ELWAHAT Journal for Research and Studies
Available online at https://www.asjp.cerist.dz/en/PresentationRevue/2

ISSN : 1112-7163 E-ISSN: 2588-1892 Volume (18)/Issue (2) (2025):88-107

Curated-Monitored Language and the Restriction of Meaning in the Digital Sphere: A Descriptive-Analytical Study of Pragmatic Constraint and the Formation of Linguistic Bubbles within the Smart Media Economy - the Blockout 2024 Campaign as a Model

Selma Ben Melit

University of August 20, 1955, Skikda (Algeria), Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Laboratory of Media and Communication Studies
s.benmelit@univ-skikda.dz

Received: 20-07-2025 Accepted: 10-10-2025 Published**:** 01-12-2025

Abstract:

This study analyzes the Blockout 2024 campaign as a significant case of how political expression is shaped within AI-driven digital environments. It explores the construction and restriction of meaning through curated language strategies like repetition, reduction, and omission, particularly across platforms, such as Twitter, Instagram, and TikTok. The research examines the symbolic and rhetorical tools—including images, slogans, and hashtags— that encode protest discourse. It highlights algorithmic censorship mechanisms, such as content deletion and restricted visibility that reshape meaning as well as limit interpretive reach. The study also investigates how algorithmic logic reinforces discursive closure and reduces dialogic diversity. Methodologically, it adopts an interdisciplinary approach combining digital sociology, semiotics, and discourse analysis, supported by precise statistical tools. The latter provides in-depth insights into protest discourse under algorithmic governance.

Keyword: Algorithmic censorship, curated-monitored language, Linguistic bubble, pragmatic constraint, smart media economy

1. Introduction:

Amid the profound transformations reshaping the digital sphere, language is no longer merely a tool for expression, it has evolved into a monitored communicative architecture, governed by the authority of

Corresponding Author: Selma Ben Melit, s.benmelit@univ-skikda.dz

algorithms and procedural classification matrices that enforce standardized models of speech and comprehension. The production of meaning is now contingent upon what can be circulated without censorship or encoded within linguistic frameworks capable of bypassing automated and platform-based surveillance technologies, this shift has given rise to hybrid linguistic patterns referred to as Curated Language—a tactical response to the dominant digital actors that regulate the flow of discourse, within this framework, the sociolinguistic dimension converges with the architecture of the smart media economy, where content is not only shaped by the logic of influence but also by algorithms of selection, direction, and suppression, This dynamic reconfigures the discursive sphere into what can be termed a Linguistic Bubble.

The Blockout2024 campaign offers a vivid case study of this phenomenon, serving as fertile ground for the emergence of encrypted, pragmatic, and semiotic language strategies aimed at circumventing algorithmic repression while preserving the protestive and interactive core of the discourse. This study undertakes a comprehensive analysis of the mechanisms of pragmatic censorship, the rhetoric of algorithmic exclusion, and the evolving boundaries of language as a tool of digital resistance. It seeks to establish a rigorous scholarly understanding of meaning constraint—not merely as an institutional act, but as a socio-cultural practice that crystallizes at the intersection of power, technology, and discursive identity in the age of intelligent media.

2. Problem Statement:

The contemporary digital sphere is undergoing profound transformations in its discursive and linguistic structures. Language is no longer a free expressive tool; rather, it has been operationalized within intelligent systems that rigorously reshape discourse according to algorithmic logic—particularly within a smart media economy driven by targeting, filtering, and data extraction. Within this context, language is reengineered in accordance with the imperatives of digital control, giving rise to what can be termed Curated and Monitored Language: a linguistic architecture produced within digital environments that subject human expression to invisible forms of surveillance and semantic reproduction dictated by filtering algorithms, platform constraints, and the political economy of

attention. These manufactured linguistic structures result in the restriction of discursive meaning, narrowing the range of expressive and interpretive possibilities. As a consequence, Linguistic Bubbles—closed semantic environments—emerge, reproducing discourse within epistemological and ideological echo chambers shaped by platform logic and sustained through algorithmic repetition, these shifts in the nature of digital language raise critical questions about discursive authority, the transformation of symbolic production, and the boundaries of linguistic agency within a communicative space governed by algorithmic systems. Accordingly, this phenomenon necessitates a sociolinguistic and pragmatic inquiry capable of unpacking new modalities of symbolic domination and analyzing the interplay between language and meaning in an era of automated surveillance and control.

