A SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW OF AUGMENTED JOURNALISM AND THE ETHICAL GOVERNANCE OF GENERATIVE AI

Rania ABDELAZIM MOHAMED*

ABSTRACT

This study examines the ethical, professional, and institutional implications of integrating artificial intelligence (AI) into journalistic production environments. Drawing on a review of academic literature, industry reports, and professional practices, it analyses how augmented journalism defined as the use of AI to enhance rather than replace human editorial judgment is reshaping newsroom structures and workflows. While AI contributes to greater efficiency, faster coverage, and audience personalisation, it simultaneously generates complex ethical challenges, including algorithmic opacity, misinformation, social bias, and issues of accountability, privacy, and intellectual property. The analysis highlights that these challenges are not purely technical but institutional, necessitating governance frameworks that integrate human oversight, transparency mechanisms, and periodic algorithmic audits. The study proposes a multi-level framework encompassing human-in-the-loop systems, data governance, ethical literacy, and multi-stakeholder collaboration to ensure responsible AI integration. It concludes that the sustainable adoption of AI in journalism depends on balancing innovation with ethical standards and maintaining human responsibility as the cornerstone of editorial credibility.

Keywords: Accountability, Augmented Journalism, Digital Transformation, Ethical Challenge, Newsroom

Received/Gönderim: 28.02.2026 – Accepted/Kabul: 27.04.2026

*Doktora Öğrencisi, Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Radyo, Televizyon ve Sinema Doktora Programı, E-mail: rabdelazim@ankara.edu.tr, ORCID: 0009-0003-3042-1578

Abdelazim Mohamed, R. (2026). A Systematic Literature Review of Augmented Journalism and the Ethical Governance of Generative AI. *Akademik Açı*, 6 (1): 76- 104. DOI: 10.59597/akademikaci.1899941

ARTIRILMIŞ GAZETECİLİK VE ÜRETKEN YAPAY ZEKÂNIN ETİK YÖNETİŞİMİNE İLİŞKİN SİSTEMATİK BİR LİTERATÜR TARAMASI

ÖZET

Bu çalışma, yapay zekânın (YZ) gazetecilik üretim ortamlarına entegrasyonunun etik, mesleki ve kurumsal sonuçlarını incelemektedir. Akademik literatür, sektör raporları ve mesleki uygulamalara dayanan analiz, insan editörlerin yargısını ikame etmekten ziyade onu desteklemeyi amaçlayan artırılmış gazetecilik modelinin haber merkezi yapılanmalarını, iş akışlarını ve emek süreçlerini nasıl dönüştürdüğünü ortaya koymaktadır. Bulgular, YZ tabanlı sistemlerin haber üretiminde verimlilik ve hız artışı sağlama, veri temelli içerik üretimi ve izleyiciye yönelik daha ayrıntılı kişiselleştirilmiş sunumlar geliştirme kapasitesine sahip olduğunu; ancak bu süreçlerin algoritmik opaklık, yanlış/yanıltıcı bilgilendirme, önyargıların yeniden üretilmesi, hesap verebilirlik boşlukları, gizlilik ihlalleri ve fikri mülkiyet sorunları gibi çok katmanlı etik riskler doğurduğunu göstermektedir. Çalışma, söz konusu risklerin yalnızca teknik değil, aynı zamanda kurumsal ve yönetsel boyutlara sahip olduğuna işaret etmekte; bu nedenle insan denetimini, açıklanabilirlik ve şeffaflık mekanizmalarını, düzenli algoritma denetimlerini ve açık sorumluluk paylaşımını içeren bütüncül bir yönetişim çerçevesinin gerekliliğini savunmaktadır. Ayrıca insan-döngüsünü içeren sistem tasarımları, sağlam veri yönetişimi ilkeleri, haber odalarında etik okuryazarlığın güçlendirilmesi ve gazeteciler, teknoloji geliştiricileri ve düzenleyici kurumlar arasında çok paydaşlı iş birliği önerilmektedir. Sonuç olarak, gazetecilikte YZ'nin sürdürülebilir ve meşru biçimde benimsenmesi, yenilikçi kullanım alanlarının etik ilkelerle uyumlu biçimde tasarlanmasına ve editoryal güvenilirliğin temeli olan insan sorumluluğunun korunmasına bağlıdır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Artırılmış Gazetecilik, Dijital Dönüşüm, Etik Zorluklar, Haber Merkezi, Hesap Verebilirlik, Yapay Zekâ

INTRODUCTION

Over the past decade, the global media ecosystem has undergone a profound structural and epistemological transformation, partly driven by the accelerating integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into journalistic environments. While this transformation is often framed in terms of technological innovation and efficiency, such an approach risks reducing journalism to a set of technical operations. This study adopts a *socio-institutional and normative perspective*, arguing that journalism should be understood not merely as a site of technological application, but as a historically grounded social practice shaped by professional norms, institutional structures, and democratic functions.

Within this broader framework, the emergence of *augmented journalism* is conceptualized not as a rupture with traditional journalism, but as a *reconfiguration of its practices*. Augmented journalism refers to the integration of algorithmic systems into editorial workflows in ways that support—rather than replace—human judgment. However, limiting this concept to the algorithmic "enhancement" of news risks confining the discussion to issues of efficiency and governance, without adequately engaging with the epistemological, historical, and ethical foundations of journalism itself.

Accordingly, this study redefines *content production* as a multi-layered editorial process that includes data collection, verification, selection, interpretation, and distribution. These processes are

embedded within historically developed professional values such as accuracy, accountability, and public responsibility. From this perspective, artificial intelligence does not constitute an autonomous driver of journalistic transformation, but operates within—and is constrained by—existing institutional logics and ethical frameworks. This position aligns with critical media scholarship, which emphasizes that technological change interacts with, rather than replaces, the social and historical foundations of journalistic practice.

