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Abstract
Based on the significance and role of ChatGPT in the power and knowledge production, this research aims to display how ChatGPT responds to questions that are by nature controversial and debatable, as their values depend on the agency or power that answers them. The main question of this work is whether this artificial intelligence model is influenced by any discourse(s). The approaches employed in this work are Michel Foucault’s discourse analysis and Norman Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis. It is contended that discourses are ubiquitously everywhere in social practices. To Fairclough and Foucault, language production is strongly connected to power and knowledge production. Therefore, utilising a qualitative method in the examination, the work wishes to identify the discourse(s) that can affect ChatGPT’s responses and discuss its implications for knowledge and power production. The research discovered that ChatGPT’s answers unveiled a prejudice towards capitalist discourse, established knowledge, and suppressed alternative opinions. Also, the definitions of capitalism and communism by ChatGPT were insufficient because the political and ideological dimensions of capitalism were ignored, which can be considered major findings of this present work regarding the two selected systems. This indicates that ChatGPT’s knowledge production, an example or model from the ongoing technological revolution, cannot be relied on for being biased in its responses.
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Introduction

The present age is recognised with the multi-faceted revolution of technology. In the last example of such an information technology (IT) revolution, ChatGPT’s emergence in November of 2022 proved to be the most dominating artificial intelligence (AI) model which has transformed the way man observes this revolt in shaping knowledge and education in an unprecedented manner (Floridi, 2023; Tlili et al., 2023). Therefore, this research aims to scrutinise how ChatGPT responds to controversial and debatable questions. To undertake this, the work employs two discourse analysis approaches in examining the research questions. By analysing language use and the selection of words within the context of the answers provided by the AI model to six questions the researchers asked, this study investigates the interplay between ChatGPT and discourse in the production of power and knowledge based on the posed questions about capitalism and communism.

The comprehensive review of the study concentrates on two fundamental discourse theories within Discourse Analysis (DA): Michel Foucault's discourse theory, on the first hand, and Norman Fairclough's integrative model, or the so-called Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), on the other hand. The review sightsees their theoretical foundations and common importance in power and knowledge's role in discourse. While Foucault focuses on discourse's productive and constitutive nature in shaping social reality and subjectivities, Fairclough highlights the relationship between language, social practices, and power dynamics. Integrating or joining these approaches can generate a comprehensive view and understanding of discourse and power, with the potential for analysing contemporary discursive practices within ChatGPT.

In this study, the researchers engaged in a question-and-answer dialogue with ChatGPT to unfold the hidden knots and twists stitched by discourses present in the responses of the AI model. The dialogue focused on the controversial topic of "What communism and capitalism are," and, later, was broken down into other four related questions because the researchers believed that communism and capitalism are still significantly debatable subjects of the century which can be discursively analysed to explore the ideological and power-relation underpinnings via language dissection. The researchers investigated ChatGPT's answers by highlighting significant words, identifying ideological or biased implications, and considering the broader context of the questions. The literature review and theoretical backgrounds about ChatGPT, capitalism, and communism guided this analysis.

The conclusion reveals biases in ChatGPT's definitions and a preference for capitalist discourse, indicating the presence of ideological elements and power dynamics in the AI-generated responses. This study underscores the need for this and other critical examinations of ChatGPT and other AI language models and their potential impact on knowledge production and ideological favouritisms.

The research pursues answering the two research questions by demonstrating a literature review of the approaches and the related studies concerning ChatGPT, followed by laying out the research methodology, data analysis, discussion, and, ultimately, the research conclusion, respectively.

