues pertinent to these communities, AI models can build trust and encourage substantive dialogue between the stakeholders. This culturally sensitive communication not only improves accessibility but also ensures that AI aligns with the real-life experiences of its users. Furthermore, inclusivity can be advanced by creating AI interfaces that are intuitive and capable of representing a variety of perspectives. For instance, narratives generated by AI regarding the Siang River dams can weave together tribal ecological insights with technical justifications for development, offering a holistic and balanced view of the situation with articulately crafting the potential gains and harms. This approach ensures that all stakeholders feel acknowledged and valued, which can mitigate opposition to proposed initiatives. Additionally, AI models can employ visual aids, interactive features, and localized storytelling methods to present complex information in a way that is comprehensible to all parties involved. Further, AI integrating all the authentic data sources like – Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) reports, geological reports, seismological reports etc. can bring better understanding and assessment to a single table for all the stakeholders which will further facilitate the approachability of the AI models. To improve accessibility, it is also essential to tackle gaps in digital literacy. Training initiatives can be established to educate communities about AI tools and their advantages. By

engaging community representatives in the design and implementation of these models, AI systems can be customized to meet the unique needs and values of the intended audience. This collaborative strategy not only enhances accessibility but also bolsters the credibility of AI as a facilitator in addressing social challenges. AI models can be designed in such a way that it can be more empathetic so that it have the capacity to understand the sensitiveness of all the stakeholders ranging from ecological, cultural, developmental, national security, energy security etc. which will increase the assurance, approachability and accessibility of the AI models especially in the case of imparting social justice.

Misinformation and disinformation represent substantial challenges to informed decision-making, especially regarding sensitive topics such as the construction of large-scale dams. Artificial intelligence (AI) can serve a crucial function in mitigating these challenges by examining misinformation patterns and actively producing fact-based narratives. For instance, AI can address false claims regarding the environmental consequences of dams by centering discussions on validated scientific evidence and presenting this data in a user-friendly manner. This proactive approach not only counters misleading narratives but also enhances public confidence in the information being shared. The capacity of AI to process extensive datasets in real-time allows it to identify and flag deceptive content effectively. This functionality can be utilized to develop platforms that emphasize accurate and impartial information. For example, AI systems can concurrently showcase both the developmental advantages and ecological issues associated with the Siang River dams, ensuring a balanced portrayal and encouraging constructive discussions. By organizing content to reduce polarization, AI can aid in building consensus and promoting solutions that are agreeable to all parties involved. Moreover, AI systems should tailor their narratives to enhance understanding and collaboration. By presenting issues in the context of common objectives, such as sustainable development, community participation and long-term community advantages, AI can cultivate a cooperative attitude among stakeholders. This strategy not only counters misinformation but also aligns with the tenets of ethical and social responsibility. Nonetheless, the deployment of AI in this arena must adhere to ethical standards, transparency, and accountability to avert misuse or the emergence of new biases which can be very well adjusted through the proper regulatory guidelines for designing AI models, which aims to create a technological advancement along the ethical lines.

Conclusion

The results of this study highlight the critical necessity for a thorough understanding of the relationship between AI models and cultural bias. In pluralistic societies like Arunachal Pradesh, where there is a numerous tribes and sub-tribes with distinct language, culture and traditions coexist, the need of AI models with minimum cultural bias holds greater significance. Although considerable progress has been made in mitigating cultural biases within artificial intelligence systems, notable challenges remain, particularly concerning data processing and algorithmic design. These challenges can unintentionally reinforce biases, underscoring the importance of continuous improvement and ethical oversight in the development of AI technologies. To improve their effectiveness as facilitators in culturally sensitive matters, AI models should be extensively trained on datasets that encapsulate the rich diversity of cultures and perspectives they intend to represent. By incorporating tribal ecological knowledge alongside technical and developmental narratives, LLMs can encompass a broader spectrum of viewpoints. This inclusive strategy not only builds trust among various user groups but also increases the accessibility and user-friendliness of AI systems.

In a diverse society, such inclusivity is essential for achieving fair representation and promoting dialogue that honours the concerns of all stakeholders. Moreover, the democratization of information is contingent upon the reduction of cultural biases in AI models. When users view AI-generated content as equitable, accurate, and impartial, their trust in these systems is enhanced. This trust is vital for closing communication gaps, encouraging collaborative decision-making, and reinforcing democratic practices. However, AI systems must ensure that the information they generate is contextually appropriate and does not generalize the perspectives in ways that it could lead to social injustice. For example, addressing the unique ecological and cultural issues faced by tribal communities in relation to mega-dam projects necessitates content that resonates with their values and traditions of the culture rather than just presenting the scenario in the generalized context. AI models should have the capacity to transform itself from automation to auto-customize mode by identifying key cultural parameters while approaching to such sensitive matters.

The study concludes that AI models possess the capacity to significantly influence the mitigation of social chaos and advancement towards imparting the social justice. However, their implementation should adhere to ethical standards, transparency, and accountability. By emphasizing inclusivity, equity, and cultural awareness, artificial intelligence systems can play a crucial role in harmonizing development with social justice, thus strengthening democratic processes in societies characterized by cultural diversity.