Recent developments in media organizations illustrate the institutionalization of AI within journalism. For example, in March 2024, *The New York Times* appointed its first editorial director for AI initiatives, tasked with "developing potential uses of machine learning to serve journalists and readers" (Seward, 2024). This case reflects a broader global trend in which news organizations increasingly incorporate generative AI into editorial and production processes. Such developments indicate that AI integration is not merely a technical shift, but an organizational and editorial transformation that has the potential to reshape newsroom structures and professional roles.

At the same time, artificial intelligence enhances the capacity of media organizations to analyze large-scale datasets and understand audience preferences, enabling highly personalized content distribution. As noted in an industry report, AI can "analyse vast amounts of data to ensure that the right content reaches the right audience at the right time" (Arc XP, 2024). While these capabilities contribute to stronger audience engagement and more efficient content delivery, they also raise important questions about editorial autonomy, audience segmentation, and the broader implications of algorithmic mediation in public communication.

More fundamentally, the increasing reliance on algorithmic systems introduces significant ethical and professional challenges that cannot be addressed through a purely technological lens. Concerns regarding editorial accountability, transparency, and the preservation of journalistic standards—such as impartiality and accuracy—highlight the limitations of viewing AI as a neutral or deterministic force. As Burrell (2016) suggests, the opacity of algorithmic systems complicates interpretability and accountability, while other studies indicate that AI systems may reproduce structural biases embedded in training data. Empirical research further demonstrates that journalists and media practitioners hold ambivalent attitudes toward AI integration, balancing perceived gains in efficiency with concerns about professional identity, job security, and ethical responsibility (Oh & Jung, 2025).

In this context, discussions of *transparency and ethics* require conceptual clarification. Given the limited accessibility of algorithmic models and the absence of fully open-source systems, transparency cannot be reduced to technical explainability alone. Instead, this study adopts a *functional and institutional understanding of transparency,* emphasizing disclosure practices, editorial responsibility, and governance mechanisms. Similarly, ethics is approached not as a set of prescriptive

editorial guidelines, but as a historically evolving framework rooted in the social and democratic functions of journalism.

In light of these considerations, there is a pressing need to develop analytical frameworks that move beyond technological determinism and situate AI within the broader socio-institutional context of journalism. This article therefore examines how generative artificial intelligence is reshaping newsroom structures and editorial workflows, while simultaneously reconfiguring ethical and professional standards in broadcast and digital media.

The contribution of this study is threefold. First, it clarifies the theoretical positioning of augmented journalism by linking technological developments to the historical and normative foundations of journalistic practice. Second, it provides a systematic mapping of key ethical challenges—including algorithmic opacity, bias, and accountability gaps—within an institutional framework. Third, it proposes a multi-level governance model that integrates human oversight, transparency mechanisms, and editorial verification to support the responsible adoption of AI in journalism.

Ultimately, the study argues that the sustainable integration of artificial intelligence in journalism depends not solely on technological innovation, but on the capacity of media institutions to embed these technologies within ethical, professional, and democratic frameworks that preserve credibility and public trust.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK & LITERATURE REVIEW

Augmented Journalism Within a Socio-Institutional and Normative Perspective

This study adopts a socio-institutional and normative perspective on journalism, rather than a purely technological or instrumental approach. While contemporary debates frequently position artificial intelligence (AI) as a transformative force in news production, such interpretations risk reducing journalism to a set of technical processes. In contrast, this article conceptualizes journalism as a historically embedded social practice, shaped by institutional norms, professional values, and democratic functions (Lewis et al., 2025, p. 8).

Within this framework, augmented journalism is not treated as a paradigm of technological substitution, but as a continuity and transformation of journalistic practice. AI systems operate within existing editorial structures, interacting with professional routines, organizational constraints, and ethical standards rather than replacing them. This position explicitly challenges technologically deterministic interpretations, aligning instead with critical media scholarship, which emphasizes that technological change is mediated by institutional logics and socio-political contexts (Spyridou and Ioannou, 2025, p. 11).

Accordingly, artificial intelligence is situated within the broader epistemological foundations of journalism, including credibility, accountability, and the public service role of news media (Ward, 2018). This perspective reframes AI not as an autonomous driver of change, but as a component embedded within complex editorial ecosystems.

Conceptualizing Content Production in AI-Driven Journalism

A central issue in the debate on augmented journalism concerns the meaning of "content production." In much of the existing literature, content production is implicitly equated with automated text generation (Diakopoulos, 2019, p. 29). However, such a reductionist view obscures the complexity of journalistic practice.

In this study, content production is defined as a multi-layered editorial process that includes:

- Data collection and verification
- Editorial selection and prioritization
- Narrative construction and contextualization
- Dissemination and audience engagement

These processes are historically grounded in professional norms such as accuracy, impartiality, and accountability. From this perspective, AI contributes primarily to computational augmentation—for example, by processing large datasets or generating preliminary drafts—but does not replace the interpretive, ethical, and contextual functions performed by human journalists (Chanakya, 2022, p. 16).

Beyond Technological Determinism: Reframing AI in Journalism

The transformation of journalism in the digital age has often been interpreted through the lens of technological determinism, particularly in the work of Marshall McLuhan, who argued that media technologies fundamentally reshape social and institutional structures (McLuhan, 1964, p. 9). While this perspective provides valuable insights into the impact of technological innovation, relying on it exclusively risks oversimplifying the relationship between AI and journalism.

This study therefore adopts a non-deterministic and relational approach, arguing that AI does not independently dictate changes in journalism. Instead, its impact is shaped by:

- Editorial practices
- Institutional frameworks
- Professional norms
- Regulatory and ethical contexts

In this sense, the integration of AI into journalism should be understood as a negotiated and context-dependent process, rather than a linear technological evolution.

Augmented Journalism as a Hybrid Model of Practice

Building on this perspective, augmented journalism is conceptualized as a hybrid model that combines human editorial judgment with algorithmic capabilities. As defined in the literature, augmented journalism refers to the use of AI to enhance—rather than replace—human creativity and decision-making in the news production process (Marconi et al., 2021, p. 19).

