



Prifysgol Cymru
Y Drindod Dewi Sant
University of Wales
Trinity Saint David

BA (Hons) Professional Communication

Assignment:	COMPONENT 2: Critical Essay-Communication, Media and Meaning
Name & ID:	Choong Jern Liang & 2528103
Student Email:	2528103@student.uwtsd.ac.uk
Subject & Code:	MWPC4005 Ways of Seeing

PREPARED FOR:

Kylie Boon

SUBMISSION DATE:

14th of September 2026

Table Of Content

Content	Pages
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Algorithms and the Public Mind	1 - 2
2.0 AI and the Crisis of Trust	3 - 4
3.0 Emotion and Fake Reality in the Post-Truth Era	4 - 5
4.0 Shift of Trust: Human Institutions to Algorithms	5 - 6
5.0 Evaluating How Media Shapes Knowledge	6 - 7
6.0 Structural Impact & Next Steps	8
7.0 Conclusion	9
8.0 References	10 - 11

Rethinking Trust in Communication in the Age of AI

1.0 Introduction

Modern media forms a clear contradiction: even though information is more accessible today than ever before, society's trust in media, major institutions, and shared facts seems to be falling apart. As artificial intelligence models, automated tools, and smart algorithms become normal parts of daily communication, basic ways to check facts, establish truth, and find clear meaning are disrupted. This essay asks a central question: Is trust in human communication collapsing because of artificial intelligence and algorithmic media platforms?

Instead of treating this massive shift as a simple story of total collapse, this essay argues that trust in communication is actually being reshaped into a brand new framework. The sudden rise of AI content, automated social feeds, and engagement algorithms does not just eliminate trust out of nowhere. Rather, it exchanges old human-verified and consensus-based systems of credibility for new network-driven, algorithmic, and emotion-based systems of authority. By reviewing theories of the public sphere, technological determinism, hyperreality, post-truth ideas, and algorithmic governance, this research shows how digital systems create, spread, and validate modern knowledge when automated tools continuously shape meaning.

1.1 Algorithms and the Public Mind

To understand the trajectory of trust in media environments, it is necessary to examine how public discourse is organised and mediated by communication infrastructures. In classical democratic theory, public trust rests upon the existence of a shared, accessible space for deliberation. Jürgen Habermas described this space as the public sphere, a domain of social life where private individuals assemble to form public opinion through rational-critical debate, shielded from the direct control of administrative state authority or raw commercial power (Habermas, 1989). Crucial to Habermas's vision is the assumption of a shared communicative rationality, wherein actors engage in dialogue using mutually agreed-upon standards of evidence, logic, and factual reference.

In the contemporary landscape, however, algorithmic media systems have fundamentally altered the structural architecture of the public sphere. Commercial digital platforms operate on business models prioritised around user engagement, attention retention, and programmatic advertising monetisation. To maximise platform dwell time, algorithms filter, rank, and personalise information flows based on user profiling, dynamic feedback loops, and predictive behavioral analytics (Gillespie et al., 2014).

[Traditional Gatekeeping Model]

Institutional Sources / Journalists —> Editorial Verification —> Universal Broadcast Public Sphere

[Algorithmic Curation Model]

Data Inputs & User Behavior —> Algorithmic Personalization —> Fragmented Affective Echo Chambers

This transition from institutional editorial gatekeeping to automated algorithmic curation produces significant epistemic fragmentation. Eli Pariser's concept of the "filter bubble" illustrates how automated personalisation isolates users within customised informational ecosystems, systematically shielding them from opposing viewpoints or conflicting factual evidence (Pariser, 2011). Similarly, research into "echo chambers" demonstrates how networked platform architecture reinforces preexisting ideological biases through repetitive exposure to aligned content.

When citizens no longer share a common baseline of factual information, the Habermasian ideal of rational-critical discourse decomposes. Trust collapses not necessarily because individuals become inherently cynical, but because the systemic infrastructure required to negotiate shared truth has been replaced by algorithmic environments optimised for emotional polarisation and cognitive comfort over critical verification (Habermas, 1989).

2.0 AI and the Crisis of Trust

Algorithmic platforms split information into isolated streams. Meanwhile, generative artificial intelligence creates a different problem by making it hard to trust media itself. Tools like deepfakes, voice clones, and automated writers make fabricating realistic images, audio, and text cheap, fast, and easy to perform at scale.

This shift changes how we view documented facts. Historically, media scholar Walter Benjamin noted that copies reduced the uniqueness of art (Benjamin, 1936). Yet photos and audio recordings still held a direct link to real events. A photograph proved that something actually happened in a real place at a real time (Barthes, 1981). Generative tools destroy this link. When realistic photos, speech, and text are built out of thin air without a real event behind them, that physical connection vanishes.

Erosion of Media Veracity	
1. Loss of Indexicality	Synthetic media breaks the link between content and physical reality (Barthes, 1981).
2. Epistemic Volatility	Truth is separated from visual / auditory proof.
3. The Liar's Dividend	Real visual proof can be easily dismissed as "AI-generated" (Chesney & Citron, 2019).