In this study, there are two research questions as follow:

1. To what extent is ChatGPT affected by one discourse more than another?
2. What are the implications of a centralised discourse?
Literature Review

Discourse or Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a widely recognised theoretical and analytical strategy for examining the intersection between language, power, and social transformation. It also strives to expose the ideological roots of discourse and cast light on the dynamic forces of social dominance (Newman, 2020). Tenorio Hidalgo (2011) stated, "CDA was a discipline designed to question the status quo, by detecting, analysing, and also resisting and counteracting enactments of power abuse as transmitted in private and public discourses”. This literature review aims to evaluate two fundamental discourse notions within discourse analysis, notably Michel Foucault's discourse and Norman Fairclough's integrative model of critical discourse analysis. Nevertheless, the review tries to illuminate these two approaches' parallels, discrepancies, and complimentary elements by exploring their theoretical foundations and methodological implications. Secondly, it aims to uncover the range of the findings stemming from the already existing research on the concepts concerning ChatGPT, in particular.

On the first hand, Foucault's discourse theory is based on his more extensive works on power and knowledge. In the words of Foucault, discourse is more than just a means of communication; it is rather a tool in the hands of the power to define and organize social reality. Moreover, discourse is a set of assertions, practices, and institutions that govern what can and cannot be uttered, how it can and cannot be stated, and who is entitled to say it. The relationship between discourse and power is the point of emphasis for Foucault, who claims that discourse is something productive, and constitutive, specifically in the manufacture of social identities and subjectivities (Roose & Dietz, 2016; Torfing, 2004).

To uphold this view, Gee (1999) argued that language is not only a means of communication as he vividly stated that many individuals believe that the primary purpose of language is to "communicate information.” However, language plays numerous roles, and sending and receiving information is far from the only one, especially in our modern Information Age. If one had to pick one fundamental function of human language, it would be one of two closely linked functions: supporting the performance of social activities and social identities and supporting human affiliation within cultures, social groupings, and institutions.

Similarly, Foucault and Fairclough acknowledge power's vital role in influencing discourse. That is why Foucault's discourse theory, on the first hand, highlights the complex link between power and knowledge by stressing how speech functions as a productive force in the edifice and regulation of social reality. Therefore, discourse, to Foucault, is more than a mere means of communication in the form of language because it also is a tool for exercising and maintaining power. Moreover, in chapter one of ‘Discipline and Punish,’ Foucault asserts that “A corpus of information, procedures, and 'scientific' discourses emerges, becoming entwined with the practice of the authority to punish (Foucault, 2016). This is alarming in the sense that language, knowledge, and scientific discourses can serve power practice to the degree of harming others such as punishment. In his analysis, he criticizes various kinds of discourses. The legal or juridical discourse that pretends to keep justice by combating crimes, on the one hand, alters into a means of justifying punishment, on the other hand. Thus, Foucault states that as soon as the crime is committed, the punishment follows immediately, enacting the legal discourse and demonstrating that the code connects ideas and facts. To conclude, he believes that discourses capacitate power to develop and enforce precise rules and norms, governing what can and cannot be said, how it can and cannot be expressed, and who can and cannot say it.
On the other hand, Norman Fairclough's integrative model of discourse analysis recognizes the importance of power in discourse, similar to the former philosopher, because Fairclough regards 'language as a form of social practice (Fairclough, 1989). Moreover, he accentuates that language is not neutral but acts within certain social settings and power relations. Thus, he claims that speech reflects and reproduces power dynamics, with language serving as a tool for social control and dominance. Moreover, Fairclough (1993) contends that power is exercised through speech by changing social practices and institutions. These points of view underscore that discourse is inextricably linked to power dynamics, and that language assists as a venue for power relations to be negotiated, strengthened, and potentially challenged.

Fairclough's discourse analysis model incorporates elements from linguistics, sociology, and critical social theory: interdisciplinary, in a word. There are also a number of prominent linguistics such as Wodak and Meyer (2001) who upholds the idea of discourse to be a multidisciplinary concept of study stretching across the human to the social sciences. Fairclough (1993) proposes a three-dimensional framework that examines discourse at text, discourse practice, and social structure levels. His approach explores how language operates as a social practice by reproducing and challenging power relations. Therefore, the interconnectedness between language, social practices, and social structures is essential for Fairclough's contributions to discourse through maintaining or transforming social order. In examining Fairclough's discourse analysis model, Gölbaşı (2017) argued that in modern communities, there has always been a struggle between dominating powers and their opponents to acquire control of the language interpretation system.

