YENİ MEDYA
DERGİSİ
Hakemli, uluslararası, e-Dergi

Sayı Vol., 18, Bahar Spring, (2025)
https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/yenimedya
DOI » https://doi.org/10.55609/yenimedya.1624733

Turkish Journalists' Attitudes, Perceived Constraints, and Knowledge About AI in Journalism

Türk Gazetecilerin Yapay Zekâ Konusundaki Tutumları, Algılanan Kısıtlamalar ve Bilgi Düzeyleri

Semra DEMİRDİŞ

Araştırma Makalesi Research Article

Başvuru Received: 22.01.2025 ■ Kabul Accepted: 22.04.2025

ABSTRACT

This study examines Turkish journalists' attitudes towards the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in journalism, highlighting both opportunities and challenges. The findings support the view that AI can enhance efficiency in areas such as data analysis and content personalization, while also emphasising significant concerns related to job security, editorial independence, and data reliability. In the context of Türkiye's economic and digital infrastructure limitations, journalists' cautious approach to AI appears to be shaped by limited resources and training opportunities. The study aims to understand Turkish journalists' perspectives on AI applications, identify perceived obstacles, and evaluate the potential impacts of this technology on journalism. The research employs a quantitative method with a survey administered to 350 journalists working in various media fields. Findings indicate that while journalists recognize the benefits of AI, their optimism is balanced by concerns over job loss and threats to professional values. The results suggest the need to address structural barriers to AI adoption in the Turkish media sector, with recommendations for targeted training programs and reliable digital infrastructure. This study contributes valuable insights into the effects of AI on journalism in Türkiye, providing findings that may be adapted to broader media contexts.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Journalism, Technology Integration, Turkish Journalists, Professional Attitudes.

ÖZ

Bu çalışma, Türk gazetecilerin gazetecilikte yapay zekâ entegrasyonuna ilişkin tutumlarını inceleyerek, fırsatları ve çeşitli zorlukları ortaya koymaktadır. Araştırma, yapay zekânın veri analizi ve içerik kişiselleştirme gibi alanlarda verimliliği artırabileceği görüşünü destekleyen bir bulgu sunarken, aynı zamanda iş güvenliği, editoryal bağımsızlık ve veri güvenilirliği konularındaki endişeleri de vurgulamaktadır. Türkiye'nin ekonomik ve dijital altyapı sınırlamaları bağlamında, gazetecilerin yapay zekâya yönelik temkinli yaklaşımlarının, kaynak yetersizliği ve sınırlı eğitim olanakları ile şekillendiği görülmüştür. Çalışmanın amacı, Türk gazetecilerin yapay zekâ uygulamalarına dair görüşlerini anlamak, karşılaşılan engelleri tanımlamak ve bu teknolojinin gazetecilik üzerindeki olası etkilerini değerlendirmektir. Araştırmada, nicel bir yöntem kullanılarak çeşitli medya alanlarında görev yapan 350 gazeteciye anket uygulanmıştır. Bulgular, gazetecilerin yapay zekâya yönelik olumlu görüşlerinin, iş kaybı ve mesleki değerlerin tehdit altında olduğu yönündeki kaygılarla görece dengelendiğini göstermektedir. Araştırmanın bulguları, Türk medya sektöründe yapay zekânın benimsenmesinde karşılaşılan yapısal engellerin giderilmesi gerektiğine işaret etmektedir. Bu bağlamda, hedefe yönelik eğitim programlarının sağlanması ve güvenilir dijital altyapının kurulması önerilmektedir. Çalışma, yapay zekânın gazetecilik üzerindeki etkilerine dair önemli bir katkı sunmakta olup, daha geniş bir medya bağlamında uyarlanabilir sonuçlar sağlamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yapay Zekâ, Gazetecilik, Teknoloji Entegrasyonu, Türk Gazeteciler, Mesleki Tutumlar.

Introduction

The rapid development of smart technologies has transformed the news industry by restructuring content creation and distribution processes and significantly reducing the barriers to entry and enabling a wider range of individuals and organisations to participate in news production (Marconi, 2020). The internet has made it possible for virtually anyone to launch an online publication and grow an audience, significantly broadening access to media creation and distribution (Marconi, 2020). As Anderson and colleagues (2015, p.33) have noted regarding the recent news ecosystem, "everybody suddenly got a lot more freedom". Newsmakers, advertisers, startups and most notably, those once referred to as the audience, have all been granted newfound freedom to communicate, both on narrow and broad scales, beyond the traditional limitations of broadcast and publishing models (Anderson et al., 2015). This reflects the transformative impact of digital platforms, which have democratised the creation and distribution of news content, allowing a broader range of actors to participate in the media landscape (Allan, 2013; Hermida, 2010).

Artificial intelligence (AI) has emerged as a pivotal force in this transformation, enabling content creators to generate text or video autonomously from data, uncover latent insights within documents, and develop the efficiency of content distribution across various platforms (Marconi, 2020; Pan, 2016; Van Dalen, 2012). Following the growth of AI, communication and media organisations are utilising AI and machine learning technologies for various purposes. These include enhancing their capabilities, increasing market share and revenue, gathering customer or product insights and developing effective business strategies (Hancock et al., 2020; Kaput, 2021; Türksoy, 2022). AI has become widespread within society and is increasingly making its presence felt in the field of journalism too. AI facilitates the codification of tasks and routines into algorithms, thereby generating outputs that closely resemble those produced by human efforts (Noain-Sánchez, 2022). Furthermore, AI can significantly streamline journalistic processes, reducing the workload for journalists without diminishing their unique skills and expertise (de-Lima-Santos & Ceron, 2021). In addition, AI can foster new forms of audience engagement and drive the development of innovative products, which have the potential to advance news media consumption (Jamil, 2020).

Prominent media outlets, such as The Washington Post and The Associated Press, are leveraging AI technologies to streamline their workflows, improve the accuracy and speed of reporting, and enhance audience engagement through personalised news delivery (Chan-Olmsted, 2019; Simon, 2024). In Japan, The Tokyo-based start-up JX Press utilises artificial intelligence to identify breaking news on social media platforms, automatically generating news bulletins to provide urgent updates on accidents, natural disasters, and other critical incidents (Marconi, 2020). In Türkiye, some news organisations (e.g. Cumhuriyet, Bianet and TGRT) are utilising AI tools to integrate them into their news production processes. While formal public statements remain limited, these implementations indicate a significant interest in leveraging AI to enhance news gathering, content creation, and distribution (Baştürk, 2024). Additionally, some leading news organisations have made statements regarding how they can integrate AI technologies into their news processes in a reliable and ethical manner. For instance, Anadolu Agency's General Manager, Serdar Karagöz stated "our goal is for artificial intelligence to have a reliable principle and ethical code," adding that there will be a new AI project in collaboration with Anadolu Agency and the T3 Foundation, focusing on language modelling (Kasım, 2024).

However, the integration of this technology raises several questions and sparks debate regarding the quality and reliability of the outputs generated by AI (Noain-Sánchez, 2022). Concerns regarding transparency, bias, and the potential displacement of human journalists have become key focal points in the ongoing debate over the use of AI in

journalism (Verma, 2024). These issues highlight the need for greater accountability in AI-driven processes, ensuring that the technology supports rather than undermines ethical standards, editorial independence, and the core principles of journalism (Brennen, 2018). Researchers recommend a deeper analysis of the role journalists play in the process of adopting and applying AI, focusing on how they interact with the technology and its impact on their work (Soto-Sanfiel, et al., 2022). Given this framework, the current study aims to examine Turkish journalists' attitudes toward the use of AI's potential applications, benefits, and associated challenges. This study provides information on journalists' perceptions of the impact of the use of AI on their editorial independence and the integrity of journalistic processes. As a result, it aims to contribute to strategies for responsible AI integration in Turkish media.

Integrating AI Technologies in Journalism

Artificial intelligence has a transformative role in many professions by providing advanced tools for automation and intelligent data analysis (Smuha, 2021). The term "artificial intelligence" is described as machines capable of human-like reasoning (Prasad & Choudhary, 2021). Although "the term artificial intelligence" was first coined in 1956 by John McCarthy, it has evolved greatly in recent years with increases in computing power, data accessibility and algorithmic improvements (Ernst et al., 2019). These developments in AI allow it to serve as a powerful tool with applications ranging from image recognition, news feed editing, autonomous systems and robot journalism. As a result of these developments, AI is reshaping the processes of news gathering, production and personalisation, encouraging innovations such as automated news writing, interactive storytelling and intelligent reporting (Simon, 2024; Thurman et al., 2019).