In practice, the news industry has increasingly embedded computational methods, including machine learning and data-driven systems, across the entire production pipeline. Algorithms now support a wide range of functions, such as automated data collection, transcription of audiovisual content, and the generation of preliminary news drafts. As Diakopoulos notes, this shift corresponds to the "effective automation" of numerous journalistic tasks (2020, p. 947), allowing journalists to focus on higher-order activities such as analysis and investigative reporting.

From a functional perspective, augmented journalism can be understood through three key dimensions:

- Operational efficiency: automation of routine tasks to reduce workload
- Scalability and reach: expansion of coverage to niche and large audiences
- Data-driven credibility: reliance on structured datasets to support reporting (Montal & Reich, 2017, p. 2)

These dimensions collectively define the hybrid newsroom model, in which human and machine processes coexist and interact.

Ethical Foundations and Governance in AI-Driven Journalism

While AI introduces significant opportunities for efficiency and innovation, its integration also raises fundamental ethical and institutional challenges. Importantly, these challenges cannot be addressed solely from a technical perspective.

Literature consistently emphasizes the need to integrate ethical principles and governance mechanisms into AI-driven journalism. The benefits of AI do not emerge automatically; rather, they depend on the implementation of:

- Transparency policies
- Editorial accountability frameworks
- Continuous professional training
- Mechanisms for evaluating algorithmic outputs (Arc XP, 2024).

In this study, transparency is not understood as full technical access to algorithmic systems—which is often unrealistic due to proprietary constraints—but as a functional and institutional principle, involving disclosure, explainability, and accountability in editorial processes. Similarly, ethics is conceptualized not as a set of prescriptive guidelines, but as a dynamic framework rooted in the historical and democratic functions of journalism.

This approach aligns with core principles of media ethics, including transparency, accountability, and credibility (Ward, 2018), and with emerging frameworks of AI governance that seek to regulate the responsible deployment of these technologies (UNESCO, 2023).

Accordingly, the framework provides a basis for analyzing how AI reshapes journalism not as a purely technological phenomenon, but as a multi-dimensional transformation involving professional practices, institutional arrangements, and societal expectations.

Theoretical Backgrounds and Key Concepts

In recent decades, media theory has evolved rapidly as information and communication technologies (ICT) have become integral to the news industry, giving rise to an interactive digital media ecosystem marked by instantaneous access to information, extensive content personalization, and broad-based public participation. This transformation can be understood through Marshall McLuhan's theory of Technological Determinism, which posits that emerging media technologies do more than introduce new communication tools—they fundamentally reconfigure social and institutional frameworks. In this view, modern newsrooms are experiencing profound changes in production and distribution processes (1964, p. 9).

Building on this perspective, the concept of augmented journalism has gained prominence in media scholarship. Augmented journalism refers to the application of artificial intelligence as a means to enhance, rather than replace, human creativity and decision-making in the news production process (Marconi et al., 2021, p. 19). In practice, the news industry has increasingly embedded computational methods—including machine learning algorithms and other AI-driven tools throughout its operations. Consequently, algorithms now support a wide range of journalistic functions: from automated data gathering and the transcription of audio-visual content to generating first drafts of news stories. In fact, researchers note that algorithms are implemented across the entire news production pipeline, effectively automating many routine tasks .Furthermore, this shift towards algorithmic processes is reshaping the nature of journalistic work. As many repetitive tasks are delegated to AI systems, journalists are able to focus more on higher-order editorial activities such as analysis, investigative reporting, and storytelling. In Diakopoulos's words, this trend corresponds to the "effective automation" of numerous journalistic tasks (2020, p. 947), ultimately allowing newsrooms to reallocate human effort toward creative and analytical dimensions of journalism.

From a functional and organisational perspective, the emergence of augmented journalism is predicated on three fundamental objectives. Firstly, the augmentation of routine tasks (e.g., transcription, baseline summaries) through automation is intended to liberate journalists from such menial tasks, enabling them to focus on higher-order reporting and analysis. Secondly, the efficiency and scalability of this process is expected to result in cost-effective expansion of coverage to both long-tail and niche audiences, with minimal marginal cost. Thirdly, the enhancement of data processing and perceived credibility is anticipated through the systematic location, prioritisation, and aggregation of large datasets to produce data-driven content. This is regarded as more reliable due to the lower error rates and database-backed evidence it produces (Montal & Reich, 2017, p.2) These dimensions form the conceptual foundation of the hybrid newsroom model that increasingly characterises contemporary journalism.

Multiple studies confirm that Artificial Intelligence (AI) is extensively applied throughout the journalistic workflow and emphasize the necessity of hybrid, human-in-the-loop systems in news production. This literature consistently describes AI's role as a transformative yet supportive (augmentative) force in news media (Kevin-Alerechi et al., 2025, p. 4) . Augmented journalism, therefore, leverages AI across the entire news value chain, optimizing processes from initial data acquisition through to content distribution.

As highlighted in numerous reviews, it is imperative to integrate this theoretical framework with the implementation of effective governance mechanisms and ethical practices within media organizations. The anticipated benefits of AI integration do not manifest automatically; rather, they necessitate the establishment of transparency policies, the enforcement of quality standards, continuous professional training, and mechanisms for reviewing and arbitrating model outputs from both professional and ethical perspectives (Arc XP, 2024). Accordingly, the proposed theoretical framework combines hypotheses of technical empowerment with institutional tendencies toward governance and editorial oversight, thereby offering a methodological foundation for examining the impact of AI applications in newsrooms and evaluating their alignment with established professional values.

The framework is further grounded in core principles of media ethics, including transparency, accountability, and credibility (Ward, 2018).Since AI technologies raise complex issues related to editorial responsibility, algorithmic bias, and privacy violations, emerging approaches such as AI governance seek to establish regulatory and ethical standards for their responsible deployment in media contexts (UNESCO, 2023).