Foucault's discourse theory stresses the creation of subjectivities via language as well as how people are located within relationships of power (Foucault, 1980). Language not only influences the reality of society but also forms subjectivity and identity. Individuals, he contends, acquire their identities into subjects through discursive activities that adhere to established norms and modalities of self-expression. The "subject-position" notion developed by Foucault underlines how human beings are situated inside discursive formations, influencing their perceptions, desires, and actions.

Fairclough's integrative model acknowledges the impact of discourse on subjectivity as well. While admitting language's power to regulate and control, Fairclough emphasizes agency and the possibilities for resistance and social transformation through discourse. Fairclough (1993) contends that individuals can contest and confront dominant discourses by participating in counter-discursive acts that can destabilize the dynamics of power and, as a result, change their social meanings.

Hence, one can contend that both Foucault and Fairclough discuss the interplay between discourse and subjectivity. It is evident that Foucault emphasizes the construction of subjectivities within power relations, but what Fairclough adds to this is that he acknowledges the agency of individuals to actively play a role in and potentially transform those discursive practices that appear to be fixed to Foucault.

Nevertheless, Foucault's method of discourse analysis is mainly focused on the detection of discontinuities and power shifts as well as the genealogical analysis of historical discourses. Foucault (1972) claims that articulated speech and written texts appear to manifest the discourse of the text of speech with the expressed words, while the true discourse can be the one that is concealed in an unuttered manner behind the words.
Contrarily, Fairclough's methodology integrates linguistic analysis with critical discourse analysis to investigate texts and discursive activities in the context of society. However, both their strategies have unique methodological vantage points. While Fairclough's integrative model is geared toward evaluating language use within particular social situations to identify the ideological components and possibility for social change hidden in discourse, Foucault's genealogical analysis reveals insights into historical changes in power relations.

From the significant perspective of both Foucault and Fairclough, Van Dijk concludes by claiming that the integration of these methodologies is advantageous to the degree that blending them can help researchers create a more complete knowledge of discourse and power. Applying Fairclough's systematic framework to discover power's linguistic and ideological components, future research could investigate novel approaches incorporating Foucauldian concepts into the analysis of contemporary discursive practices (Fairclough, 1993).

The researchers think that the concept of discourse, despite its differences in meaning and implications by numerous thinkers and scholars, has, briefly and precisely, been defined by Marianne Jørgensen and Louise Phillips as the basic notion that language is structured following various patterns that people's utterances adhere to when they participate in various spheres of social life; well-known examples include "medical discourse" and "political discourse." Discourse analysis is the study of certain patterns in discourse (Gee, 1999).

In a recent study, Li et al. (2023) found out that Twitter users were largely favorable about the usage of ChatGPT; nonetheless, their worries converged into five distinct categories: academic integrity, impact on learning outcomes and skill development, capability limitations, policy and societal concerns, and workforce challenges. Based on that finding, they offer some implications to the policymakers, users of ChatGPT, tech corporations, educators and social media platforms about the significance of responsibility and ethicality of benefitting from ChatGPT (Li et al., 2023). Moreover, Lund et al. (2023) underscore the potential impact of such an AI model on research and essay writing and their academic publications. However, for some scholars, this model of AI is considered to be a revolutionizing force in the scholarly world, but the former joint article argues that the ethical ramifications of this technology, as well as its underlying GPT-3 technology, have yet to be properly examined. (González-Padilla, 2023). Two of their influential conclusions are that such a model can create a danger to academic integrity and bring about ethical considerations and concerns that have arisen due to copyright and citation issues.