Building on this context, the present study is guided by the following core research question:

What is the nature of curated and monitored linguistic structures within the digital space of smart media platforms, and how do they contribute to the restriction of discursive meaning and the formation of closed linguistic bubbles in the case of the Blockout2024 campaign?

This central question branches into the following sub-questions:

- ✓ What are the dominant linguistic and pragmatic patterns found in the digital discourse surrounding the Blockout2024 campaign on smart media platforms?
- ✓ What are the semiotic and rhetorical features of curated and monitored language as manifested in posts and interactions related to the campaign?
- ✓ What indicators point to algorithmic censorship interventions in the campaign's content (e.g., deletion, shadow banning, suppression of hashtags, or restriction of reach)?
- ✓ How have algorithmic mechanisms reshaped the meaning of the Blockout2024 campaign and directed its semantic trajectory across platforms?
- ✓ What role have linguistic repetitions and trending hashtags played in the production of closed Linguistic Bubbles around the campaign's discourse?
- ✓ How have power relations among users (activists), platforms, and algorithms been manifested in the management of the campaign's digital discourse?

3. **Significance of the Study**:

This study derives its significance from its position at the intersection of a complex epistemological triad: linguistic transformations within the digital environment, algorithmic control over meaning, and the articulation of discourse within the smart media economy, in a context increasingly defined by algorithmic interventions in shaping discursive interactions, digital language can no longer be considered a neutral medium of communication. Instead, it has become a battleground for pragmatic struggles and invisible mechanisms of control that reproduce power through systematic linguistic filtering and selection. The importance of this study lies in its aim to deconstruct the notion of Curated and Monitored Language as a novel semiotic and pragmatic phenomenon through which meaning is directed and molded within automated communicative spaces. These spaces subject language to the policies of platforms, market logics, and algorithmic selectivity.

From an applied perspective, the study gains relevance by analyzing the Blockout2024 campaign as an empirical case that reflects emerging forms of control and provides a fertile ground for testing hypotheses related to discursive restriction and the formation of linguistic bubbles, furthermore, the study offers an original contribution to understanding the mechanisms through which closed discursive repetition is generated and meaning is reproduced under algorithmic governance.

In doing so, it advances the development of new analytical tools suited to the nature of contemporary digital discourse and opens the door to critical reflections on the future of language, meaning, and power in intelligent communication environments.

4.Objectives of the Study:

- ✓ To analyze the linguistic and pragmatic structures present in the digital discourse related to the Blockout2024 campaign, by identifying the dominant linguistic patterns that shaped its content across various smart media platforms, and by describing the discursive formation mechanisms operating within automated digital environments.
- ✓ To explore the semiotic and rhetorical features of curated and monitored language through a detailed examination of the

expressive strategies and semiotic symbols employed in meaning-making throughout the campaign. This includes an analysis of the rhetorical and persuasive techniques embedded within discourses of censorship and algorithmic filtering.

- ✓ To identify indicators of algorithmic censorship affecting the campaign's linguistic content, by tracing the interventions of platforms—such as deletion, concealment, restricted access, or automated rewording—thus highlighting the invisible mechanisms that restructure meaning and frame user interaction.
- ✓ To examine the mechanisms of semantic reproduction within the framework of algorithmic selectivity, by investigating how algorithms contribute to interpretive guidance and how digital infrastructures participate in reframing the pragmatic dimensions of discourse.
- ✓ To assess the role of discursive repetition in the construction of closed linguistic bubbles, by analyzing recurring linguistic patterns and trending hashtags that facilitate the reproduction of enclosed and ideologically insulated discourse, thereby generating homogenous and isolated discursive environments.
- ✓ To deconstruct power relations among digital actors—namely users (activists), platforms, and algorithms—by critically examining the limits of linguistic expression in spaces governed by technical regulation and market logic, and by evaluating the tensions between linguistic freedom and the algorithmic governance of meaning within the digital public sphere.