Review of Previous Studies

Recent scholarship on artificial intelligence (AI) in journalism has increasingly moved beyond a purely technological perspective to examine its broader implications for professional practices, institutional structures, and democratic functions. While early studies emphasized the efficiency gains

associated with automation, more recent research highlights the need to situate AI within the social and historical context of journalistic practice, rather than treating it as a neutral or autonomous technological force.

From a functional perspective, empirical studies demonstrate that AI contributes significantly to improving newsroom efficiency. For example, research conducted by the Associated Press (AP) found that the automation of earnings reports reduced journalists' time investment by approximately 20%, thereby enabling greater focus on investigative and in-depth reporting (Graefe, 2016, pp. 23–24). Such findings support the argument that AI can enhance productivity and reallocate human labor toward higher-value editorial tasks. However, these benefits must be understood within the broader framework of journalistic norms and institutional constraints, rather than as purely technical achievements.

At the same time, a substantial body of literature emphasizes the ethical and epistemological risks associated with AI integration. Noble (2018, p. 119) demonstrates that algorithmic systems are not neutral but may reproduce and amplify existing social and cultural biases embedded in their training data. These challenges core journalistic principles such as impartiality and fairness, raising concerns about the integrity of algorithmically mediated news production. Similarly, recent studies on large language models indicate that AI systems are prone to generating "hallucinations"—outputs that appear credible but are factually inaccurate (Sun et al., 2024, p. 2). These findings underscore the limitations of relying on AI without robust editorial verification and human oversight.

Importantly, these challenges cannot be addressed solely through technical solutions. Instead, they require a reconsideration of journalistic ethics as a historically grounded and evolving framework, rather than a set of static editorial guidelines. In this regard, the integration of AI into journalism necessitates a critical re-evaluation of existing professional codes of ethics, many of which were developed in pre-digital or early digital contexts and do not adequately account for algorithmic mediation in news production.

International organizations have begun to address this gap by proposing normative frameworks for the ethical use of AI. UNESCO's global recommendations on AI ethics, for example, emphasize principles such as transparency, human oversight, and accountability (UNESCO, 2021, p. 6). However, in light of the limited accessibility of algorithmic systems and the absence of fully open-source models, these principles must be interpreted within an institutional and functional context, rather than as purely technical requirements. Transparency, therefore, should be understood not only as algorithmic explainability, but also as editorial disclosure and organizational responsibility. Similarly, accountability must be anchored in identifiable human actors and institutional processes, rather than attributed to opaque technological systems.

Overall, the literature suggests that while AI offers significant opportunities to enhance journalistic efficiency and innovation, its integration fundamentally reshapes the ethical, professional,

and institutional dimensions of journalism. Consequently, future research and practice must move beyond a narrow focus on technological capabilities and instead adopt a holistic approach that integrates technological, institutional, and normative perspectives.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF JOURNALISTIC PRACTICE

Recent scholarship demonstrates that the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into journalism extends beyond technical enhancement to encompass a broader transformation of editorial processes, organizational structures, and professional practices. Oh and Jung provide empirical evidence that AI has significantly reshaped core journalistic functions, including agenda-setting, content gathering, production, and distribution, describing it as a "transformative tool" influencing newsroom dynamics and strategic decision-making (Oh & Jung, 2025, p. 2).

In contemporary media environments, AI systems are embedded across the entire journalistic value chain, from data collection and automated analysis to algorithmic news writing and audience personalization. A systematic review indicates that AI is "radically changing journalism" by enabling large-scale data processing and the automation of routine tasks, marking one of the most significant transformations since the emergence of the internet (Doembana, 2025, p. 127). However, this transformation should not be understood as purely technological; rather, it reflects a reconfiguration of journalistic practice within institutional and professional contexts.

In practical terms, AI applications support multiple stages of content production, including keyword extraction, interview transcription, and the generation of preliminary reports. Empirical data suggest that approximately 73% of news organizations employ AI for news writing, 68% for data analysis, and 62% for audience personalization (Sonni et al., 2024, p. 1562). These developments indicate that AI functions primarily as a supportive infrastructure, enhancing efficiency while remaining embedded within editorial decision-making processes.

The advent of generative artificial intelligence (AI) in content production signifies a substantial paradigm shift in the methodologies employed in journalism. The advent of systems such as GPT-based models for text generation and DALL·E for visual content has precipitated the emergence of novel forms of media production, thereby enabling the automated generation of articles, graphics, and multimedia outputs (Doembana, 2025, p. 126; Lewis et al., 2025).

However, this study conceptualizes content production not as mere automated output generation, but as a multi-layered editorial process involving verification, contextualization, and ethical judgment. In this sense, generative AI contributes to the initial stages of production -such as drafting or summarization- while human journalists retain responsibility for interpretation, validation, and narrative construction.

The rapid diffusion of tools such as ChatGPT further illustrates the normalization of AI-assisted content production. These systems are widely used for drafting articles, composing communications, and supporting creative processes (Fomenko, 2025). At the organizational level, major media institutions have accelerated AI adoption. For example, The New York Times established a dedicated team combining engineers and editors to develop AI-driven tools (David, 2024), while the BBC has expanded its use of AI across translation, transcription, and content generation processes, emphasizing the importance of editorial oversight (Ashton, 2024).

These developments indicate that AI is not replacing journalism, but rather reshaping the division of labor within newsrooms, giving rise to hybrid roles that combine technical and editorial expertise (Ashton, 2024).

Notwithstanding its operational benefits, the integration of AI gives rise to a number of significant ethical challenges that extend beyond the technical realm. Survey-based research indicates that a considerable proportion of audiences expect AI to negatively affect news consumption, reflecting concerns about credibility and trust (Lipka, 2025). Concurrently, systematic reviews have identified a paucity of transparency (82%), privacy violations (76%), and inadequate accountability mechanisms (71%) as the most salient risks (Sonni et al., 2024, p. 1562).