Furthermore, about this fast advancement in the number of global users, Baum and Villasenor (2023) state that ChatGPT has more than 100 million monthly active users within two months of its inception, surpassing TikTok and Instagram in that time frame. They believe that this AI’s extraordinary development mainly resides within its involvement in an ostensibly human-like way to quickly respond to writing essays and poems similar to humans; however, they do not hesitate to claim that the same tool can be a source of producing.

To sum up, this section has sightseeing and compared Foucault's and Fairclough's discourse conceptions within the framework of critical discourse analysis. While both approaches share a common concern with language. They concluded that this rapid popularity is exceptional in the performance of AI models. Although, Fan and Jiang (2023) believe that ChatGPT has the potential to segment competent topic annotaters in discourse analysis dialogues, while it has difficulty in grasping sophisticated rhetorical patterns.
Hence, this study attempts to fill a gap in the current literature concerning the ideological implications of answers or information provided by ChatGPT regarding controversial and debatable questions, which have not been addressed so far in the existing literature review.

Methods

The methodology used in this work is qualitative because the two research questions are to be answered based on the context of the answers provided by ChatGPT. In addition, the two analysis approaches of Foucault and Fairclough are utilised in a manner to examine the specific texts of the answers such as words and language selection to identify the ideological and power-relation implications. Therefore, the collected data are analysed qualitatively.

Research Instruments

To answer the present research questions, the researchers conducted a six-question-and-answer dialogue or conversation with ChatGPT to identify the discourse(s) that feed pieces of information and provide understanding to the users of such an AI model. The selected Question-Answer dialogue between the researchers who asked the questions and ChatGPT which/who answered the researchers’ questions is centred around one of the most controversial topics of the last and this century, which can be summarised in this way: ‘What Communism and Capitalism Are?’ Selecting this major ideologically debatable question and breaking it down into other fourteen questions is due to ideology's role in answering the questions regarding Capitalism and Communism.

Research Procedures

The present researchers, first, read the answers provided by ChatGPT to the researchers. Then, they highlighted the essential words in the answers: the words that make noteworthy ideological or biased significations and the way words or language are used by and large in light of the questions posed. After that, based on the literature review in the field and the theoretical and conceptual frameworks of both Capitalism and Communism, the researchers analysed the answers by ChatGPT.

Analysis

The first and second questions are ‘What is Capitalism?’ and ‘What is communism?’’. The answers to the first two questions by ChatGPT are the following:

- Capitalism is a type of economic system in which private individuals or corporations own and operate the means of producing and distributing commodities and services.
- Communism is a political and economic philosophy that seeks to establish a society without classes in which all assets and resources are owned and managed by the entire population.

According to ChatGPT’s answers, capitalism is only an economic system, while communism is a political and economic ideology.
Karl Marx and Fredrick Engels, the first co-founders of communism, believe that an ideology is a superstructure of the capitalist mode of production. Bourgeois ideology in their view, for instance, is produced based on the capitalist mode of production. In their co-authored ‘German Ideology,’ they state that men are the creators of their conceptions, thoughts, and so on -- actual, active men conditioned by a defined development of their production forces and the interplay corresponding to them, up to its most extreme forms. Consciousness can never be anything other than conscious existence, and men's actual living process is their existence. Suppose men and their circumstances look upside-down in all ideologies, as in a camera obscura. In that case, this phenomenon stems from their historical life-process just as much as the inversion of things on the retina does from their physical life process.

In the above statement, Marx and Engels think that ideology is the kind of consciousness that is created alongside the social existence of men within the system under which they live. Hence, the way people think is a product like any other material product that is manufactured by the system. Therefore, The capitalist system has produced the kind of ideological thinking pertinent to capitalism as its superstructure. However, as mentioned in the last part of the above extract, a significant feature of this ideology is that it appears in a reversed form as an object, the way an object is inverted within a camera retina. The implication of such an inversion resides in transforming consciousness to see itself as true consciousness or one that is creatively and independently generated by the individual apart from any role the established system plays in shaping the consciousness. In light of this understanding, Marx concludes that ideology is the false consciousness of reality.