5.Conceptual Definitions of the Study :

5.1 Curated-Monitored Language: this refers to a linguistic pattern produced within digital platforms governed by artificial intelligence and algorithmic systems, where content is surveilled and reshaped through mechanisms of selection and control (Aleksic, 2024, p. 48), in this context, language becomes a directed tool that no longer necessarily reflects the speaker's intent but is reformulated according to technical and market-oriented criteria that serve the interests of the platform. (Gillespie, 2018, p. 14)

Operationally, it encompasses all observable linguistic phenomena within the Blockout2024 campaign content that reflect the subjection of discourse to mechanisms of algorithmic selection, deletion,

filtering, or redirection—such as standardized vocabulary, recurring hashtags, or reformulated expressions.

5.2Pragmatic Constraint : Refers to the restriction of language's ability to perform its communicative functions within digital spaces due to the intervention of digital mechanisms (Herring, 2013, p. 129) (algorithms, filtering systems, technical censorship) that limit the diversity of intentions and steer speech acts toward predetermined expressive patterns. (boyd, 2010, p. 45).

Operationally, it is measured by the extent to which the pragmatic dynamism of language within the campaign is diminished—evidenced by the dominance of repetitive or functionally narrow discursive forms, the disappearance of interpretive diversity, or the absence of multiple perspectives in digital posts and analyses.

5.3 Linguistic Bubble : Describes a condition of discursive closure in the digital sphere, in which individuals interact within homogenous discursive circles that continuously reproduce the same meanings and symbols, this is driven by algorithmic filtering and repetition mechanisms, which weaken critical interaction and reinforce discursive isolation. (Pariser, 2011, p. 12)

Operationally, it is assessed through the repetition of hashtags and phrases within the campaign content, discursive homogeneity, and the limited presence of pragmatic plurality in discussions—indicating the formation of a closed linguistic community that reproduces itself.

5.4 Smart Media Economy : An emerging media model based on leveraging artificial intelligence and algorithms in content production and distribution, whereby language and meaning are subordinated to market logics and optimized for maximum engagement, this is achieved through content personalization, attention steering, and data-driven targeting, operating through mechanisms of precision targeting and automated interactivity. (Srnicek, 2017, p. 65)

Operationally, it is reflected in the management of discourse within the Blockout2024 campaign across platforms such as Instagram, Twitter, and TikTok, by analyzing how attention is directed, priorities are ranked, and content is selectively promoted based on commercial criteria.

5.5 Algorithmic Censorship : A form of invisible control exerted by algorithms over digital content through techniques such as automated deletion, restricted reach, content concealment, or engagement suppression—without direct human oversight (Cobbe & Singh, 2020, p. 500)This mechanism reproduces power in a technical form that silently regulates meaning circulation. (Noble, 2018, p. 145)

Operationally, it is measured by observing instances of content deletion, suppression of hashtags or posts related to the campaign, and documenting concealment techniques or algorithmic visibility shifts that affect the reach and pragmatic impact of meaning.

6. Theoretical Approach:

This study adopts a Critical Socio-Pragmatic Approach, rooted in the convergence of contemporary sociolinguistic theories and digital discourse pragmatics. It conceptualizes language as a tool of domination and a mechanism for the reproduction of power within the smart media environment. This approach maintains that digital language is not a neutral symbolic system but a form of socially structured action, technologically mediated and governed by algorithmic systems that constrain meaning, classify agents, and redirect pragmatic intentions within automated production contexts. (Herring , 2004, p. 325)

From this standpoint, curated and monitored language becomes a manifestation of symbolic and epistemic power relations, generating linguistic bubbles that reflect the positioning of actors within closed digital structures. (Zuboff, 2019, p. 242)The approach draws upon key concepts from Speech Act Theory (Searle, Austin), Relevance Theory (Sperber & Wilson), and Digital Sociolinguistics (Herring, boyd), while also incorporating the sociological critique of platforms (Zuboff, Gillespie, Srnicek) to understand how language becomes subject to surveillance and algorithmic control within the frameworks of the attention economy and surveillance capitalism. (Pasquale, 2015, p. 101).

Applying this theoretical framework to the study, the research embraces a critical socio-pragmatic sociolinguistic perspective, positing that language within digital spaces is no longer a neutral or benign communicative medium but has been subjected to technological and market-driven structures through which new forms

of symbolic and epistemic domination are exercised. Based on this framework, three core theoretical hypotheses are proposed:

- ✓ Digital discourse is restructured within algorithmic networks that control its meaning and pragmatic context.
- ✓ Algorithms do not merely organize content but also reproduce power through invisible regulatory mechanisms that exert rhetorical and semiotic influence.
- ✓ These environments foster closed pragmatic spaces, producing so-called linguistic bubbles, wherein users are confined to repetitive and homogenized discursive patterns that reinforce polarization and undermine dialogic engagement.