This separation of visual or written representation from physical reality creates what Chesney and Citron call the "Liar's Dividend." As public awareness of generative AI and synthetic media spreads, bad actors and public figures gain the ability to dismiss real, authentic proof of wrong behavior by simply claiming that it is an AI-generated fake (Chesney & Citron, 2019).

As a result, the trust crisis works in two directions at the same time:

- **Pervasive Skepticism:** People struggle to check if real content is genuine, leading to a habit of doubting all news and media.
- **Pervasive Deniability:** Public figures use this widespread doubt to avoid accountability, ruining baseline standards of shared public truth.

Instead of trust being placed in false claims, trust in media systems completely disappears because the medium itself can no longer guarantee a reliable connection to actual facts.

3.0 Emotion and Fake Reality in the Post-Truth Era

How AI and algorithms destabilise truth reflects a cultural shift into the "post-truth" era. Post-truth does not mean facts disappeared; instead, it describes a climate where objective evidence matters less in shaping public views than emotional appeals, personal opinions, and group identity (McIntyre, 2018).

In modern digital spaces, high-emotion signals like anger, fear, validation, and surprise spread content much faster and wider than carefully verified factual news (Vosoughi et al., 2018). Algorithms built to keep users engaged automatically boost intense emotional posts. Consequently, these automated networks continuously fuel post-truth habits by favoring content that aligns with personal identity while hiding dry, neutral, and detailed reporting.

From the viewpoint of Jean Baudrillard's ideas on hyperreality, this trend represents the logical end result of media evolution. Baudrillard argued that modern culture has swapped out real-life experiences for media symbols, building a world where manufactured copies of reality feel far more convincing and significant to people than actual truth itself, which is a phenomenon called the simulacrum (Baudrillard, 1994).

[Baudrillard's Orders of Simulacra]

Stage 1: Reflection (Sign reflects basic reality) —> Stage 2: Perversion (sign masks & perverts reality) —> Stage 3: Absence (Sign masks absence of basic reality) —> Stage 4: Pure Simulacrum (Sign bears no relation to any reality at all)

In the context of generative artificial intelligence and automated digital platform environments:

- AI systems generate writing, imagery, and online personas that function completely inside the boundaries of simulation.

- Conversational bots and synthetic internet personalities never reflect actual human life experience; instead, they combine statistical patterns drawn from enormous collections of digital text.
- Data flows through self-reinforcing cycles of artificial media, where hyperreal digital creations continuously fight to capture human focus.

When global communication channels operate mostly as simulated environments tailored for emotional impact, traditional frameworks of credibility based on real-world evidence, formal qualifications, and authoritative institutional checking can no longer explain how belief works. Personal confidence moves away from factual evidence toward emotional connection: people accept information not because it aligns with observable reality, but because it feels naturally right inside their curated cultural bubble.

4.0 Shift of Trust: Human Institutions to Algorithms

Is trust in communication facing total destruction, or is it undergoing a structural shift? Scholars of technology and culture argue that human societies rarely operate without trust. When established institutions lose credibility, trust does not disappear; it is redistributed to new systems, actors, and mechanisms (Botsman, 2017).

Historically, trust in communication was institutional and centralised. Publics relied on legacy intermediaries, such as mainstream news organisations, academic institutions, publishing houses, and regulatory bodies to act as authoritative gatekeepers who vetted information prior to publication. This institutional model relied on professional norms, legal accountability, peer review, and editorial oversight (Giddens, 1990).

Shift in Trust Architecture	
Institutional / Legacy Model	Algorithmic / Distributed Model
• Centralized editorial gatekeeping • Verification via professional norms • Human expertise & regulatory frameworks • Top-down distribution models	• Automated predictive filtering • Validation via network metrics • Affective alignment & speed • Peer-to-peer viral circulation

In algorithmic and AI-driven media environments, traditional trust is being superseded by distributed and computational trust. Users increasingly deposit faith in:

- Automated recommendation engines, search platform interfaces, and algorithmic filtering systems to curate massive volumes of data efficiently.
- Technical protocols, mathematical optimisation, and platform metrics (e.g., likes, shares, views, algorithmic relevance scores) as proxies for truth and social value.

This transition involves a profound shift in power. As authority moves from human gatekeepers to automated systems, accountability becomes opaque. Machine learning models, particularly deep neural networks, operate as "black boxes" whose decision-making processes are obscured by commercial secrecy and technical complexity (Pasquale, 2015). When an algorithm privileges a piece of political misinformation or an AI system generates hallucinated factual errors, identifying responsibility becomes exceptionally difficult. The systemic obfuscation of accountability further alienates users, compounding the sense that trust in public communication channels is dissolving, even as individuals remain daily dependent on these same algorithmic infrastructure systems.

5.0 Evaluating How Media Shapes Knowledge

To evaluate how these dynamics manifest across media contexts, the matrix below compares traditional communication environments, contemporary algorithmic platforms, and emerging generative AI ecosystems across key dimensions of trust, verification, and knowledge control.