Eyerman (1981) argues that the relationship between false consciousness and ideology is strong especially because the bourgeoisie lifestyle or its social existence generates ideology. He also states that “Marx and Engels focused primarily on the concept of ideology, referring to the distorted beliefs intellectuals held about society and the power of their own ideas”. Therefore, the first founders of communist philosophy and theory define communism neither as ideology nor as false consciousness, but conversely speaking to ChatGPT, they attribute ideology to capitalism.

ChatGPT, furthermore, defines capitalism as only an economic system and communism as a political and economic ideology. Paying a short visit to ‘The Capital,’ the so-called most important text written by Marx, helps one understand that capitalism is also a political system too. In demonstrating the history of capitalism as an economic system, he reaches the point that capitalism could not be maintained without its political apparatuses. For instance, Marx argues
that capitalism first started from the individual capitalists in the form of small artisans, particularly when they departed from the earlier kinds of production and exchange and headed toward the capitalist form of production that encompassed the accumulation of commodity exchange for surplus value. Based on this analysis, Marx clearly states that the various stages of primitive accumulation are now distributed, more or less chronologically, across Spain, Portugal, Holland, France, and England. They arrive at a systematic combination in England by the end of the 17th century, incorporating the colonies, the national debt, the current style of taxing, and the protectionist system. These techniques, such as the colonial system, rely in part on raw force.

Marx, at the end of Volume I of Capital, maintains his view by also adding that they all, however, use the authority of the State, the concentrated and organized force of society, to speed and shorten the process of transition from the feudal mode of production to the capitalist mode. Force is the midwife of every old society in the process of giving birth to a new one. It is an economic power in its own right.

One may conclude that Marx strongly believes that the capitalist economic structure and base are strongly tied to the political power, the state in particular. As a result, capitalism was born as an economic force or base, which was then protected by only the political apparatuses created to safeguard the capitalist interests of the early capitalists. Today’s capitalism is also protected by laws or legal systems that originated from the political power of the state and its military. Therefore, the disintegration of the economy from the political is greatly related to the previous critique of bourgeoisie ideology that was raised above.

On the other hand, Wood (2009) contends that capitalism from its birth needed to hide the social and political roles and implications that capitalism has on people's social existence because it ideologically serves the capitalist system to survive. Extending the previous two questions before, the researchers, in question three, asked ChatGPT “Why do you define communism as an ideology while capitalism as an economic system? To this, the AI model answered in this way: “Communism is often considered an ideology because it encompasses a set of beliefs and values about social and economic organization, as well as a vision for a particular type of society” (ChatGPT).

The researchers did not want to delve into the theoretical background of the answer as they found it necessary to engage more by asking an extra question regarding the same content but about capitalism, as this: “Does capitalism have any set of beliefs and values about the social and economic organization? ChatGPT responded by saying: “Yes, capitalism has a set of beliefs and values about the social and economic organization, although these tend to focus primarily on the economic organization rather than broader social organization” (ChatGPT).

As the answers are read, one can feel an apparent contradiction in this AI’s ways of defining ideology and later ascribing it to communism and removing it for capitalism. First, it defines communism as an ideology because it has a ‘set of beliefs and values,’ while capitalism is not defined as an ideology, although it has a ‘set of beliefs and values,’ too. This research argues against this kind of contradiction or opposing definitions because defining ideology by ChatGPT is pre-established on the condition of having a ‘set of values and beliefs.’ Not only this, but it is also significant to underline the same point by highlighting the idea discussed earlier spinning around the separation of the economic from the political in the capitalist ideology. Therefore, one might say that ideology has always played a huge role in defining communism and capitalism. Based on the theoretical heritage of the capitalist economics analysis, as illuminated by Marx and
Wood earlier, ideology plays a significant role in ChatGPT in obscuring and inverting the object of knowledge of either concepts or systems in favour of capitalism.