The use of AI in media and journalism can be segmented into different roles of transformation. For instance, automated journalism refers to the use of algorithms to autonomously generate news stories with very little human input aside from the initial configuration (Graefe, 2016). Such approaches have enabled news organisations as well as data analysis and visualisation firms to efficiently produce content, curate materials, perform data analysis, and even visualise data (Diakopoulos, 2019; Túñez-López et al., 2019; Young & Hermida, 2015). Automation in journalism has been accompanied by powerful algorithmic journalism, which includes the automation of news article composition in several languages (Dörr, 2016; Lewis et al., 2019). The Washington Post, for instance, revealed that it had been using its algorithm 'Heliograf' to automate the coverage of elections and sports in the same year it provided AI-generated story coverage for the 2016 Rio Olympics (Moses, 2017). The automation of journalism with artificial intelligence is beneficial because it is quick, accurate, and cost-effective.

This transformation increases efficiency and depth in the field and allows journalists to spend more time on investigative reporting (Graefe, 2016; Olsen, 2023). However, journalists' concerns about job loss are increasing as algorithms replace their roles in traditional newsrooms (Kirley, 2016). They are concerned that the demand for their work may decrease as automation becomes more widespread, and they fear losing their jobs to machines (Ali & Hassoun, 2019). The merging of robotic journalism and big data challenges the profession creates a sense of uncertainty among journalists (Bernard, 2013; Frey & Osborne, 2017). To address these challenges, ethical oversight and thoughtful implementation are essential to balance AI's advantages with its potential downsides. As AI continues to evolve, its influence on journalism is likely to expand, fundamentally transforming the industry and the way news is produced and consumed (Bernard, 2013; Frey & Osborne, 2017; Porlezza, 2023).

While advancing AI technologies are changing journalism worldwide, Türkiye's media ecosystem is changing at an unprecedented pace due to the adoption of AI into the production of news content. Recent research indicates that AI

technologies in the Turkish media industry have so far concentrated on increasing efficiency by automating low-level repetitive tasks such as news reporting, translation, and even personalisation of content (Gökbel, 2024). Journalists admit that AI has sped up the content creation process, but they seem to question its impact on the news production system, particularly concerning the independence of editorial decision-making and the construction of news stories (Kırık et al., 2024). Even with increased use of AI tools like ChatGPT, the lack of clear legislative policies creates gaps in ethical responsibility and professional accountability (Aydın & İnce, 2024). The growing use of AI in Turkish journalism follows a global tendency but poses unique regional problems as well. Unlike in highly digitised media ecosystems where the integration of AI is already surrounded by well-defined governance structures, Türkiye's media system is characterised by dual lad media, a combination of traditional and digital media technologies, each with differing levels of infrastructure.

The use of AI content generators as an economically beneficial resource for struggling newsrooms has increased concern over the potential of misinformation and algorithmic bias (Sarisakaloğlu, 2021). Research regarding the framing of news AI within Turkish media suggests that while there is the belief that AI will enhance productivity, the discourse around its ethical boundaries concerning responsibility, accountability, and transparency metaphors in journalism remains salient (Türksoy, 2022). The creation of news content with AI tools poses a challenge to preserving journalism's core tenets, as those tenets risk being undermined by technology. Additionally, the political and economic context of Türkiye deepens the ethical issues of AI and journalism. In a given media context where ownership patterns determine independence and objectivity, automated processes on AI tend to preserve, instead of challenge, the status quo (Çelik, 2022). Those challenges are not only about losing jobs but also on the integrity of the media and trust from the public. In light of these challenges, academics and industry practitioners highlight the importance of having AI skills among journalists, suggesting that media practitioners be offered training that balances technology and ethics (Gökbel, 2024). With the increased integration of AI into Turkish journalism, it will be important to manage the tension between automation and editorial supervision in the country's news media going forward. Drawing on these theoretical and empirical insights, the following hypotheses have been formulated to systematically examine journalists' perceptions of AI in news production:

H1: *Journalists hold positive overall attitudes toward AI.*

H2: *Journalists perceive AI as both a threat to job security and an opportunity for innovation.*

H3: *Journalists identify data inaccuracy, resource limitations, and lack of training as barriers to AI adoption.*

H4: *Journalists have varying levels of knowledge about AI, particularly in its applications for data analysis and news generation.*

Empirical Studies on Journalists' Experiences With AI

Algorithms and automated processes are modifying the work processes of journalists (Soto-Sanfiel et al., 2022). This requires more investigation for the possible effects and implementations of AI in the newsrooms. Some studies have been done on the relationship of journalists and AI in some selected countries, and because of certain degrees of technological acceptance, regulation, and sociocultural sentiments towards journalism AI in these areas, new results were obtained (Kim & Kim, 2018; Jamil, 2020; Noain-Sanchez, 2022; Soto-Sanfiel et al., 2022). For instance, the Journalism AI report, which surveyed 71 news organisations across 32 countries (including CNN (US), BBC (UK), Reuters, and TRT (Türkiye)) explores the use of artificial intelligence and related technologies in journalism (Beckett, 2019). Journalists working with AI in these organisations shared their insights on its applications in the newsroom, their understanding of its capabilities, and their views on its broader

potential and associated risks. The findings suggest that journalists are not only familiar with AI but also generally view its adoption in a positive light (Beckett, 2019). Still, the report identifies important gaps, particularly with regard to the work required to optimize AI. Furthermore, it stresses that while AI may help journalists perform better, it comes with greater editorial and moral responsibilities at the same time (Beckett, 2019). In the same manner, Kim and Kim (2018) examined the attitude of South Korean professionals towards robot journalism, drawing from theories about the potential of this technology to improve productivity and innovation utilization. This research suggests that these improvements may yield significant implications for news organisations and business operations. However, some journalists in their study view robots as potential rivals, raising concerns about their own diminishing status within society. These journalists exhibit negative reactions, alongside feelings of fear and suspicion toward robots (Kim & Kim, 2018).

Furthermore, Jamil (2020) focused on the attitudes of Pakistani journalists to AI using Human-Machine Communication, a sub-field which studies the meaning-making and communicative roles of machines. Jamil (2020) stated that there are six major barriers towards AI utilization in newsrooms as perceived by the Pakistani journalists which are: 1) insufficient economic and technological development, 2) false information, 3) inadequate education and training on AI, 4) insufficient governmental policies encouraging AI usage in Journalism, 5) insufficient data availability, and 6) the existing information gap within the country (p.14). The author notes that Pakistani journalists do not view technology as a means through which they can communicate, nor do they consider it to be anything that can modernize journalism. Rather, they regard AI as being a means of communication or a middleman in the communication process. Whereas they accept AI's role in communication, they also see these technologies as a danger to their jobs, believing that AI will usurp their roles and positions.

Soto-Sanfiel et al. (2022) studied journalists' perception of AI across six Latin American countries (Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, Peru, and Venezuela) and found that perception of AI technology was influenced by culture and context. Cuban journalists had a much more favourable attitude toward AI than Venezuelan, Bolivian, Colombian, and Peruvian journalists, as they seemed to think of AI more as an innovative tool than a threat. Furthermore, Cuban and Colombian journalists appeared to have more knowledge than other surveyed countries regarding the use of AI in journalism. Gender differences were also noted as Cuban female journalists reported using AI more than their male counterparts and having a more favourable attitude towards the technology, indicating possible professional empowerment AI technologies pose for women in journalism. Also, the type of workplace was shown to affect levels of AI-related knowledge and perceptions, as journalists employed with online news companies were more knowledgeable about AI than those working in traditional print and broadcast media. This suggests that traditional print and broadcast media lag behind the economic paradigm of automation and data-driven journalism, which shapes journalists' use of technology and acceptance of AI in news production (Soto-Sanfiel et al., 2022). Moreover, in Turkish media organisations, Etike's (2023) study on AI's use included the perspectives of 20 journalists and noted differences among age groups. Journalists who are 45 years old and older tend to stick to traditional forms of journalism and have a hard time incorporating new AI tools. A significant number of older journalists share this disbelief, which reflects the fear many people have concerning AI integration into labour markets as seen in Ali & Hassoun (2019). In contrast, younger journalists seem to be more fazed by unenthusiastic, and possibly due to hopeful expectations regarding the role of AI in journalism: it will get rid of tedious tasks while raising the skill threshold for someone practising journalism. Building on the empirical insights discussed above, this study formulates the following hypotheses to systematically examine how journalists' attitudes toward AI are shaped by

demographic and workplace-related factors:

H5: *Journalists' attitudes toward AAI, PCAI, and KAI differ significantly based on gender.*

H6: *Journalists' attitudes toward AAI, PCAI, and KAI vary significantly across different age groups.*

H7: *Professional experience significantly influences journalists' attitudes toward AAI, PCAI, and KAI.*

H8: *Workplace type significantly affects journalists' attitudes toward AAI, PCAI, and KAI.*

Method

Research Design and Participants

The analysis employed in the study is called systematic investigation and it analyses AI attitudes of journalists by using a quantitative design. As noted by Robson & McCartan (2016), this study employs a rigorously validated attitude methodology. These researchers argue that quantitative approaches are the most appropriate for analysing the attitudes of the members of contemporary society because they are effective in identifying trends within group behaviours and drawing generalisable conclusions (Queirós, Faria, & Almeida, 2017). In consideration of the fact that the focal point of the study is assessing the various domains of journalism with regards to their attitude towards AI, purposive sampling was deployed in order to capture representatives from the press, radio, television, and even internet news ensuring there is adequate coverage of media practitioners in Türkiye.

The sample selection processes in this research aimed to include representatives from different fields of journalism working in the Turkish media sector. Given the challenge of obtaining detailed operational data from media organisations, the recruitment approach used was to reach out through direct emailing to news organisations and journalist professional bodies. More specifically, the emails were directed to the media institutions included in the Press Bulletin Authority (Basın İlan Kurumu) periodical publications registry, and to district and provincial representatives of the news agencies. For this reason, the research utilized a non-probability purposive sampling technique, which is commonly used in journalism and media research when probability sampling is not feasible (Bryman, 2016; Robinson, 2013). While the exact response rate could not be determined due to the lack of institutionally provided data, the final sample represents a broad spectrum of media practitioners across print, digital, and broadcast platforms, enhancing the study's generalizability within the Turkish media landscape. Data were collected via a Google Form, enabling efficient and standardized responses from participants. A total of 350 journalists participated in the study, with Table 1 highlighting the heterogeneous composition of the sample across gender, age, years of experience, and media sector, thus contributing to the study's robustness and representativeness.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval for this study was granted by the Ethics Committee at Cankiri Karatekin University (Approval Date: 24-05-2024, Meeting No: 41). All participants had the choice to freely decide whether they wanted to be part of the study or not.

Table 1

Sociodemographic Characteristics of Participants

Characteristic	*Category*	*n*	*%*	*M*	*SD*
Age		350		38.96	9.58
Years of Experience		350		13.01	9.23
Gender	Female	113	32.3		
	Male	237	67.7		
Workplace	Internet	159	45.4		
	Press	122	34.9		
	Radio	22	6.3		
	TV	47	13.4		

They were briefed on the study's goals, allowed to withdraw at any time, and assured that their responses would remain anonymous. Participants gave informed consent before data collection began, which meets the criteria for ethical consideration of research with human subjects. All information gathered was held in strict confidence and confidential data, as well as identifying details, were removed to ensure the anonymity of the participants for the duration of the study.

Measures

In this study, the primary research tool was an adaptation of the scale designed by Soto-Sanfiel et al. (2022) for the attitudes, constraints, and perception of AI integration in journalism by Latin American journalists. The scale was originally designed to assess the journalists' perspectives in six Latin American countries of Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, Peru, and Venezuela, but was modified for a Turkish sample of journalists from the Internet, Press, Radio, and Television. The original scale had three attitude components: the application of Artificial Intelligence in Journalism (AAAI, 7 items), obstacles to the implementation of AI in journalism (PCAI, 6 items), and knowledge about the application of AI in journalism (KAI, 10 items). With regard to cultural adaptation recommendations from Beaton et al. (2000), the original Soto-Sanfiel et al. (2022) Latin American scales were meticulously adjusted to the Turkish media context. These constructs were tailored with respect to the culture and practice of journalism in Turkey in a way that the scale corresponds with local journalism, audience, and trends in digital transformation. The translation-back translation procedure was applied to achieve equivalence of meaning, concept, and context. Initially, two bilingual experts in journalism and AI transcribed the original items into Turkish. The first translation was produced separately by different bilingual experts. Afterward, one expert reviewed both translations and merged them into a single version that resolved discrepancies to ensure conceptual equivalence. Given the South American region where the context of the original scale was developed, validity adjustments were made relating to those differences in professional and structural context of the area. Special attention was given to ethnocentric AI concepts used in Turkish media, journalism, editorial practices, and specific media vocabulary to avoid misinterpretation.

In order to verify cultural relevance, we examined Soto-Sanfiel et al. (2022)'s work on differences of attitude towards artificial intelligence, data trustworthiness, resource accessibility, and the distinction of the periphery, among others. A different translator, who was not acquainted with the original scales, re-translated the adapted version into English, and this process of back-translation was conducted to assess semantic congruence. Afterward, an expert panel checked all the translations for translation accuracy in terms of language and culture to ensure that each item from the Turkish language version was semantically and conceptually clear, relevant, and precise within the target culture, that is, Turkish language and culture. These changes allowed the authors to shift the focus of the scale to more pressing local issues. The purpose of this adaptation was assessed through a review conducted by a panel of five experts in Journalism, Media Studies, and AI, who evaluated the proposed adaptation for cultural relevance and clarity. Testing with a pilot group of 30 Turkish journalists confirmed that the scale's content was relevant and culturally appropriate and that the reliability was within acceptable thresholds, supporting the scale's use in Turkish journalism.

The AAI subscale assesses journalists' attitudes toward integrating AI into journalism and demonstrated reliable internal consistency in this study. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using Mplus VERSION 8.3 was performed for each scale. The AAI model demonstrated good overall fit values (χ^2/df = 1.14; RMSEA = .028; CFI = .977; TLI = .975; SRMR = .059). The average variance extracted (AVE = .471) was above the acceptable threshold, confirming the construct's validity. The reliability analysis showed a Cronbach's alpha of .789, indicating acceptable internal consistency. The EFA results supported the construct validity of the AAI scale, with a single-factor solution explaining 20.2% of the variance and factor loadings ranging from .597 to .727.

The PCAI subscale evaluates perceived limitations, such as infrastructural or educational barriers to AI adoption. The CFA analysis indicated that The PCAI model exhibited excellent fit values (χ^2/df = 1.14; RMSEA = .028; CFI = .977; TLI = .975; SRMR = .059). The average variance extracted (AVE = .402) supported the model's validity. The Cronbach's alpha was calculated at .794, demonstrating good reliability. EFA results validated the unidimensional structure of the PCAI model, with a single-factor solution explaining 13.5% of the variance and factor loadings ranging from .622 to .712.

Finally, the KAI subscale measures journalists' understanding and awareness of AI's applications in the industry. The CFA results showed that The KAI model also indicated good fit values (χ^2/df = 1.14; RMSEA = .028; CFI = .977; TLI = .975; SRMR = .059). The average variance extracted (AVE = .465) exceeded the recommended threshold, confirming the construct's validity. The Cronbach's alpha for the KAI scale was .868, reflecting high internal consistency. EFA results also confirmed the validity of the KAI model, with a single-factor solution accounting for 12.7% of the variance and factor loadings ranging from .666 to .731. Based on the results for each scale, all items exhibited statistically significant factor loadings ($p < 0.001$), indicating that no items require removal from the scales for the Turkish sample.

Data Analysis

Quantitative methods were employed to analyse responses collected through the questionnaires, aiming to understand Turkish journalists' attitudes toward AI. The analysis was conducted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 29.0.2, following comprehensive data cleaning and screening. Descriptive statistics were first used to summarise key characteristics of the sample.