7. Methodological Approach :

Given the nature of the research problem—which centers on deconstructing curated and monitored linguistic structures, analyzing forms of meaning restriction, and exploring the formation of linguistic bubbles within the digital campaign Blockout2024—this study adopts a qualitative descriptive-analytical method, supported by a discourse-pragmatic digital analysis framework. This approach is particularly well-suited, as it enables the researcher to provide a precise description of the linguistic and semiotic structures manifested in digital discourse and to analyze them within the technical and algorithmic contexts in which they emerge. Furthermore, it facilitates a deeper understanding of how meaning is constructed and directed within communicative environments governed by platform logics and automated surveillance mechanisms. This aligns with the dual requirements of sociolinguistic and pragmatic analysis.

The methodology relies on qualitative tools such as discourse content analysis, pragmatic framing, and semiotic deconstruction, allowing for the tracking of selection and filtering indicators such as deletion, repetition, rephrasing, and discursive closure. It is also consistent with the nature of the study's hypotheses, which do not seek quantitative causal relationships, but rather aim to explore the dynamics of language and meaning production within a complex digital context where algorithmic power operates within a smart media economy. Thus, the adoption of this methodology is grounded in a scientific rationale that responds to: the nature of the topic, its pragmatic and semiotic dimensions, and its applied model based on the analysis of a real-world digital campaign.

8. Research Corpus :

The research corpus in this study comprises digitally mediated discursive content related to the Blockout2024 campaign, including posts, tweets, and textual materials disseminated across key smart media platforms such as X (formerly Twitter), Instagram, and TikTok . This corpus is methodologically appropriate, as it constitutes the actual communicative environment in which curated and monitored language, pragmatic constraints, and linguistic bubble formations manifest—core conceptual constructs that this study seeks to deconstruct and analyze.The selection of this corpus is grounded in the intersection between platform architecture and interactive discourse, where these platforms offer diverse patterns of automated linguistic interaction, shaped by algorithmic filtering and classification mechanisms.

9. Sample of the Study:

In line with the nature of the research problem addressed in this study—which aims to analyze the manifestations of curated and monitored language and the mechanisms of constraining pragmatic meaning within the Blockout2024 campaign—a purposive sample was adopted. This sample consists of a deliberately selected set of digital posts and interactive texts (tweets, posts, comments, hashtags, and visual-verbal slogans) circulated across three major platforms that represent the pillars of contemporary smart media: X (formerly Twitter), Instagram, and TikTok. The sampling focused on a specific time frame, from October to December 2024, during which the campaign reached its peak in terms of digital circulation and public engagement. The purposive sample is the most suitable choice for this context, due to the qualitative and analytical nature of the study and its direct focus on the linguistic and semiotic content produced within a specific digital environment. The aim is not statistical generalization, but rather theoretical and functional representation of textual categories that clearly embody the features of curated and surveilled digital language, and that reflect the hypotheses concerning the formation of linguistic and discursive bubbles in algorithmic spaces. The sampling process considered the diversity of interactions and rhetorical-pragmatic patterns, with particular emphasis on content that generated high levels of engagement (likes, shares, comments), or was subject to evident moderation (deletion, restriction, alteration).

9.1 Sample Size:

Given the qualitative and analytical nature of this study—which focuses on deconstructing curated and monitored linguistic structures and the formation of linguistic bubbles within the digital content of the Blockout2024 campaign—the sample size was determined based on the principle of theoretical saturation rather than conventional statistical calculation. In qualitative research, samples are not measured by numerical size but rather by their capacity to represent symbolic, semantic, and discursive diversity within the studied context. Accordingly, the study employed an analytical sample composed of 150 textual-interactive units, distributed across the three selected digital platforms: Twitter (X), Instagram, and TikTok. Specifically, the sample includes: 60 tweets from Twitter, 50 visual-verbal posts from Instagram, and 40 selected TikTok clips containing embedded slogans or symbolic language.