Moving to the last point (point ‘e’) regarding question four provided by the AI model as it follows: “Limited government intervention: Capitalism generally supports limited government intervention in the economy, with the belief that markets will work best if left to operate on their own without significant government interference.”

In light of that, one can claim that government is not an economic institution but a political one as well. Government intervention can be educational, commercial, legal, or military, and the government’s limitation incorporates its reduction in all those aspects. Friedman (1955), one of the most significant capitalist economy analysts, underlines the three tasks of a government as he states that the fundamental functions of government are as follows. It should provide for the nation's military defence. Individual contracts should be enforced. It should shield citizens against crimes committed against them or their property. When government attempts to reorganize the economy, impose morality, or assist particular interests in the name of good intentions, the cost is inefficiency, lack of motivation, and loss of freedom. The government should serve as a referee rather than an active participant.

Based on this bourgeois economic analyst’s viewpoint, one cannot simply accept the definition of capitalism as merely an economic system because even the capitalist economists themselves believe that government is political; as it is, for instance, behind education and the military, which cannot be unbiased since they defend specific interests of the state and the established political-economic apparatus. Friedman’s request for alienating the government from the other tasks and limiting its intervention is per se a political request. Also, since the consolidation of capitalism into a system, there has never been a market devoid of a government or a state that side by side with the market is politically involved in matters related to the social existence of society.

In question five “What are the differences between communism and capitalism?”; ChatGPT, again, contradicts its own previous definition of communism as three main lines of their differences follow:

Communism and capitalism are two distinct economic systems with different principles and values. Capitalism is an economic system in which the means of production, such as land, factories, and businesses, are owned and controlled by private individuals or corporations. Communism, on the other hand, is an economic system in which the means of production are collectively owned and controlled by the community as a whole.

In the above lines, there are two points to concentrate on. First, defining communism at this point contradicts the earlier one by removing the terms ‘political’ and ‘ideology.’ Secondly, both capitalism and communism are defined as mere economic systems.

The model was asked in question six: “Which one is better, capitalism or communism?”; in its answer, it highlights that it should remain neutral because it is an AI model, while it continues answering the question in the following words:

Capitalism is often praised for its ability to promote innovation, economic growth, and individual freedom. However, capitalism can also lead to economic inequality, exploitation of workers, and environmental degradation, among other issues.

Communism, on the other hand, is often praised for its emphasis on social equality and community ownership of resources. It is argued that a communist system can lead to a more just and equitable society, where everyone has equal access to resources and opportunities.
However, communism can also lead to bureaucratic inefficiencies, lack of incentives for innovation, and suppression of individual freedoms, among other issues.

Freedom is one of the terms that Karl Marx and Engels recurrently used in their criticism of capitalism. One of the instances where Marx and Engels converge on the concept of freedom is related to the revolutionary event of the Paris Commune (Sowell, 1995). In the same way, freedom is defined positively by Marx and Engels, and it is conceived as highly significant for individuals and society. For instance, the Paris Commune was a revolutionary incident to them because it had the characteristics of universal suffrage, criticism of the government, and freedom from the church. For them, likewise, innovation and economic growth are considered significant in the development of any society. Hence, the so-called depictions of such terms are based on who and how the words are defined. However, this AI model states that it remains neutral in giving opinions but, indeed, gives opinions and is biased in the sources it depends on in providing the answers.

Theoretically, Foucault's discourse analysis focuses on the connections between power, knowledge, and language. It endeavors to comprehend how discourses produce knowledge, impact social behaviors, and shape knowledge. When applying Foucault's discourse analysis to analyses a text, one must look at the text's underlying power structures, knowledge assertions, and social implications.