References

1. Al-Abdullatif, Ahlam M. (2023). Modeling students' perceptions of chatbots in learning: Integrating technology acceptance with the value-based adoption model. Education Sciences https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13111151
2. Araujo, T., Helberger, N., Kruikemeier, S., & De Vreese, C. H. (2020). In AI we trust? Perceptions about automated decision-making by artificial intelligence. *AI & Society*, *35*(3), 611–623. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-019-00931-w
3. Arora A, Kaffee L-A, Augenstein I. 2023. Probing pre-trained language models for cross-cultural differences in values. In: Proceedings of the first workshop on cross-cultural considerations in NLP (C3NLP). p. 114–130; Dubrovnik, Croatia: Association for Computational Linguistics https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2311.14096
4. Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big? In *FAccT '21: Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 610–623). https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922
5. Bergman, R. (2023, February). *ChatGPT and Mediation*. Mediate.com. https://mediate.com/chatgpt-and-mediation/
6. Bianchi, F., Kalluri, P., Durmus, E., Ladhak, F., Cheng, M., Nozza, D., Hashimoto, T., Jurafsky, D., Zou, J., & Caliskan, A. (2023). Easily accessible Text-to-Image generation amplifies demographic stereotypes at large scale. *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 1493–1504. https://doi.org/10.1145/3593013.3594095
7. Blasi, D., Anastasopoulos, A., & Neubig, G. (2022). Systematic Inequalities in Language Technology Performance across the World's Languages. *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 5486–5505. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.376
8. CloudMoyo. (2023, April 4). 7 Reasons to Use ChatGPT (& 5 Reasons You Shouldn't) *CloudMoyo* - . https://www.cloudmoyo.com/blogs/7-reasons-to-use-chatgpt-5-reasons-you-shouldnt/#:~:text=ChatGPT%20is%20a%20powerful%20tool,efficiency%2C%20personalization%2C%20and%20analytics.
9. Davani, A., Díaz, M., Baker, D., & Prabhakaran, V. (2024). Disentangling Perceptions of offensiveness: cultural and moral correlates. *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, *60*, 2007–2021. https://doi.org/10.1145/3630106.3659021
10. Dobrijević, G., & Đoković, F. (2020). E-Negotiation: Can artificial intelligence negotiate better deals? In *International Scientific Conference on Information Technology and Data Related Research*. https://doi.org/10.15308/sinteza-2020-289-294
11. Von Eschenbach, W. J. (2021). Transparency and the black box problem: Why we do not trust AI. *Philosophy & Technology*, *34*(4), 1607–1622. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-021-00477-0
12. European Commission. 2024, January 31. A European approach to artificial intelligence. https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/european-approach-artificial-intelligence
13. Fard, A. E., & Lingeswaran, S. (2020). Misinformation Battle Revisited: Counter Strategies from Clinics to Artificial Intelligence. *Companion Proceedings of the the Web Conference 2018*. https://doi.org/10.1145/3366424.3384373
14. Filho, H. a. F. (2024). Making sense of negotiation and AI: The blossoming of a new collaboration. *Journal of Strategic Contracting and Negotiation*. https://doi.org/10.1177/20555636241269270
15. Gelfand, M. J., Raver, J. L., Nishii, L., Leslie, L. M., Lun, J., Lim, B. C., Duan, L., Almaliach, A., Ang, S., Arnadottir, J., Aycan, Z., Boehnke, K., Boski, P., Cabecinhas, R., Chan, D., Chhokar, J., D'Amato, A., Ferrer, M. S., Fischlmayr, I. C., . . . Yamaguchi, S. (2011). Differences between tight and loose cultures: a 33-Nation study. *Science*, *332*(6033), 1100–1104. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1197754
16. Hancock, J. T., Naaman, M., & Levy, K. (2019). AI-Mediated Communication: definition, research agenda, and ethical Considerations. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *25*(1), 89–100. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmz022
17. Jenks, C. J. (2024). Communicating the cultural other: trust and bias in generative AI and large language models. *Applied Linguistics Review*. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2024-0196
18. Lamiroy, M. (2023, January). *ChatGPT for Lawyers | Lamiroy Consulting Blog*. Lamiroy Consulting Blog. https://www.lamiroy.com/blog/chatgpt-for-lawyers/
19. Liu, Z. (2024). Cultural Bias in Large Language Models: A Comprehensive Analysis and Mitigation Strategies. *Journal of Transcultural Communication*. https://doi.org/10.1515/jtc-2023-0019
20. Logg, J. M., Minson, J. A., & Moore, D. A. (2019). Algorithm appreciation: People prefer algorithmic to human judgment. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *151*, 90–103. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2018.12.005
21. Melamed, J. (2023, April). Optimization in Mediation and Artificial Intelligence. Mediate.com. https://mediate.com/optimizing-ai-in-mediation/
22. Muller, C., & De Vasconcelos Aguiar, J. P. (2023, August 31). *What is the digital divide? - internet society*. Internet Society. https://www.internetsociety.org/blog/2022/03/what-is-the-digital-divide/

23. Schneider, B. (2022). Multilingualism and AI: The Regimentation of Language in the age of Digital Capitalism. *Signs and Society*, *10*(3), 362–387. https://doi.org/10.1086/721757
24. Tao, Y., Viberg, O., Baker, R. S., & Kizilcec, R. F. (2024). Cultural bias and cultural alignment of large language models. *PNAS Nexus*, *3*(9). https://doi.org/10.1093/pnasnexus/pgae346
25. Thoppilan, R., Daniel, D. F., Hall, J., Shazeer, N., Kulshreshtha, A., Cheng, H., Jin, A., Bos, T., Baker, L., Du, Y., Li, Y., Lee, H., Zheng, H. S., Ghafouri, A., Menegali, M., Huang, Y., Krikun, M., Lepikhin, D., Qin, J., . . . Le, Q. (2022). LAMDA: Language Models for Dialog Applications. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2201.08239
26. Weisheit, S., & Salger, C. (2023, June). *Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Mediation – ChatGPT as Mediator 4.0*. Mediate.com. https://mediate.com/artificial-intelligence-ai-in-mediation-chatgpt-as-mediator-4-0/