10. Data Collection Instrument:

This study employed content analysis as the primary data collection instrument, due to its methodological capacity to deconstruct the discursive, semiotic, and pragmatic structures embedded within the digital content of the Blockout2024 campaign. These structures are closely tied to practices of algorithmic curation and symbolic censorship, which give rise to what may be termed "curated and monitored language." Content analysis was chosen for its ability to provide deep, interpretive readings of meaning that transcend the surface levels of texts. It allows for the detection of recurrent linguistic patterns, as well as the mechanisms of deletion, concealment, and reformulation enacted by smart media platforms. This method is particularly compatible with a sociolinguistic approach that aims to dismantle the symbolic authority of language and analyze pragmatic structures within automated digital environments.

10.1 Unit of Analysis: The study adopted the Interactive Textual Unit as its basic unit of analysis. This includes:

- ✓ A standalone tweet or a connected thread on Twitter (X)
- ✓ A textual or visual post on Instagram, including its interactive comments
- ✓ A short video on TikTok that features linguistic-semiotic elements (e.g., speech, captions, hashtags)

10.2 Content Analysis Categories: The analysis categories were organized into three intersecting dimensions that reflect the core research domains:

- ✓ Linguistic–Pragmatic Category: Directive or mobilizing speech acts; forms of protest and dissent; the use of symbolic or encrypted language; pragmatic formulations prone to deletion or user reporting.
- ✓ Semiotic–Rhetorical Category: Visual symbols with ideological charge; the interplay between image and text in meaning-making; the use of metaphorical and rhetorical figures.
- ✓ Algorithmic–Censorship Category: Indicators of automated restriction, deletion, or reporting; presence of platform-imposed moderation cues (e.g., hidden posts, content warnings); reformulations or linguistic strategies used to circumvent digital censorship.

This instrument—with its carefully defined units and categories—enables an in-depth analysis that contributes to the understanding of meaning-making mechanisms within a digital environment where language is subject to technological and market-driven constraints. Such a framework aligns precisely with the study's objectives, research questions, and the formation of linguistic bubbles in the smart media economy.

11. Instrument Validity and Reliability Instrument Validity:

Validity is one of the most critical methodological criteria for evaluating the quality of data collection tools. It refers to the extent to which an instrument accurately measures the studied phenomenon and reflects the conceptual reality it belongs to. Within the framework of this study—which adopts a qualitative–quantitative content analysis approach to digital discourses using semiotic and pragmatic analytical tools—instrument validity was ensured through both face validity and content validity. The analytical categories were constructed based on the theoretical foundation of the study and the conceptual framework of constrained digital discourse, in alignment with the research objectives and questions. This approach guarantees comprehensive coverage and ensures the interpretive adequacy of the proposed analytical categories.

The content analysis form was submitted to a panel of experts specializing in digital media, discourse analysis, and pragmatic linguistics, who reviewed it for logical consistency and structural representation of categories and units of analysis. Their evaluations confirmed that the instrument accurately represents the domains of the studied phenomenon—namely, the rhetoric of constraint and the disassembly of the tongue—while also accounting for the semiotic and pragmatic relationships embedded within digital content in smart media environments. This reinforces the conceptual and content validity of the instrument. Therefore, the tool's validity in this study extends beyond structural and formal verification to include the functional manifestation of the analytical categories within the digital communication environment, ensuring theoretical-field alignment and lending scientific credibility to the anticipated findings.

12. Instrument Reliability: To verify the reliability of the content analysis instrument developed for this study—designed to measure the pragmatic and semiotic dimensions of digital media discourse within an artificial intelligence-mediated environment—the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used to assess internal consistency across the analytical categories. The reliability analysis yielded the following values:

Table 01: Overall Reliability Coefficient (Cronbach's Alpha) of the Content Analysis Instrument Based on the Interactive Textual Unit and the Three Analytical Categories Across Digital Platforms (Twitter, Instagram, TikTok)

Analytical Category	No. of Items	α Twitter	α Instagram	α TikTok	Overall α
Linguistic-Pragmatic Category	6	0.869	0.855	0.847	0.857
Semiotic-Rhetorical Category	5	0.838	0.824	0.812	0.825
Algorithmic-Censorship Category	5	0.854	0.840	0.827	0.840
Overall	16	—	—	—	0.848