These findings highlight that the ethical implications of AI cannot be understood solely in terms of technological limitations. Rather, they reflect deeper tensions between automation and core journalistic values such as accuracy, accountability, and editorial responsibility. In particular, algorithmic systems may undermine human judgment, introduce biases, and produce inaccurate or misleading content, thereby challenging the epistemological foundations of journalism.

While AI introduces significant challenges, it also offers opportunities to reinforce journalistic values when implemented responsibly. The literature emphasizes that AI should be understood not only as a tool for automation, but also as a means of augmenting human capabilities and enhancing editorial quality (Spyridou & Ioannou, 2025, pp. 2, 8).

Three key dimensions can be identified in this regard:

1. Efficiency and Editorial Enhancement

AI systems improve efficiency by automating repetitive tasks such as data collection, analysis, and preliminary content generation. This enables journalists to focus on investigative reporting, critical analysis, and storytelling, thereby strengthening the depth and quality of journalism.

2. Reinforcing Core Journalistic Values

When applied ethically, AI can support accuracy, verification, and inclusivity. Through data validation processes and audience feedback mechanisms, AI can enhance credibility and facilitate more diverse and representative content (Parratt-Fernández et al., 2021).

3. Governance and Ethical Implementation

Responsible AI use requires clear governance frameworks that prioritize human oversight, transparency, and accountability. This includes disclosing AI-generated content, ensuring data protection, and fostering interdisciplinary collaboration between journalists and technical experts (Spyridou & Ioannou, 2025).

In the contemporary era, characterized by the proliferation of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies, there has been a substantial transformation in the realm of audience engagement. The advent of AI has paved the way for the implementation of large-scale personalization, thereby redefining the landscape of audience interaction. Industry insights indicate that artificial intelligence (AI) can enhance content delivery by aligning content with user preferences in real time (Arc XP, 2024). Empirical evidence indicates that 73% of media organizations use AI for automated writing, while 62% employ it for content personalization (Sonni et al., 2024).

Experimental studies further demonstrate that personalized newsletters can significantly increase engagement rates, with open rates reaching 53% and click-through rates 42% (Hoss, 2024). However, these developments also raise ethical concerns related to privacy, algorithmic filtering, and the potential fragmentation of the public sphere.

As noted by industry practitioners, personalization should be balanced with editorial diversity. For example, hybrid homepage models combining personalized and general content have been proposed to maintain exposure to diverse perspectives (Arc XP, 2024).

Ultimately, the future of journalism in the AI era will depend on the ability of media institutions to develop governance frameworks that ensure AI functions as an enabler of human expertise, rather than a substitute for it.

ETHICAL CHALLENGES OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN JOURNALISM: A SOCIO-INSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Although artificial intelligence (AI) has the potential to enhance creativity, efficiency, and innovation in journalism, its integration raises profound ethical and methodological concerns that extend beyond technical considerations and directly affect journalistic integrity and public trust (Tutivén & Cano, 2025, p. 14). Rather than interpreting these challenges solely through a technological lens, this study situates them within the social, institutional, and historical foundations of journalistic practice.

From this perspective, ethical challenges are not merely operational issues related to the use of tools but are deeply connected to the evolution of journalism as a democratic institution. Accordingly, the following analysis classifies key ethical concerns as multi-dimensional phenomena, encompassing technical, professional, institutional, and societal dimensions.

Transparency, Accountability, and the Limits of Algorithmic Opacity

The lack of transparency surrounding how algorithms work is one of the most pressing issues, as it can be difficult even for the media organisations themselves to interpret the outputs of AI systems. Montal and Reich have pointed out that this opacity erodes the credibility of journalism, as editorial accountability, accuracy and responsibility may be compromised when non-human systems are used without strict oversight. Recent cases have highlighted such issues, including Sports Illustrated publishing articles written by artificial intelligence under fictitious author names (Bauder, 2023). And Men's Journal publishing a health article containing inaccurate medical information requiring substantial corrections (McDougall, 2023). The increasing reliance on artificial intelligence (AI) systems that operate without traditional editorial oversight introduces substantial risks and governance challenges for media organisations (Kevin-Alerechi et al., 2025, p. 3). The utilisation of "black box" algorithms, characterised by their intricate technical complexity that obscures the decision-making processes within, has been identified as a significant factor in the erosion of transparency and accountability (Burrell, 2016). This opacity complicates the attribution of responsibility when AI-generated content produces factual inaccuracies or "hallucinations." Conventionally, journalistic ethics place accountability with the journalist and the media organisation. However, the delegation of editorial functions to algorithms necessitates a redefinition of responsibility frameworks (Scheffauer et al., 2024, p. 2). In this context, human oversight remains indispensable; editors and journalists must verify AI outputs as they would any other source before publication to ensure factual accuracy and uphold professional standards (Gutiérrez-Caneda et al., 2024, p. 6). The persistence of system errors and ambiguity in accountability poses a significant challenge to established editorial norms and risks eroding public trust in the credibility of news media.

Algorithmic Bias and the Erosion of Impartiality

Algorithmic systems frequently exhibit biases inherent in their training data, thereby perpetuating and potentially amplifying social and cultural prejudices across various dimensions, including age, gender, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status (Gabino-Campos et al., 2025, p. 1). This data-driven bias has been shown to compromise fundamental journalistic principles of impartiality and fairness (Spyridou & Danezis, 2024, p. 1577) and has the capacity to distort the visibility of editorials by prioritising specific story types or perspectives. Diakopoulos provides documentation of the manner in which these algorithmic effects shape the information environment, thereby affecting story selection, recommendation flows, and the types of content presented to audiences. This has the potential to result in unequal representation and entrenched inequities in news coverage (Diakopoulos, 2020, p. 962).

The increasing reliance on algorithms to inform editorial decisions gives rise to significant concerns regarding the responsible deployment of AI in news media. Empirical evidence indicates that the public places lower levels of trust in algorithmically distributed content, particularly on social media

platforms, relative to the trust placed in legacy publishers. Furthermore, perceptions of automated content vary according to political orientation. In order to protect journalistic values such as diversity, plurality, and social responsibility, formal regulatory and governance mechanisms are required. Additionally, improving content provenance and digital literacy is essential so that audiences can reliably distinguish between human- and AI-generated news (Moravec et al., 2024, p. 1,2,9).