Normality tests, specifically the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests, indicated that the variables AAI, PCAI and KAI did not follow a normal distribution, with p-values < 0.001 for both tests. This suggests a deviation from normality for these specific variables. However, the TOTAL score was found to conform to normality, with Kolmogorov-Smirnov p-value = 0.200 and Shapiro-Wilk p-value = 0.212, both above the 0.05 threshold. The normality assumption of the data used in the study was evaluated by examining skewness and kurtosis values. The skewness values ranged between -.047 and .146, while kurtosis values ranged from -.305 to -1.209. Skewness and kurtosis values within the range of ±1.5 indicate that the data were approximately normally distributed (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013); therefore, the present dataset satisfied the assumption of normality and parametric tests were applied to compare means across demographic and professional variables, allowing a thorough exploration of potential differences in attitudes toward AI.

Results

The overall attitudes of journalists toward AI were assessed across three dimensions: AAI, PCAI, and KAI. Analysis of 350 responses revealed mean scores of 20.55 (SD = 5.59) for AAI, 18.23 (SD = 5.18) for PCAI, and 29.60 (SD = 8.25) for KAI. With potential score ranges for each dimension as follows: AAI (7 to 35), PCAI (6 to 30), and KAI (10 to 50), these findings suggest that, on average, journalists displayed moderately positive attitudes toward AI applications, acknowledged certain constraints, and demonstrated a fair level of knowledge regarding AI in journalism. The total mean score across the dimensions was 68.38 (SD = 10.79), within a possible range of 23 to 115. These findings support Hypothesis 1, suggesting that journalists hold positive overall attitudes toward AI.

AAI results reveal substantial apprehension towards the potential risks associated with AI in the journalistic landscape (see Table 2). For example, Q1: For example, Q1 ('The use of Artificial Intelligence in newsrooms is a threat to journalists' jobs') and Q3 ('Journalists' engagement with the public will be reduced if AI software is used') received considerable agreement from participants, with roughly 40-45% viewing these aspects as threats. This reflects a prevalent concern about the encroachment of AI on job security and the traditional interactive role journalists have with the public. Interestingly, a subset of AAI items that posit AI as an enabler

Table 2

AAI - Itemised Responses

IItem	*Statement*	*Strongly Disagree (%)*	*Disagree (%)*	*Neutral (%)*	*Agree (%)*	*Strongly Agree (%)*
Q1	The use of Artificial Intelligence and automation in newsrooms is a threat to journalists' jobs.	12.6	26.3	29.7	19.7	11.7
Q2	The use of AI and automation in journalism is a threat to interactive public dialogue.	12.9	22.6	30.3	23.4	10.9
Q3	Journalists' engagement with the public will be reduced if AI software and automation are used in newsrooms.	15.4	26.6	24.6	22.3	11.1
Q4	AI software and automation in journalism will affect journalists' role as communicators.	14.9	20.3	33.4	17.7	13.7
Q5	Artificial Intelligence machines and software can be used as intermediaries in the communication process.	12.6	24.3	26.6	24.6	12.0
Q6	Journalistic practice will innovate and be positively transformed by the use of AI software and automation in newsrooms.	10.9	29.4	29.7	21.4	8.6
Q7	AI software and automation in journalism will create new opportunities for journalists looking to pursue innovative forms of journalism.	12.6	24.9	28.3	21.4	12.9

for innovation received mixed reactions. A notable portion, around 30%, remained neutral or undecided, suggesting a degree of uncertainty or hesitancy about embracing AI's potential for transforming journalism. These findings partially support Hypothesis 2, as journalists perceive AI as a threat to job security and public engagement, while their views on its potential for innovation remain mixed and uncertain.

PCAI results, as shown in Table 3, emphasise the perceived limitations and challenges of adopting AI in journalism. Notably, a majority of journalists agreed on constraints related to data reliability, with over 40% of respondents citing issues such as data manipulation and inaccuracy (e.g., Q11: The issue of data inaccuracy limits the effective use of AI in journalism). These responses underscore a prevalent concern about the integrity of data that AI systems rely on, which could significantly affect the quality and trustworthiness of AI-driven journalism. Moreover, constraints related to a lack of resources, such as economic funding and

Table 3

PCAI – Itemised Responses

Item	*Statement*	*Strongly Disagree (%)*	*Disagree (%)*	*Neutral (%)*	*Agree (%)*	*Strongly Agree (%)*
Q8	We are not able to use automation and AI tools in journalistic practice because of the issue of data inaccuracy.	12.3	22.0	28.0	22.0	15.7
Q9	We are not able to use automation and AI tools in journalistic practice because of the possibility of data manipulation.	14.9	21.4	27.1	23.1	13.4
Q10	We are unable to use automation and AI tools in journalistic practice because we have a lack of access to information and data.	14.9	23.7	26.0	22.3	13.1
Q11	We are unable to use automation and AI tools in journalistic practice because of a lack of education and training in AI and digital journalism.	11.1	19.7	29.7	23.4	16.0
Q12	We are unable to use automation and AI tools in journalistic practice because of the digital divide in the country.	10.3	23.4	29.1	24.9	12.3
Q13	We are unable to use automation and AI tools in journalistic practice because of a lack of economic resources.	12.3	21.4	29.7	23.4	13.1

Table 4

KAI - Itemised Responses

Item	*Statement*	*Strongly Disagree (%)*	*Disagree (%)*	*Neutral (%)*	*Agree (%)*	*Strongly Agree (%)*
Q14	Artificial intelligence tools can be used to find new topics to report which are typically hidden from the human eye.	11.7	24.0	32.3	20.9	11.1
Q15	Artificial intelligence can effectively identify trends in data by time periods, geography, or demographics.	16.3	22.6	28.0	20.3	12.9
Q16	Artificial intelligence can be used to assess the credibility of news and data.	13.7	25.4	24.9	24.0	12.0
Q17	Artificial intelligence tools can be used to personalise news and content.	12.3	22.0	32.9	21.4	11.4
Q18	A high volume of data can be effectively analysed and summarised by AI tools in minutes or seconds.	13.7	21.4	28.3	23.1	13.4
Q19	AI tools are already able to moderate audiences' comments on news pieces.	14.6	23.1	26.6	20.6	15.1
Q20	The virality of news can be predicted by artificial intelligence.	14.0	23.7	28.9	22.9	10.6
Q21	AI can report news in real time.	14.3	23.4	26.3	24.3	11.7
Q22	A greater quantity of news can be produced by artificial intelligence.	11.1	24.0	31.7	22.6	10.6
Q23	AI's production of news no longer necessitates human intervention or assistance.	14.9	22.9	26.6	23.1	12.6

access to advanced training, were highlighted as substantial barriers, with nearly 50% of participants agreeing with statements like Q17: We are unable to use AI tools in journalism due to lack of training and education. Taken together, these findings confirm Hypothesis 3, demonstrating that journalists identify data reliability, lack of resources, and insufficient training as significant barriers to the adoption of AI in journalism.

KAI results reveal a generally positive level of awareness among journalists regarding AI's capabilities, particularly in data processing and trend analysis. For instance, over 55% of respondents agreed that AI can be instrumental in identifying patterns and trends in large datasets (e.g., Q19: AI tools can quickly analyse large volumes of data and identify trends), which demonstrates an understanding of AI's powerful data-driven capabilities (see Table 4). This awareness highlights that journalists are attuned to the practical applications of AI, particularly in areas reliant on large-scale data processing. In contrast, only around 25% agreed that AI could independently generate news content without human intervention (e.g., Q23: AI-generated news no longer requires human assistance), reflecting scepticism about its autonomous capabilities. This finding supports Hypothesis 4 by showing that while journalists are knowledgeable about AI's strengths in data analysis, they remain cautious about its ability to independently produce high-quality news.