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on the outputs of SPSS v25

The elevated overall reliability coefficient (α = 0.848) indicates a high degree of internal consistency for the content analysis tool, underscoring the stability and credibility of the analytical indicators across the three platforms. The highest alpha value was observed in the Linguistic–Pragmatic category (α = 0.857), reflecting the clarity and precision of the linguistic constructions used for directives, mobilization, and pragmatic encoding. These indicators are particularly sensitive to digital communicative contexts. Likewise, the Semiotic and Algorithmic-Censorship categories also yielded high reliability coefficients, further supporting the tool's validity in capturing elements of visual meaning and manifestations of digital regulation—especially within platforms characterized by fluid algorithmic and interactive dynamics, such as Instagram and TikTok. These findings confirm that the tool was developed through a methodologically rigorous process that accounted for the integration of all three analytical dimensions, thereby establishing its suitability for measuring the interrelated textual, visual, and algorithmic interactions that shape the discourse of contemporary digital campaigns.

13. Applied Dimension of the Study:

13.1 Technical Overview of the Blockout2024 :

Campaign Blockout2024 was a global digital movement that gained momentum in the context of the Israeli assault on Gaza in 2024. The campaign was spearheaded by activists and users across various social media platforms—particularly TikTok, Instagram, and Twitter—with the aim of exerting symbolic and moral pressure on celebrities and influencers who remained silent about the ongoing violations or who demonstrated implicit or explicit alignment with the aggressor. The campaign is built around the strategy of "digital blocking" or "symbolic boycott" through the mass use of the block feature, constituting a decentralized collective response to media complicity and elite silence. The significance of this campaign lies in its role as a sociolinguistic model of interactive resistance within the digital sphere. It redefined the meaning of digital silence, transforming it from a personal stance into a socially condemned sign. The campaign also revealed new discursive dynamics in which language, imagery, and hashtags are deployed as tools of symbolic and moral counter-

restraint—what may be described as a form of "intelligent grassroots cancel economy."

13.2 Discussion and analysis of results:

Table 02: Statistical Distribution of the Linguistic–Pragmatic Category by Platform

Subcategory	Twitter	Instagram	TikTok	Total	Percentage (%)	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Symbolic Language / Encoding	30	15	10	55	36.67%	18.33	8.50
Objection / Resistance Expressions	18	15	12	45	30.00%	15.00	6.25
Mobilization / Calls to Action	6	12	12	30	20.00%	10.00	3.46
Pragmatic Deletion / Reportable Expressions	6	8	6	20	13.33%	6.67	1.15
Total — Linguistic–Pragmatic Category	60	50	40	150	100.00%	—	—

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on the outputs of SPSS v25

The quantitative distribution of the Linguistic–Pragmatic category reveals that Twitter ranked highest in the use of symbolic and encoded language, with 30 tweets out of a total of 60 (50%). This reflects a highly encrypted expressive mode likely adopted to evade algorithmic censorship. Instagram, by contrast, exhibited a balanced deployment of symbolic language (15) and objection/resistance expressions (15), indicating a dual visual–verbal strategy in framing protest discourse. Meanwhile, TikTok showed stronger representation in the categories of mobilization/calls to action and objection (12 each out of a total of

40), suggesting a reliance on dynamic and visual content to activate rapid forms of digital mobilization and collective persuasion. The highest standard deviation recorded in the "symbolic language" category (8.50) points to significant variation across platforms in the use of this discursive mode, whereas the low deviation in the "pragmatic deletion" category (1.15) indicates a high degree of convergence among platforms in the minimal use of this pattern. Taken together, these findings suggest that the campaign's digital ecosystem strategically leveraged the rhetoric of encryption and mobilization, with relative variation across platforms reflecting the affordances and constraints unique to each medium in processing and circulating distinct discursive forms.

Table 03: Statistical Distribution of the Semiotic–Rhetorical Category by Platform

Subcategory	Twitter	Instagram	Tik Tok	Total	Percentage (%)	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Image–Text Relationship	12	25	13	50	33.33%	16.67	5.51
Charged Visual Symbols	15	13	12	40	26.67%	13.33	1.53
Hybrid Rhetorical Techniques	18	10	7	35	23.33%	11.67	4.58
Metaphors and Allegorical Expressions	15	2	8	25	16.67%	8.33	5.25
Total – Semiotic–Rhetorical Category	60	50	40	150	100.00%	—	—

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on the outputs of SPSS v25

The results reveal a strong presence of the Image–Text Relationship category on Instagram, with 25 out of 50 posts (50%), aligning with the platform's inherently visual nature. Here, text–visual combinations play a pivotal role in conveying encrypted meanings and embedding ideological discourse within an indirect expressive framework.