Dimension	Legacy Broadcast & Print Media	Algorithmic Social Media Platforms	Generative AI & Synthetic Environments
Main Source of Trust	Official institutions, expert editors, and professional journalism ethics rules	Peer approval, user likes, and overall platform popularity metrics	Software reliability, smooth user interfaces, and procedural execution
How Knowledge is Controlled	Top-down choices made by human editors,	Automated sorting algorithms driven by	AI training datasets, safety rules, and

	organizations, and government regulators	user clicks and engagement tracking	precise user prompt designs
Basis of Truth	Real-world facts, expert agreement, and standard checkable source information	Emotional connection, shared political values, and group online agreement	Logical sense, realistic writing or visual quality, and statistical probability
Main Weakness	Insider political bias, elite power, and leaving out everyday voices	Filter bubbles, viral fake news, and deep political division online	Made-up information, fake media, and losing touch with real proof
Communication Style	One sender to many viewers; clear gap between creator and reader	Interactive network; regular users create content and participate directly	Automated computer output; human and AI collaboration in continuous feedback loops

The progression of media technology reflects a steady decoupling of communication from direct human oversight and real-world verification. Where traditional systems concentrated power within institutional elites, algorithmic platforms decentralised distribution while concentrating control over technical infrastructure. Generative AI pushes this trend even further by automating content creation itself, swapping genuine human authorship for probabilistic text and media generation.

6.0 Structural Impact & Next Steps

The shift in how trust is built across these systems has serious effects on democratic societies, media literacy, and public trust in institutions. This issue cannot be solved by quick technical solutions, like automatic deepfake scanners or AI moderation tools. These technical fixes usually start a cat-and-mouse game, where generative tools quickly upgrade to dodge detection (Yang et al., 2023).

Fixing this trust crisis requires fixing both the social and technical roots of today's media environment. Key research points to several essential steps:

1. Re-evaluating Platform Business Models

As long as digital platforms rely on business models that boost engagement through outrage, automated recommendations will keep damaging healthy public debate (Zuboff, 2019). Government policies like mandatory algorithm audits, open data rules, and strict limits on user tracking are necessary to make online media serve the public good.

2. Teaching Algorithmic and Information Literacy

Traditional media literacy centered on spotting author bias in print or TV news. Today's education must teach people about how algorithms work and how we form beliefs online (Noble, 2018). Citizens need to learn how personalised feeds shape what they see, how AI generates plausible text instead of proven facts, and how platforms profit off emotional reactions.

3. Restoring Trust Through Provenance and Accountability

Instead of giving up on traditional media sources, news organisations must adapt by operating with total transparency. Using digital verification tools, such as cryptographic standards from the Coalition for Content Provenance and Authenticity (C2PA), provides a reliable way to trace media origins without blindly trusting platform companies.

7.0 Conclusion

Trust in communication is not experiencing a simple, linear collapse in the age of AI and algorithmic media; rather, it is undergoing a profound structural shift. The transition from legacy institutional gatekeeping to automated algorithmic curation and generative media has fragmented the public sphere, destabilized the connection between media content and real-world facts, and accelerated post-truth dynamics driven by emotional engagement.

As algorithmic systems replace traditional methods of institutional validation, authority has shifted toward automated software and computer-generated simulations. When communication environments prioritize predictive engagement and believable content over verified facts and human accountability, shared baseline reality becomes contested. Restoring trust in public communication requires more than technical countermeasures; it demands a systematic restructuring of platform business models, government regulation, and updated approaches to media literacy designed for an automated media age.

8.0 References

- Barthes, R. (1981) *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*. Translated by R. Howard. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Baudrillard, J. (1994) *Simulacra and Simulation*. Translated by S.F. Glaser. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Benjamin, W. (1936) 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction', in Arendt, H. (ed.) *Illuminations*. New York: Schocken Books, pp. 217-251.
- Botsman, R. (2017) *Who Can You Trust? How Technology Brought Us Together and Why It Might Drive Us Apart*. London: Portfolio Penguin.
- Chesney, C. and Citron, D.K. (2019) 'Deepfakes and the New Disinformation War', *Foreign Affairs*, 98(1), pp. 147-155.
- Gillespie, T. (2014) 'The Relevance of Algorithms', in Tarleton, G., Boczkowski, P.J. and Foot, K.A. (eds.) *Media Technologies: Essays on Communication, Materiality, and Society*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 167-194.
- Giddens, A. (1990) *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1989) *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Translated by T. Burger. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- McIntyre, L. (2018) *Post-Truth*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Noble, S.U. (2018) *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism*. New York: New York University Press.
- Pariser, E. (2011) *The Filter Bubble: What the Internet Is Hiding from You*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Pasquale, F. (2015) *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vosoughi, S., Roy, D. and Aral, S. (2018) 'The spread of true and false news online', *Science*, 359(6380), pp. 1146-1151.

Yang, X., Li, Y. and Lyu, S. (2023) 'Exposing Deep Fakes Using Inconsistent Head Poses', *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 18, pp. 1112-1124.

Zuboff, S. (2019) *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. New York: PublicAffairs.