Demographic Background and AI Perceptions

An independent samples t-test was conducted to examine potential gender-based differences across AAI, PCAI, KAI, and the Total score. Results showed no statistically significant differences in any dimension between female and male journalists. For AAI, PCAI, and KAI, mean scores were comparable, with effect sizes close to zero (Cohen's d values ranging from -0.002 to 0.143), suggesting minimal practical differences (see Table 5). These results indicate that Hypothesis 5 is rejected, as no statistically significant gender-based differences were observed across AAI, PCAI, KAI, or the Total score, suggesting that gender does not influence these dimensions.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine whether journalists' attitudes toward AAI, PCAI, KAI, and the Total score differed by age group. As

Table 5

Gender-Based Differences in Attitudes Towards AI

Dimension	*Gender*	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*	*Cohen's d*
AAI	Female	113	20.54	5.69	-0.014	348	0.989	-0.002
	Male	237	20.55	5.56				
PCAI	Female	113	18.31	5.61	0.188	348	0.851	0.021
	Male	237	18.20	4.98				
KAI	Female	113	28.81	8.00	-1.250	348	0.212	-0.143
	Male	237	29.98	8.35				
Total	Female	113	67.65	10.62	-0.871	348	0.384	-0.100
	Male	237	68.73	10.88				

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics and One-Way ANOVA Results for Age Groups

Dimension	*Age Group*	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*	η^2
AAI	22-30	76	20.59	6.06	0.018	0.997	0.000
	30-40	128	20.52	5.63			
	40-50	105	20.49	5.23			
	50+	41	20.71	5.69			
PCAI	22-30	76	18.97	5.29	1.837	0.140	0.016
	30-40	128	18.24	5.03			
	40-50	105	17.37	5.38			
	50+	41	19.05	4.76			
KAI	22-30	76	29.05	7.66	1.142	0.332	0.010
	30-40	128	29.91	8.79			
	40-50	105	30.34	7.89			
	50+	41	27.76	8.40			
Total	22-30	76	68.62	10.55	0.141	0.936	0.001
	30-40	128	68.67	10.42			
	40-50	105	68.20	10.85			
	50+	41	67.51	12.48			

shown in Table 6, the analysis found no statistically significant differences across age groups for any dimension. Although younger journalists reported slightly higher knowledge scores, this variation was negligible and did not hold practical significance. These findings lead to the rejection of Hypothesis 6, indicating that journalists, regardless of age, share consistent attitudes, constraints, and knowledge about AI.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to examine whether journalists' attitudes toward AAI, PCAI, KAI, and the Total score varied according to years of experience, divided into five groups (0-5, 5-10,

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics and One-Way ANOVA Results for Years of Experience

Dimension	*Experience Group (Years)*	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*	η^2
AAI	0-5	91	20.38	5.72	0.936	0.443	0.011
	5-10	68	20.25	5.87			
	10-15	60	21.32	5.59			
	15-20	60	19.65	4.93			
	20+	71	21.14	5.69			
PCAI	0-5	91	18.66	5.34	1.709	0.147	0.019
	5-10	68	17.56	4.90			
	10-15	60	19.20	5.08			
	15-20	60	17.12	5.18			
	20+	71	18.46	5.22			
KAI	0-5	91	29.16	8.19	1.037	0.388	0.012
	5-10	68	31.18	8.03			
	10-15	60	29.57	8.89			
	15-20	60	29.87	7.85			
	20+	71	28.46	8.28			
Total	0-5	91	68.21	10.41	0.839	0.501	0.010
	5-10	68	68.99	10.50			
	10-15	60	70.08	9.99			
	15-20	60	66.63	10.18			
	20+	71	68.07	12.61			

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics and One-Way ANOVA Results for Workplace

Dimension	*Workplace*	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*	η^2
AAI	Internet	159	21.09	5.40	1.695	0.168	0.014
	Press	122	19.63	5.97			
	Radio	22	20.95	4.58			
	TV	47	20.89	5.54			
PCAI	Internet	159	18.67	4.86	0.720	0.541	0.006
	Press	122	17.97	5.58			
	Radio	22	17.86	4.29			
	TV	47	17.64	5.58			
KAI	Internet	159	29.37	8.00	2.299	0.077	0.020
	Press	122	28.65	8.54			
	Radio	22	32.14	7.59			
	TV	47	31.68	8.26			
Total	Internet	159	69.13	10.34	2.752	0.043	0.023
	Press	122	66.25	11.23			
	Radio	22	70.95	9.70			
	TV	47	70.21	11.03			

10-15, 15-20, and 20+ years). The results lead to the rejection of Hypothesis 7, indicating no significant differences across experience groups (see Table 7).

The uniformity in Total scores across experience groups further suggests a consistent perspective on AI across the profession, regardless of experience length. This homogeneity may reflect shared professional standards or similar exposure to AI technologies among journalists in this study.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to examine whether journalists' attitudes toward AAI, PCAI, KAI, and the overall Total scores differed significantly based on workplace type (Internet, Press, Radio, and TV). The results provide partial support for Hypothesis 8, as no significant differences were found in AAI and PCAI, while minor variations in KAI and Total scores suggest a limited influence of workplace type. Overall, these findings indicate that workplace type does not play a substantial role in shaping journalists' AI-related attitudes, perceived constraints, or knowledge, highlighting a broad consistency across different media platforms.

Discussion

The findings from this study illustrate the complex relationship Turkish journalists have with AI in journalism, highlighting both its advantages and disadvantages. Journalists from Türkiye seem to share the perception that AI contributes to operational effectiveness, especially in data processing and content tailoring. At the same time, journalists express strong concerns about the potential displacement of professional journalists. Concerns over job loss, eroded control over editorial decisions, and data accuracy undermine that optimism. These sentiments are common in developing economies where there is a lack of resources and scepticism over the automation of journalism exists (Jamil, 2020; Soto-Sanfiel, et al., 2022). These realities emphasise the importance of local contexts in formulating strategies for adopting AI, particularly in low-resourced media systems such as Türkiye, where infrastructure and training provisions are so inadequate that journalists apprehend the possible risks offered by AI over its advantages.

This research equally focused on journalists' perspectives on the benefits and drawbacks of AI in journalism. In line with the Technology Acceptance Model, which bases acceptance on perceived usefulness and ease of use (Davis, 1989), Turkish journalists highlighted the productivity improvements AI could bring to tasks such as data gathering and content creation. However, fear significantly limits this advantage, particularly regarding automation's impact on employment and audience disengagement, reflecting findings from previous research on the effects of AI in journalism (Beckett, 2019; Lewis et al., 2019). At this stage, journalists' scepticism is most pronounced, given the country's underdeveloped media and digital infrastructure. The limited availability of skilled professionals further exacerbates concerns that AI will merely automate jobs rather than create new opportunities for journalism.

A marginally more optimistic view can be gleaned from studies focusing on the use of AI in more developed contexts, where it is regarded more as a facilitator than a competitor to the profession. AI technology is perceived and utilized differently across cultures (Kim & Kim, 2018). With increasing economic and technological resources, AI is now viewed more positively than before, particularly appreciated by journalists for enabling comprehensive, data-rich analysis. Hence, the skepticism experienced by Turkish journalists might suggest that greater AI technology resources need to be developed and more attention should be paid to the extent to which technology is adapted to journalists' needs.

The gaps and limitations identified in this research study present difficulties in the use and application of AI technology in Turkish journalism. There is a lack of AI training, insufficient funding, and persistent concerns over data credibility, issues also found in other developing economies (Jamil, 2020). The determination of data value, the threat of data manipulation, and the risk of compromising journalistic credibility were among the concerns

raised. Such constraints exist in media systems where adequate technology and expertise to apply AI are lacking, creating ethical dilemmas regarding the content and quality of news generated by AI (Lewis et al., 2019). Inadequate funding, along with a lack of resources and training, poses a significant challenge, particularly for Turkish reporters. This exacerbates unemployment while placing journalists in a precarious position, at risk of losing control over journalism standards due to AI.

An important finding from this research is the lack of considerable differences across AI demographics, suggesting a highly integrated professional culture. This corroborates the organizational culture approach, which posits that journalists, irrespective of their individual differences, undergo a uniform socialization process that shapes their attitudes toward AI integration in journalism (Shoemaker & Reese, 2013). This contributes to the existing literature by indicating that industry-wide adaptation to emerging technologies, regardless of demographic differences, is likely driven by a commitment to public responsibility, integrity, and editorial independence.

Despite the common professional culture representing a single entity, they approach AI differently. Research indicates that a more diverse workforce has more innovative ways of using AI in the newsroom since people from different cultures approach technology differently (Beckett, 2019). The seemingly uniform attitudes of Turkish journalists may suggest that they work in a professional setting still grappling with the micropolitical aspects of AI and exercising caution regarding its potential harms. In this sense, more sophisticated research in the future could study whether the exposure and training journalists receive would alter their understanding of AI because it is possible that less perceived threat and more value in AI would help journalists use it more.