Discussion

In light of this and the given analysis, this present work discusses that the elements necessary to underline capitalist power in the production of such an AI model play an obvious role in shaping one’s understanding and knowledge of concepts like capitalism and communism. The reproduction of knowledge in the way ChatGPT offers helps capitalist-preferred knowledge and the bourgeoisie-type understanding be the dominant knowledge and understanding. This is primarily achieved because ChatGPT relies on specific sources of information and ignores others, ultimately serving one discourse over the other. Francis Lyotard (1979) criticized this capitalist discourse preference against another as a meta-narrative: modern scientific knowledge.

Situating the ChatGPT answers in broader contexts such as social, political, cultural, economic, and historical is one of the tasks of analyzing any text according to Foucault’s discourse analysis. Without undertaking this, receivers of knowledge would not be able to comprehend text production and the impact of power dynamics in both the text’s production and reception. Moreover, the claims that are being made should be analyzed based on the power and agents that produce them. From Foucault’s view, assists the reader in revealing central and marginal voices within the text because the power that produces the text raises its claims and suppresses or marginalizes other claims.

Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis (CDL) emphasizes the relationship between language and power as social structures. Thus, the fundamental notion of CDL is language in relation to power structures. As the answers have been analyzed, ChatGPT uses language in a specific manner fed by the established power of capitalism; as a result, it reproduces the same power by disseminating such knowledge among the readers. For example, words or terms such the political, economic, and ideological are employed in a biased way. Additionally, the one who has the power to speak for and against or to centralize or marginalize in the form of linguistic expressions is essential to Fairclough, too. The research, benefiting from Fairclough, aimed at uncovering the meanings behind such sorts of reproduction of meaning by this AI model.
language used by ChatGPT in its answers is reinforced by the social-political and ideological discursive contexts of the bourgeoisie power, also the hidden meanings that have been analyzed by deconstructing the language elements were unearthed by returning to some original texts which were marginalized or even suppressed to speak.

**Research Findings**

1. Even though the AI model claims to be impartial, its answers are biased in favor of capitalist discourse.
2. The study finds Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis and Foucauldian discourse analysis to be vital theories to expose the ideological foundations and biases of ChatGPT.
3. The predisposition for capitalist discourse as highlighted in the analysis uncovers biases and also contradictions in ChatGPT's, it also finds the power of ChatGPT in the production of knowledge.
4. The analysis highlights ChatGPT's produced knowledge, which is effective in the production of ideological powers, which may suppress opposing viewpoints and alternatives.

**Conclusion**

The research aims to integrate these methodologies by applying Foucauldian ideas and Fairclough's framework to evaluate and reveal ChatGPT's ideological underpinnings and the possibilities for knowledge transformation. Discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis, provide useful paradigms for analyzing language, power, and social change. By utilizing Norman Fairclough's integrative model and Michel Foucault's discourse theory, it has been found that Fairclough focuses on language as a social practice that reflects and reproduces power relations, while Foucault emphasizes discourse as a tool of power that creates social reality. The research has found that there are contradictions and biases in ChatGPT's responses to the six questions concerning capitalism and communism. ChatGPT describes communism as a political and economic ideology, whereas capitalism is just an economic system. However, historical examination and theoretical stances by Marx and Engels show that politics, economics, ideology, and capitalism are inextricably linked. Contrary to ChatGPT's definitions, the research contends that ideology, politics, and economics play major parts in both systems. Additionally, the selected AI model’s responses exhibit a bias toward capitalist discourse, reiterating prevailing knowledge and stifling competing viewpoints. The power dynamics and linguistic biases found in ChatGPT's answers are clarified by the discourse analysis of Foucault and by Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis. As a result, the inadequate definitions of capitalism and communism offered by ChatGPT do not sufficiently capture the political and ideological components of either system. This suggests a preference for capitalist discourse. The study also highlights the ideological repercussions of ChatGPT's responses, showing how they replicate biased information and discourage competing opinions, especially on the side of the suppressed discourse. The presence of prejudices and the repetition of dominant discourses in ChatGPT's responses point to the presence of ideological, prejudiced, and discriminatory elements in such responses.
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