Twitter, on the other hand, leans toward hybrid rhetoric, evidenced by 18 out of 60 tweets that integrate condensed linguistic expressions with carefully selected symbols, reflecting a high-density linguistic economy suited to the tweet's format and textual constraints. Moreover, the employment of metaphor and semantic manipulation accounts for 25% of Twitter's tweets, indicating a rhetorical strategy that capitalizes on the power of insinuation. For TikTok, the Image–Text Relationship and Charged Visual Symbols categories appear in near-equal proportions (13 and 12 out of 40 clips, respectively), highlighting a reliance on dynamic visual combinations for meaning production, particularly within digital resistance contexts that necessitate symbolic condensation without explicit declaration. The high standard deviation in Metaphors and Allegorical Expressions (5.25) points to significant variation among platforms in employing this pattern, as it appears marginalized on Instagram compared to Twitter and TikTok. Conversely, the low deviation in Charged Visual Symbols (1.53) reflects a consistent pattern of usage across all three platforms. These findings collectively indicate a nuanced and strategic deployment of semiotic–rhetorical media, aligned with the distinctive characteristics of each platform: while Instagram is dominated by integrated image–text content, Twitter is distinguished by metaphorical and hybrid rhetoric, and TikTok intensifies its presence through dynamic symbolic visual expressions tailored to the nature of short, direct video content.

Table 04: **Statistical Distribution of the Algorithmic–Regulatory Category by Platform**

Subcategory	Twitter	Instagram	TikTok	Total	Percentage (%)	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Overt Censorship Indicators	25	10	10	45	30.00%	15.00	8.66
Reformulation/ Rephrasing	20	12	10	42	28.00%	14.00	5.29
Dissemination Restriction	10	15	13	38	25.33%	12.67	2.52
Automated Deletion/Reporting	5	13	7	25	16.67%	8.33	4.16

Total – Algorithmic–Regulatory Category	60	50	40	150	100.00 %	—	—

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on the outputs of SPSS v25

The results of the table highlight a clear dominance of Twitter in overt censorship indicators, with 25 instances recorded out of 60 tweets (41.6%) involving explicit warnings, blocks, or alert notifications. This prevalence is attributed to the sensitivity of hashtags and high reporting rates, especially in campaigns of a political nature or those opposing traditional media institutions. Conversely, dissemination restriction is notably prominent on Instagram (15 cases) and TikTok (13 cases), where algorithms operate invisibly to reduce content reach, particularly when using banned hashtags or repeatedly posting visual content classified as violating guidelines. This form of censorship is covert yet effective, adversely impacting the dynamics of organic content spread. The reformulation category appears as an interactive mechanism to counteract censorship across all platforms, particularly on Twitter (20 cases), where users resort to modifying terms or altering symbols and spellings to evade automated filtering. Instagram and TikTok also demonstrate a moderate presence of this strategy, reflecting a growing digital awareness to resist automated filtering. It is noteworthy that automated deletion/reporting is more prevalent on Instagram (13 cases), indicating an active role of collective reporting mechanisms or preventive censorship compared to other platforms. Statistically, the high standard deviation in overt censorship indicators (8.66) reveals significant variance among platforms, with Twitter uniquely characterized by its high incidence rate. In contrast, the low deviation in dissemination restriction (2.52) suggests stability of this regulatory pattern across platforms, indicating it as a quasi-constant digital censorship method. These findings clearly reveal divergent patterns of digital censorship across platforms: overt and reactive censorship intensifies on Twitter, while silent/algorithmic censorship dominates on Instagram and TikTok. Furthermore, the data underscore the evolving user strategies of re-encoding and reformulation to circumvent deletion or suppression of reach, reflecting a complex interactive structure wherein automated regulatory behaviour intertwines with the discursive practices of activists.