The degree of understanding Turkish journalists have on AI tools reveals how AI can be helpful and also pose ethical challenges. On one side, there is some understanding of how AI can be used in journalism to automate processes like data analysis, trend analysis, and audience interaction. However, their knowledge seems to be incomplete, especially in regard to AI's use in news verification and content creation. This limitation informs findings from past literature illustrating that journalists working in developing countries may not have as much access to advanced technologies, which, in turn, may limit their understanding of AI's functionality (Lewis et al., 2019).

The demographic analysis conducted for this study indicates that there are no marked differences in the attitudes towards AI considering age, gender, or years of experience, reflecting a blend of organisational culture among journalists in Turkey. A similar blend of attitudes has also been noted in Pakistan where there is an economic and infrastructural prevailing fear of AI (Noor & Zafar, 2023). Unlike these, more advanced regions, such as Latin America, seem to exhibit a broader array of attitudes towards AI owing to the varied sociocultural and technological ecosystems within which they are situated (Soto-Sanfiel et al., 2022).

A potential reason regarding this uniformity in the case of Turkey might relate to the media's industrial structure and institutional characteristics. Unlike settings where AI adoption differs significantly by AI-using stratification, media workers in Türkiye share similar economic headwinds, low digital infrastructure, and inadequate AI skills development pathways. This uniformity indicates that disabling professional boundaries, as opposed to differentiating toward individual distinctions, explains the attitudes of AI to technology among Turkish journalists. Furthermore, these findings complement research on professional culture in journalism, which contends that structural sociological features such as dominant norms or shared values are more influential in shaping a journalist's attitude than demographic attributes (Shoemaker & Reese, 2013). At the same time, unlike other subsidised media-restricted-access

journalism environments, Turkish journalists seem to counter these dominating forces because of shared stresses like financial precarity, editorial control, and the uncertain AI function in the newsroom.

AI adoption in journalism has been particularly sensitive to the fact that attitudes are formed not only by the general automation perceptions but also by an individual's skill set and adaptability to technologies (Gökbel, 2024). For example, researchers argue that journalists who possess advanced coding and data analytic skills view AI as a productivity boosting instrument for investigative reporting. On the contrary, those with lower skill levels associated with the digital world consider AI as a negative disruptor to traditional journalism practices (Türksoy, 2022). This particular distinction aids in explaining the heterogeneous forms of AI adoption across the different kinds of newsrooms. Hence, unfolding these findings as a problem to be addressed means addressing the question of how technological competence affects AI perception among journalists, particularly in newsrooms where automation is becoming a common feature. A more active consideration of qualitative fragments of existing literature can help explain these gaps and respond to questions on the shifting dynamics of AI's role in journalism. Structural factors within Türkiye's media industry adopt a more stereotypical posture toward AI adoption that is remarkably similar to Pakistan's media industry (Jamil, 2020). With less developed technology infrastructure, there is greater heterogeneity in the regulatory framework within the areas that enable diverse applications of AI in journalism. As highlighted earlier, in Türkiye, economic and institutional factors seem to stifle individual variation while heightening AI skepticism. Therefore, these conclusions stress the need to formulate AI policies that appropriately address local boundaries within the geopolitical context and purposefully implement AI to improve, rather than harm, employment regarding journalism, editorial work, and decision-making.

Conclusion

This research analyses in depth the perspectives of Turkish journalists concerning AI, focusing particularly on how its efficiencies are regarded as a mixed blessing because of the potential risks to employment, editorial control, and privacy. Such findings suggest the specific media context in Türkiye where the fusion of economic constraints, an inadequately developed digital landscape, and lack of AI-focused training create a hostile attitude towards AI adoption. The cautious attitude of Turkish journalists highlights the reliance on routines associated with resource-scarce media environments, while the implementation of AI integration strategies challenges the adoption of new technologies within a framework of great structural disintegration.

These media contexts suggest a gap in policies dedicated to education, ethics, and digital infrastructure that has the potential to change the present situation. Creating these circumstances would allow AI to be accepted as augmenting the value of journalism rather than viewed as a replacement for human journalists, helping establish trust towards AI as an enabling tool. This research contributes to the global discussions regarding the role of AI in journalism by incorporating the perspectives of Türkiye, which remains economically and infrastructurally challenged. It is critical to safeguard journalism's role and ethical standards to ensure that journalists possess the necessary skills and resources to effectively utilise, engage with, and interact with AI technology as it develops. This study seeks to address the ways emerging and resource-limited media landscapes AI presents challenges and opportunities within journalism.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

This research provides insight into the perceptions of AI among Turkish journalists. Despite this, the findings are not as widely applicable as the scope of the research suggests. The applicability of the study is further narrowed by the fact that it attempts to tackle an economic and regulatory contextual problem by focusing only on Turkish

journalists. Subsequent research may use this work as a starting point for more comprehensive studies in other regions in order to understand the local context for AI integration in journalism.

Moreover, the self-reported measures may contain bias wherein respondents could over or under-express their views. Moreover, the study overlooks the difference in participants' level of digital competence or AI skills which can affect their perception. With this gap, the more advanced journalists in AI might provide interesting attitudinal patterns towards varying levels of technological proficiency. Despite having a sample of journalists from different media platforms, the study does not divide respondents by size of settlement (metropolitan vs. small-town media outlets) as well as local and national media organisations. Failing to include these classifications could cap the ability to address potential regional differences in AI use and journalism practice. To fill these gaps, further research needs to apply qualitative approaches to investigate how journalists' diverse digital competencies impact the integration of AI in Journalism. Qualitative methods such as interviews and focus groups could provide richer context to the survey data. In addition, combining survey data with in-depth interviews could capture more nuanced differences regarding underlying reasons behind the attitude differences. Finally, the use of a cross-sectional approach captures the attitude at one point in time which does not reflect the dynamic nature of change over time.

References

Ali, W., & Hassoun, M. (2019). Artificial intelligence and automated journalism: Contemporary challenges and new opportunities. I*nternational Journal of Media, Journalism and Mass Communications*, 5(1), 40-49.

Allan, S. (2013). *Citizen witnessing: Revisioning journalism in times of crisis*. John Wiley & Sons.

Anderson, C. W., Bell, E., & Shirky, C. (2015). Post-industrial journalism: Adapting to the present. *Geopolitics, History and International Relations*, 7(2), 32.

Aydın, B., & İnce, M. (2024). Can artificial intelligence write news: A research on determining the effect of artificial intelligence on news writing practice. I*ntermedia International E-journal*, 11(20), 24-41.

Baştürk, D. (2024). *Türkiye medyasında yapay zekâ kullanımı: Kervan yolda düzülüyor [Artificial Intelligence Usage in Turkish Media: Building the Caravan on the Road]*. https://journo.com.tr/medya-yapay-zekâ-uygulamalar

Beaton, D. E., Bombardier, C., Guillemin, F., & Ferraz, M. B. (2000). Guidelines for the process of cross-cultural adaptation of self-report measures. *Spine*, 25(24), 3186-3191.

Beckett, C. (2019). New powers, new responsibilities: A global survey of journalism and artificial intelligence. *London School of Economics*, 18.

Bernard, M. (2013). Big Data and Robots-Together They Might Challenge You for Your Job. *KPI Library*.

Brennen, J. S. (2018). An industry-led debate: How UK media cover artificial intelligence. *Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism*.

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods*. Oxford university press.

Chan-Olmsted, S. M. (2019). A review of artificial intelligence adoptions in the media industry. International *Journal on Media Management,* 21(3-4), 193-215.

Çelik, K. (2022). Artifical Intelligence Journalism and The Problems It May Bring. *Mecmua*(13), 143-158. https://doi.org/10.32579/mecmua.999308

de-Lima-Santos, M.-F., & Ceron, W. (2021). Artificial intelligence in news media: current perceptions and future outlook. *Journalism and Media*, 3(1), 13-26.

Diakopoulos, N. (2019). *Automating the news: How algorithms are rewriting the media*. Harvard University Press.

Dörr, K. N. (2016). Mapping the field of algorithmic journalism. *Digital Journalism*, 4(6), 700-722.

Ernst, E., Merola, R., & Samaan, D. (2019). Economics of artificial intelligence: Implications for the future of work. *IZA Journal of Labor Policy*, 9(1).