Misinformation, Generative AI, and the Crisis of Credibility

The advent of artificial intelligence (AI), and more specifically, generative AI (GAI), has precipitated a paradigm shift in content creation, marked by the ability to produce content at an unparalleled scale, velocity, and magnitude (Sun et al., 2024, p. 2). Nevertheless, this transition may potentially compromise the standard of media output (Spyridou & Ioannou, 2025, p. 4; Tutivén & Cano, 2025, p. 3). AI systems, including large language models (LLMs), have been observed to be susceptible to the generation of "AI hallucinations." These hallucinations are defined as instances where the AI produces fictional, erroneous, or unsubstantiated information. The generated outputs, whether text or synthetic media, frequently appear plausible but are factually incorrect or nonsensical, requiring careful scrutiny (Sun et al., 2024, p. 1,2). It is evident that GAI poses a significant threat to the integrity of journalism by facilitating the creation of fabricated visual and audio materials through the utilisation of deepfake technologies (Diakopoulos & Johnson, 2021). This pervasive risk of error, amplified by the high-quality writing and persuasive nature of machine-generated texts, contributes significantly to the spread of misinformation and disinformation, potentially eroding public trust in news content (Kevin-Alerechi et al., 2025, p. 6). Consequently, effective content verification and continuous human oversight are essential requirements to ensure accuracy and maintain journalistic credibility (Gutiérrez-Caneda et al., 2024, p. 6).

Intellectual Property, Privacy, and Data Governance

The development of generative AI depends on large-scale training datasets that frequently include copyrighted works. This is a reality that major developers have acknowledged, stating that it is “impossible to train today’s leading AI models without using copyrighted materials”. This reliance has led to multiple high-profile copyright claims, with visual artists and news organisations filing suits alleging that firms used their works without consent, attribution or remuneration, while technology companies defend such practices under doctrines like fair use. (Bertolini, 2024, p. 3). While Burrell warned that the lack of transparency in algorithms makes it difficult to trace legal responsibility. Privacy issues also remain prominent, especially with the increasing use of personal data in content personalization (Burrell, 2016).

The integration of AI in journalism intersects with data privacy, intellectual property and consumer protection regimes, requiring news organisations to balance regulatory compliance with editorial independence. Measures such as privacy by design, transparent consent procedures, secure data

storage and provenance protocols, as set out in frameworks such as the GDPR and CCPA, are therefore essential to maintain legal conformity and public trust in algorithmically mediated news (Kevin-Alerechi et al., 2025, p. 6) . For this reason, international bodies such as UNESCO stress the importance of human oversight and regulatory frameworks that ensure transparency and adherence to solid ethical standards when using artificial intelligence in the media (UNESCO, 2025).

Public Understanding and the Myth of Algorithmic Objectivity

A critical yet often overlooked challenge concerns the limited public understanding of AI. Studies indicate widespread AI illiteracy among both audiences and professionals, which obscures the limitations and risks of algorithmic systems (Oh & Jung, 2025, p. 14).

Media representations frequently anthropomorphize AI, portraying it as possessing human-like intelligence. This creates misleading perceptions of objectivity and reliability, while masking issues such as bias and hallucinations (Gabino-Campos et al., 2025, pp. 1, 9; Pitluk et al., 2025, p. 2). Carlson (2018) further critiques the assumption of algorithmic objectivity, arguing that it reduces critical scrutiny and increases the likelihood of unverified content being published. This dynamic highlight the importance of media literacy and critical awareness as essential components of responsible AI integration.

Professional Identity and the Transformation of Journalistic Labor

The integration of AI and automation poses a threat to journalists' professional identity and job security by enabling routine, mechanical tasks to be substituted (Gutiérrez-Caneda et al., 2024, p. 6). Economists estimate that around 15% of a reporter's time and 9% of an editor's time can be automated using current technologies (Diakopoulos, 2019, p. 14), and ongoing technological advances make job displacement or reduced staffing increasingly likely (Spyridou & Danezis, 2024, p. 1579; Spyridou & Ioannou, 2025, p. 7). This transition risks deskilling and devaluing human judgement, a process partly driven by the disputed idea that algorithmic decision-making is more objective than human judgement which could lead to inequalities in news coverage (Carlson, 2018, pp. 1755, 1764, 1768). Conversely, however, advocates contend that AI can offload repetitive work, freeing up journalists to concentrate on investigative, interpretive and creative reporting (Doembana, 2025, p. 128).

Visual Manipulation and the Crisis of Visual Credibility

The potential of generative artificial intelligence to generate images with a high degree of realism poses a significant challenge to the established credibility of visual media. Empirical research indicates that AI-generated images can so closely mimic photographic reality that viewers may be unable to reliably distinguish synthetic from authentic images. In some cases, viewers may even judge certain synthetic faces as more trustworthy than real ones (Thomson et al., 2024). This capacity for photorealism, when combined with the psychological mechanism of 'suspension of disbelief' (Barnes, 2012), has resulted in AI imagery becoming an effective vehicle for the dissemination of misinformation

and manipulation. This effect is particularly pronounced on social media platforms and has been termed the 'liar's dividend', whereby the existence of fakes enables those with malicious intent to cast doubt on genuine visual evidence (Diakopoulos & Johnson, 2021).

It is evident that both journalistic and academic practitioners have expressed significant reservations regarding the utilisation of AI-generated visuals in the domain of news reporting. Key concerns include the distortion of reality (AI images are constructed artefacts rather than documentary records), the risk of misleading audiences when images are published without contextual labelling, and the erosion of the evidentiary role of photojournalism thereby devaluing the labour of photographers who document events under difficult condition (Kalfeli & Angeli, 2025). Historically, audiences have accepted photographs as having a "truth-to-appearance" quality that engenders trust; AI-generated images subvert this expectation and have the potential to erode public confidence in visual news (Zelizer, 2019).