14. Study Results:

- ✓ Content analysis of the interactive discourse surrounding the Blockout2024 campaign revealed that the selected and regulated linguistic structures tend to constrain pragmatic meaning through the adoption of reductive discourse and systematic symbolic condensation. This contributes to the formation of closed semantic patterns that reproduce ideas within a limited discursive space, thereby supporting the hypothesis of the emergence of digital "linguistic bubbles."
- ✓ It was found that the dominant linguistic and pragmatic patterns in the campaign's digital discourse rely on direct propaganda lexicon and easily recyclable militant slogans (e.g., "Boycott," "Don't Stay Silent," "Participate"), reflecting a clear response to the demands of the digital economy predicated on attention economy and pragmatic reduction.
- ✓ Semiotic and rhetorical analyses demonstrated that the selected language is characterized by dense symbolism and constructivism through the strategic use of emotive imagery (victims, blood, flags, masks), alongside repetitive hashtags that function as powerful framing mechanisms directing meaning.
- ✓ The study identified significant indicators of algorithmic censorship, manifested in the partial or total removal of hashtags, reduced reach, and interaction disruption. These practices reshape reception according to covert regulatory mechanisms that control meaning and limit its dissemination across platforms.
- ✓ It was evident that digital algorithms contribute to reshaping pragmatic meaning by prioritizing certain content over others through access arrangements and display hierarchies. This bias is reflected in the systematic privileging of some discursive interactions while marginalizing others, reinforcing the hypothesis of invisible censorship.
- ✓ The findings showed that linguistic repetition, reliance on popular hashtags, and circular discourse led to the creation of closed discursive spaces with similar linguistic structures, fostering communicative closure and constraining semantic plurality. This substantiates the concept of the "linguistic bubble" within smart media.
- ✓ The study concluded that the discursive structure of the Blockout2024 campaign reflects a pragmatic struggle between users and algorithms, where algorithms continuously redirect discourse according to digital power dynamics, revealing a clear

divergence between users' intentions and platform governance. This raises critical questions about the limits of freedom of expression in digital spaces governed by artificial intelligence.

15. Conclusion:

In light of the analytical and statistical findings, the Blockout2024 campaign stands as a significant case reflecting transformations in digital discourse within the realm of smart media. The campaign demonstrates how selected linguistic structures intersect with algorithmic platform logic, producing new discursive patterns characterized by reduction, repetition, and symbolic condensation. The study reveals that, despite its activist and rights-based orientation, the campaign does not operate outside the framework of soft surveillance imposed by digital platforms—whether via algorithmic tools or closed communicative architectures. The results affirm that the digital sphere does not generate meaning freely and openly; rather, it reshapes it according to technical parameters governed by artificial intelligence and the dynamics of the news economy.

Moreover, the language employed in campaign content functions not merely as a means of expression but is also subject to programmed selection mechanisms that steer its discursive trajectory and reframe it within narrowly defined linguistic bubbles. The study also reveals a clear rupture in power dynamics within the digital space—between user agency and platform authority—where algorithms emerge as a mediating force that recalibrates discourse and limits its circulation under the pretext of security or implicit alg
orithmic rationality.

References:

1. Aleksic, A , Algospeak, How social media is transforming the future of language, Basic Books.2024.
2. Gillespie, T, Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, content moderation, and the hidden decisions that shape social media, Yale University Press,2018.
3. boyd, d , Social network sites as networked publics: Affordances, dynamics, and implications. In Z. Papacharissi, Routledge,2010.
4. Herring, S. C , Discourse in Web 2.0: Familiar, reconfigured, and emergent. In D. Tannen & A. M. Tester (Eds.), *The* handbook of discourse analysis ,2nd ed, Wiley-Blackwell,2013.
5. Pariser,E ,The filter bubble: What the Internet is hiding from *you*, Penguin Press,2011.
6. Srnicek, N, Platform capitalism, Polity Press,2017.
7. Cobbe, J, & Singh, J, Algorithmic censorship by social platforms: Power and resistance. Philosophy & Technology, 33(4), 2020.
8. Noble, S. U, Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism, NYU Press,2018.
9. Herring, S. C , Computer-mediated discourse analysis: An approach to researching online behavior. In S. A. Barab, R. Kling, & J. H. Gray , Cambridge University Press, 2004.
10. Zuboff, S, The age of surveillance capitalism*:* The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power, PublicAffairs.2019.
11. Pasquale, F, The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information, Harvard University Press.2015.