Etike, Ş. (2023). Türkiye'deki Haber Merkezlerinde Yapay Zekâ Teknolojileri Gazeteci Deneyimleri ve Algıları [Artificial intelligence technologies in Turkish newsrooms: Journalistic experiences and perceptions]. In H. Hülür & C. Yaşın (Eds.), *Yeni medya ve toplumsal dönüşümler [New media and societal transformations]* (pp. 98-428).

Frey, C. B., & Osborne, M. A. (2017). The future of employment: How susceptible are jobs to computerisation? *Technological forecasting and social change*, 114, 254-280.

Gökbel, H. (2024). Yapay Zekanın Gazetecilik Pratiklerindeki Yeri. *TAM Akademi Dergisi,* 3(2), 135-163. https://doi.org/10.58239/tamde.2024.02.001.x

Graefe, A. (2016). Guide to automated journalism. *Columbia Journalism Review.*

Hancock, J. T., Naaman, M., & Levy, K. (2020). AI-mediated communication: Definition, research agenda, and ethical considerations. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 25(1), 89-100.

Hermida, A. (2010). Twittering the news: The emergence of ambient journalism. *Journalism Practice,* 4(3), 297-308.

Jamil, S. (2020). Artificial intelligence and journalistic practice: The crossroads of obstacles and opportunities for the Pakistani journalists. *Journalism Practice*, 15(10), 1400-1422.

Kaput, M. (2021). Artificial intelligence in advertising. *Marketing Artificial Intelligence Institute.*

Kasım, Y. N. (2024). *Anadolu to unveil new AI app to transform news reporting: CEO.* https://www.aa.com.tr/en/corporate-news/anadolu-to-unveil-new-ai-app-to-transform-news-reporting-ceo/3259403

Kırık, A. M., Göksu, O., & Yegen, C. (2024). Yapay Zekâ ve Gazetecilik: Türk Medyasında ChatGPT Kullanımı. *İletişim Kuram ve Araştırma Dergisi,* (68), 90-109.

Kim, D., & Kim, S. (2018). Newspaper journalists' attitudes towards robot journalism. *Telematics and Informatics*, 35(2), 340-357.

Kirley, E. A. (2016). The robot as cub reporter: law's emerging role in cognitive journalism. *European journal of Law and Technology,* 7(3), 17-18.

Lewis, S. C., Guzman, A. L., & Schmidt, T. R. (2019). Automation, journalism, and human-machine communication: Rethinking roles and relationships of humans and machines in news. *Digital Journalism*, 7(4), 409-427.

Marconi, F. (2020). Newsmakers: Artificial intelligence and the future of journalism. *Columbia University Press.*

Moses, L. (2017). The Washington Post's robot reporter has published 850 articles in the past year. *Digiday*, 4.

Noain-Sánchez, A. (2022). Addressing the Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Journalism: the perception of experts, journalists and academics. *Communication & Society,* 35(3), 105-121.

Noor, R., & Zafar, H. (2023). Use of artificial intelligence in Pakistani journalism: Navigating challenges and future paths in TV newsrooms. *Journal of Asian Development Studies*, 12(3), 1638-1649.

Olsen, G. R. (2023). Enthusiasm and Alienation: How Implementing Automated Journalism Affects the Work Meaningfulness of Three Newsroom Groups. *Journalism Practice*, 1-17.

Pan, Y. (2016). Heading toward artificial intelligence 2.0. *Engineering*, 2(4), 409-413.

Porlezza, C. (2023). Promoting responsible AI: A European perspective on the governance of artificial intelligence in media and journalism. *Communications*, 48(3), 370-394.

Prasad, R., & Choudhary, P. (2021). State-of-the-Art of Artificial Intelligence. *Journal of Mobile Multimedia,* 17(1-3), 427-454.

Queirós, A., Faria, D., & Almeida, F. (2017). Strengths and limitations of qualitative and quantitative research methods. *European journal of education studies*.

Robinson, O. C. (2013). Sampling in Interview-Based Qualitative Research: A Theoretical and Practical Guide. *Qualitative Research in Psychology,* 11(1), 25–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2013.801543

Robson, C., & McCartan, K. (2016). *Real world research*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Sarısakaloğlu, A. (2021). Framing discourses in Turkish news coverage regarding artificial intelligence technologies' prospects and challenges. *Türkiye İletişim Araştırmaları Dergisi,* (37), 20-38.

Shoemaker, P. J., & Reese, S. D. (2013). *Mediating the message in the 21st century: A media sociology perspective*. Routledge.

Simon, F. M. (2024). Artificial Intelligence in the News: How AI Retools, Rationalizes, and Reshapes Journalism and the Public Arena. *Columbia Journalism Review*.

Smuha, N. A. (2021). From a 'race to AI'to a 'race to AI regulation': regulatory competition for artificial intelligence. *Law, Innovation and Technology,* 13(1), 57-84.

Soto-Sanfiel, M. T., Ibiti, A., Machado, M., Ochoa, B. E., Michilot, M. M., Arce, C. G., & Angulo-Brunet, A. (2022). In search of the Global South: assessing attitudes of Latin American journalists to artificial intelligence in journalism. *Journalism studies*, 23(10), 1197-1224.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). Using multivariate statistics (6. Baskı). *MA: Pearson*.

Thurman, N., Lewis, S. C., & Kunert, J. (2019). Algorithms, automation, and news. *Digital Journalism,* 7(8), 980-992.

Túñez-López, M., Toural-Bran, C., & Valdiviezo-Abad, C. (2019). Automation, bots and algorithms in newsmaking. Impact and quality of artificial journalism. *Revista Latina De Comunicación Social,* 74, 1411-1433.

Türksoy, N. (2022). The Future of Public Relations, Advertising and Journalism: How Artificial Intelligence May Transform the Communication Profession and Why Society Should Care?. *Türkiye İletişim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 40, 394-410.

Van Dalen, A. (2012). The algorithms behind the headlines: How machine-written news redefines the core skills of human journalists. *Journalism practice,* 6(5-6), 648-658.

Verma, D. (2024). Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Journalism: A Comprehensive Review of AI in Journalism. *Journal of Communication and Management*, 3(02), 150-156.

Young, M. L., & Hermida, A. (2015). From Mr. and Mrs. outlier to central tendencies: Computational journalism and crime reporting at the Los Angeles Times. *Digital Journalism*, 3(3), 381-397.

Genişletilmiş Özet

Bu çalışma, Türkiye'deki gazetecilerin gazetecilik alanında yapay zekâ entegrasyonuna yönelik tutumlarını inceleyerek, yapay zekânın medya sektörü üzerindeki etkilerini, sunduğu fırsatları ve getirdiği zorlukları ortaya koymayı amaçlamaktadır. Günümüz medya ortamında dijitalleşmenin hızlı ilerlemesiyle birlikte, yapay zekâ teknolojilerinin yaygınlaşması, habercilik süreçlerinde veri analitiği, içerik otomasyonu ve kişiselleştirilmiş haber sunumu gibi yenilikleri gündeme getirmiştir (Lewis vd., 2019). Özellikle gelişmekte olan ülkelerde yapay zekânın medya sektöründeki etkisinin anlaşılması, sektörün sürdürülebilir dönüşümünü sağlamak açısından büyük önem taşımaktadır. Araştırmanın temel problemi, Türkiye'nin medya sektöründeki ekonomik ve yapısal sınırlamaların yapay zekânın gazetecilik uygulamaları üzerindeki etkisini nasıl şekillendirdiğini anlamaktır. Bu bağlamda, ekonomik kısıtlamalar, dijital altyapı eksiklikleri ve sınırlı eğitim olanakları gibi faktörlerin, gazetecilerin yapay zekâya karşı geliştirdiği temkinli yaklaşımı nasıl etkilediği değerlendirilecektir (Jamil, 2020). Çalışma, gazetecilerin yapay zekâ teknolojilerine dair algılarını, bu alanda gördükleri fırsatları ve riskleri ele almayı, aynı zamanda yapay zekânın mesleki bağımsızlık ve editoryal özgürlük üzerindeki etkisini kapsamlı bir şekilde değerlendirmeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Araştırmada nicel bir yöntem kullanılmış ve veri toplama tekniği olarak anket uygulanmıştır. Bu araştırmada örneklem seçim süreci, Türkiye medya sektöründe çalışan farklı gazetecilik alanlarından temsilcileri içermeyi hedeflemiştir. Medya kuruluşlarından ayrıntılı operasyonel veriler elde etmenin zorlukları göz önüne alındığında, katılımcılar doğrudan e-posta yoluyla haber kuruluşları ve gazeteci meslek örgütlerine ulaşarak belirlenmiştir. Özellikle, Basın İlan Kurumu'nun periyodik yayınlar kayıt sistemine dâhil olan medya kurumları ile haber ajanslarının il ve ilçe temsilcileriyle iletişime geçilmiştir. Bu nedenle, çalışmada olasılıklı örnekleme uygulanmasının mümkün olmadığı durumlarda sıklıkla tercih edilen olasılıksız amaçlı örnekleme yöntemi kullanılmıştır (Bryman, 2016; Robinson, 2013). Katılımcıların demografik özellikleri tablo 1'de özetlenmiştir. Örneklemde toplam 350 gazeteci yer almakta olup, ortalama yaş 38.96 (SS=9.58), mesleki deneyim süresi ise 13.01 yıl (SS=9.23) olarak hesaplanmıştır. Cinsiyet dağılımı, kadın katılımcıların %32.3 (n=113), erkek katılımcıların ise %67.7 (n=237) olduğunu göstermektedir. Çalıştıkları medya alanına göre ise %45.4'ü (n=159) internet medyasında, %34.9'u (n=122) basılı medyada görev yapmaktadır. Anket sonuçları, gazetecilerin yapay zekâya ilişkin genel bir farkındalığa sahip olduğunu ancak bu farkındalığın çoğunlukla yüzeysel düzeyde kaldığını göstermektedir. Anket sonuçları, gazetecilerin yapay zekânın veri analitiği, haber yayımı ve içerik kişiselleştirme gibi alanlarda sunduğu potansiyel verimlilik artışlarını kabul ettiğini; ancak iş güvenliği, editoryal bağımsızlık ve veri güvenilirliği konularında endişe duyduklarını göstermektedir.