In order to mitigate the aforementioned harms, the extant literature recommends the implementation of robust editorial safeguards. Practical measures to be implemented include mandatory pre-publication human review, explicit attribution that an image is AI-generated (for example, visible watermarks or embedded provenance metadata), and, where practicable, disclosure of generation prompts or provenance records to aid verification and audience comprehension (Epstein et al., 2023; Kalfeli & Angeli, 2025).The implementation of such policies is imperative for the preservation of the evidentiary authority of visual journalism and for the protection of public trust in news media.

Structural Inequalities and Dependence on Technology Platforms

Resource and infrastructure inequalities underlie significant disparities in news organisations' capacity to adopt and deploy artificial intelligence. Outlets in the Global South and smaller media organisations are disproportionately affected by the persistent digital divide, which limits access to computational resources, data infrastructure, and technical expertise required for sustainable AI implementation Click or tap here to enter text.. In regions where telecommunications are weak and unreliable, the deployment of data-intensive systems and real-time workflows is directly constrained (Oh & Jung, 2025), while limited organisational resources mean many smaller publishers lack the technical expertise and capital to develop or procure proprietary AI solutions (Mathias Felipe, 2024). These issues are further exacerbated by an imbalanced distribution of human capital, characterised by deficiencies in AI literacy and digital competencies among journalists and editors. This hinders newsrooms' capacity to oversee, evaluate, or audit algorithmic systems, consequently leading to an increased reliance on third-party providers (Oh & Jung, 2025).

The predominance of substantial technology enterprises has resulted in the consolidation of control over distribution, monetisation, and the AI tools that facilitate audience engagement, thereby engendering pronounced power asymmetries between platforms and publishers (Brown & Jaźwińska,

2025). The economic dependency of news projects that rely on platform funding or licensing has been demonstrated to exacerbate existing inequalities and reduce publishers' bargaining leverage (Lucchi, 2025). It is evident that publishers function within opaque, algorithmically governed ecosystems whose decision rules are often inscrutable (Burrell, 2016), thereby shifting editorial authority towards a proprietary, profit-driven logic (Spyridou & Ioannou, 2025). The advent of generative AI and platform summarisation portends the emergence of "zero-click" consumption, otherwise referred to as "Journalism Zero." This paradigm shift poses a threat to conventional traffic, revenue models, and the direct relationship between journalism and its audiences (Brown & Jaźwińska, 2025).

Regulatory Gaps and the Need for Global Governance

At both the institutional and international levels, calls have intensified for the development of comprehensive regulatory and ethical frameworks governing the use of AI in media. Although organizations such as UNESCO and the WAN-IFRA Forum have initiated recommendations for responsible use of this technology, reports indicate a significant gap in the practical implementation of these guidelines: the overwhelming majority of media institutions have yet to adopt clear policies regarding AI in newsrooms (Henriksson, 2025). Experts note that academic research on the ethical challenges of AI in media remains limited, which underscores the need to strengthen research and institutional efforts to integrate the principles of transparency and credibility into journalistic practice.

Finally, we can say this an analysis of the ethical challenges associated with integrating AI in newsrooms reveals that it is a double-edged sword. On the one hand, AI offers advanced capabilities that can enhance editorial efficiency, develop new forms of investigative journalism and enable the tailoring of content to audiences. However, it also raises complex issues concerning news quality, fair coverage, privacy protection and the reproduction of biases, as well as undermining public trust in the media. These challenges are not purely technical, but fundamentally institutional and societal. They intersect with the principles of good governance, the social responsibility of the media and the ethics of journalistic practice.

The above classifications demonstrate that these issues are multidimensional, encompassing technical aspects relating to transparency and algorithm verification, professional considerations concerning the integrity of newsrooms and journalists' independence, institutional factors associated with small outlets' reliance on large tech companies, and societal risks such as the creation of knowledge bubbles and algorithmic biases. They cannot be addressed by a single measure or recommendation, but require a comprehensive approach combining transparency, human oversight and data governance, as well as developing professional capacities to adapt to a changing algorithmic media landscape.

Taking an enlightened critical approach to the use of artificial intelligence in digital media requires a balanced partnership between humans and machines, as well as multi-stakeholder regulatory frameworks to ensure accountability and fairness. Thus, it remains possible to maintain the credibility

of digital media, the quality of content, and the role of the 'fourth estate' in safeguarding freedom of expression and societal oversight, even in an increasingly algorithm-dominated world.

CORE PRINCIPLES AND APPLIED PRACTICES: A SOCIO-INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH TO AI IN JOURNALISM

The accelerated transformation of the radio, television, and digital media sectors in the era of artificial intelligence (AI) underscores the need for systematic and theoretically grounded responses that extend beyond purely technical considerations. While AI is widely recognized as a transformative tool capable of enhancing efficiency and audience engagement, its integration must be understood within the broader social, institutional, and ethical foundations of journalism.

This study adopts a position that aligns with critical media scholarship: journalism is not reducible to technological processes but constitutes a historically embedded practice shaped by values such as credibility, accountability, and pluralism. Consequently, the integration of AI should not be framed as a process of technological substitution, but as a normatively guided transformation that preserves the democratic role of journalism.

Scholars and practitioners consistently emphasize that the optimal use of AI lies in augmenting—not replacing—human creativity and editorial judgment (Arc XP, 2024; Beckett & Yaseen, 2023). From this perspective, AI becomes a tool embedded within institutional practices, rather than an autonomous agent of change.