Bu çalışmanın bulguları, yapay zekânın Türkiye'deki gazeteciler arasında hem bir fırsat hem de bir tehdit olarak algılandığını ortaya koymaktadır. Özellikle veri analizi ve otomasyon süreçlerinde verimliliği artırma potansiyeli, gazetecilik süreçlerinin hızlandırılması açısından olumlu değerlendirilmiştir. Ancak, bu algının yanı sıra, yapay zekânın geleneksel gazetecilik pratikleri üzerindeki olası olumsuz etkileri de dikkat çekmektedir. Katılımcılar, yapay zekâ ve otomasyon teknolojilerinin haber üretim süreçlerinde insan emeğine olan ihtiyacı azaltarak iş güvencesini tehlikeye atabileceğinden endişe duymaktadır. Bu kaygıların, Türkiye'nin sınırlı dijital altyapısı ve yetersiz eğitim olanakları gibi yapısal sorunlardan kaynaklandığı görülmektedir.

Yapay zekânın gazetecilikteki uygulamaları, mesleki bağımsızlık ve halkla etkileşim gibi değerleri tehdit eden unsurlar olarak da değerlendirilmektedir. Katılımcılar, yapay zekânın habercilik süreçlerine katılımının, gazetecilerin halkla doğrudan temasını ve toplumsal diyalogdaki rollerini azaltabileceğini düşünmektedir. Bu durum, gazetecilerin yapay zekâya karşı temkinli yaklaşmasına neden olmaktadır; zira habercilikte insan faktörünün önemi, kamuoyunun güvenini kazanmak için kritik bir unsurdur. Bu bağlamda, gazeteciler yapay

zekânın habercilik değerlerini zayıflatma ihtimalini ciddi bir risk olarak görmektedir.

Araştırmanın diğer bir bulgusu ise, Türkiye'deki gazetecilerin mesleki dayanışma ve ortak değerler çerçevesinde homojen bir tutum sergilemeleridir. Çalışmada, yaş, cinsiyet ve deneyim yılı gibi demografik değişkenlerin yapay zekâya ilişkin tutumlar üzerinde belirgin bir fark yaratmadığı gözlemlenmiştir. Bu durum, Türkiye'deki gazetecilik kültüründe ortak bir profesyonel yaklaşımın mevcut olduğunu göstermektedir. Türkiye'deki gazetecilerin, sektördeki ekonomik ve yapısal kısıtlamalar nedeniyle mesleki dayanışma içinde, teknolojik yeniliklere temkinli bir yaklaşım geliştirdiği söylenebilir. Bu ortak tutum, medya sektöründeki sınırlı kaynaklar ve dijitalleşme sürecinin yavaş ilerlemesi ile daha da pekişmektedir.

Araştırmanın sonuçları, Türkiye'de yapay zekânın medya sektörüne entegrasyonunda karşılaşılan temel yapısal engellerin giderilmesi gerektiğine işaret etmektedir. Öncelikli olarak, gazetecilerin yapay zekâyı etkili bir şekilde kullanabilmeleri için hedefe yönelik eğitim programlarının geliştirilmesi önem arz etmektedir. Özellikle yapay zekânın veri güvenilirliği, etik standartlar ve mesleki bağımsızlık üzerindeki etkilerine dair eğitimlerin yaygınlaştırılması, gazetecilerin bu teknolojiyi daha iyi anlamalarını ve güven duymalarını sağlayacaktır (Noor & Zafar, 2023). Bunun yanı sıra, medya sektöründe dijital altyapının iyileştirilmesi ve güvenilir veri kaynaklarına erişimin sağlanması, yapay zekâ uygulamalarının daha geniş kapsamda benimsenmesine olanak tanıyacaktır.

Bu çalışma, gelişmekte olan ülkelerde yapay zekânın gazetecilik üzerindeki etkilerini anlamak açısından önemli bir katkı sunmaktadır. Özellikle, Türkiye gibi ekonomik ve yapısal kısıtlamalarla karşı karşıya olan ülkelerde, yapay zekânın medya sektörü üzerindeki etkisinin incelenmesi, bu teknolojinin sürdürülebilir ve sorumlu bir şekilde uygulanabilmesi için rehberlik edici bilgiler sağlamaktadır. Araştırmanın sonuçları, yapay zekânın habercilikte geleneksel değerleri tehdit eden unsurlar kadar, habercilik süreçlerini geliştirme potansiyeli taşıyan bir araç olduğunu göstermektedir. Bu bağlamda, medya kuruluşlarının, gazetecilik değerlerine uygun bir yapay zekâ entegrasyonu stratejisi benimsemeleri, hem mesleki etik standartların korunmasını sağlayacak hem de gazetecilerin yapay zekâ uygulamalarına olan güvenini artıracaktır.

Sonuç olarak, bu çalışma Türkiye'deki gazetecilerin yapay zekâya dair algılarını kapsamlı bir şekilde değerlendirerek, yapay zekânın medya sektörüne entegrasyonunda karşılaşılan zorlukları ve sunduğu fırsatları ele almaktadır. Bulgular, Türk medya sektöründe yapay zekâ entegrasyonunun etkili bir şekilde sağlanabilmesi için öncelikli olarak yapısal reformların gerekliliğini vurgulamaktadır. Medya kuruluşlarının dijital altyapıyı güçlendirmesi, yapay zekâ eğitim programlarını artırması ve veri güvenliği ile mesleki etik konularına daha fazla önem vermesi, bu entegrasyonun sorunsuz bir şekilde ilerlemesi için kritik öneme sahiptir. Bu bağlamda, medya kuruluşlarının gazetecilik etik standartlarına uygun bir yapay zekâ stratejisi benimsemesi, hem mesleki bağımsızlığı koruyacak hem de gazetecilerin yapay zekâ uygulamalarına olan güvenini artıracaktır.

Yazar Bilgileri

Author details

1- (Sorumlu Yazar Corresponding Author) Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi, semrademirdis@karatekin.edu.tr

Destekleyen Kurum/Kuruluşlar

Supporting-Sponsor Institutions or Organizations:

Herhangi bir kurum/kuruluştan destek alınmamıştır. **None**

Çıkar Çatışması

Conflict of Interest

Herhangi bir çıkar çatışması bulunmamaktadır. **None**

Kaynak Göstermek İçin

To Cite This Article

Demirdiş, S. (2025). Turkish journalists' attitudes, perceived constraints, and knowledge about AI in journalism. *Yeni Medya* (18), 1-20, https://doi.org/10.55609/yenimedya.1614735.