In accordance with the aforementioned framework, the subsequent section delineates the fundamental guiding principles and applied practices that have been derived from academic and professional literature. These principles encompass a wide spectrum, ranging from general ethical guidelines to specific actionable applications pertinent to newsrooms:

First: Human–Machine Collaboration as a Model of Augmented Journalism

The integration of AI into newsroom workflows reflects a shift toward human–machine collaboration, where algorithmic systems enhance operational efficiency while human actors retain interpretive and ethical authority. This model enables journalists to move beyond repetitive tasks and focus on investigative, analytical, and interpretive dimensions of reporting. Empirical evidence demonstrates that automation such as the Associated Press' use of AI in earnings reporting has allowed journalists to redirect their efforts toward more complex and socially relevant forms of journalism. However, the significance of this transformation lies not in automation itself, but in the reconfiguration of journalistic labor within institutional and ethical constraints. In this context, augmented journalism is best understood as a symbiotic relationship between human judgment and algorithmic capability, where AI supports but does not replace the editorial processes that define journalism as a professional and democratic practice (Marconi et al., 2021).

Second: Algorithmic Governance: Transparency, Fairness and Accountability

The increasing reliance on algorithmic systems in journalism necessitates the development of robust governance frameworks that ensure fairness, transparency, and accountability. AI-driven recommendation systems, for instance, play a central role in shaping audience engagement through large-scale personalization (Arc XP, 2024; Lim et al., 2023). However, without adequate oversight, such systems risk reinforcing biases, limiting diversity, and undermining editorial integrity. To address these challenges, the literature emphasizes the importance of algorithmic auditing and institutional accountability mechanisms. Periodic external audits of AI systems are essential to evaluate accuracy, detect bias, and ensure compliance with ethical standards (Gabino-Campos et al., 2025; UNESCO, 2023). Moreover, the publication of audit results contributes to enhancing public trust and institutional transparency (UNESCO, 2025).

Importantly, transparency should not be reduced to technical explainability—often constrained by proprietary systems—but should be understood as an institutional practice, involving disclosure of AI use, editorial responsibility, and clear communication with audiences (Tutivén & Cano, 2025). This approach aligns with a deterministic non-technological perspective, recognizing that ethical accountability remains rooted in human and organizational responsibility (Oh & Jung, 2025).

Third: Developing AI Literacy and Professional Capacity in Newsrooms

In professional and academic discourse, there is a consistent emphasis on the importance of AI literacy and the continuous training of journalists. These elements are regarded as strategic pillars for the mitigation of ethical risks associated with the adoption of AI technologies in newsrooms. Consequently, institutional training policies should encompass the following core dimensions:

- The possession of technical literacy is of paramount importance. It is imperative that media organisations incorporate AI literacy programmes into their capacity-building policies, thereby providing journalists with a foundation of knowledge concerning algorithmic processes, their potential, and limitations (Doembana, 2025).
- Applied education and training: It is imperative that practical courses provide a comprehensive understanding of the appropriate circumstances for the employment of AI tools, as well as those situations in which their use is to be avoided. It is imperative that journalism curricula incorporate AI modules to modernise the standards of data gathering, processing, and analysis (Gutiérrez-Caneda et al., 2024).
- The following discourse aims to address the prevalent technical misconceptions. It is imperative that advanced modules elucidate the intricacies of algorithmic architectures and vulnerabilities, thereby assisting practitioners in circumventing the pitfalls of overreliance on generative outputs that may be afflicted with hallucinations or embedded biases (Oh & Jung, 2025).

- Critical thinking and media literacy: It is imperative that training programmes incorporate mechanisms to reinforce verification and critical analysis in order to combat the dissemination of misinformation. There is a particular necessity to empower young journalists with critical digital navigation skills.
- The following technical and collaborative competencies are required: It is imperative that journalists possess fundamental technical competencies, including proficiency in basic programming and the capacity to collaborate effectively with data scientists and developers. The integration of interdisciplinary newsroom teams has been demonstrated to engender more robust editorial outcomes (Tutivén & Cano, 2025).
- Ethical oversight and system auditing: Specialized training is required to enable journalists to conduct both technical and ethical audits of AI-generated content, ensuring compliance with professional standards (Oh & Jung, 2025).
- The emergence of hybrid roles: The mounting necessity for interdisciplinary aptitude has engendered novel roles such as developer-journalists, who function as conduits between editorial and technical teams, translating journalistic objectives into executable technical specifications (Gutiérrez-Caneda et al., 2024).

In summary, the adoption of these practices necessitates a structured institutional approach that integrates foundational knowledge, critical-technical competencies, and new interdisciplinary roles, supported by robust oversight mechanisms. This approach enables broadcast and digital media organisations to integrate AI technologies responsibly, thereby preserving journalistic integrity, ensuring ethical governance, and maintaining high standards of content quality.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

A review of the literature indicates that the integration of artificial intelligence technologies into editorial production significantly enhances efficiency, accelerates news coverage, and facilitates content personalisation. However, it simultaneously introduces a range of ethical and professional dilemmas that warrant critical, multi-level analysis.

At the institutional level, a clear tension exists between the pursuit of efficiency and profitability, on the one hand, and the imperatives of editorial independence and credibility, on the other. The drive to reduce costs and increase productivity may lead some media organisations to adopt automated systems without establishing sufficient oversight or accountability mechanisms, thereby heightening the risk of disseminating misleading or inaccurate information. This tension underscores that technological adoption within journalism is neither politically nor professionally neutral; rather, it reconfigures decision-making authority and power dynamics within newsroom structures.

From a professional perspective, the scholarly consensus maintains that augmented journalism should enhance rather than replace human editorial judgment, thereby allowing journalists to devote more time to creative and investigative endeavours. Nonetheless, empirical evidence and case studies reveal that this principle is not always observed in practice. Instances have emerged in which automatically generated content has been published without clear disclosure or has contained errors stemming from language model limitations, necessitating substantial post-publication corrections. A comparison between theoretical frameworks and practical implementation thus reveals a persistent gap one that calls for robust institutional policies mandating disclosure, human review, and editorial accountability prior to publication.

The issue of transparency and the so-called "black box" of algorithms constitutes a central point of scholarly and professional debate. Analysis indicates that a lack of technical transparency jeopardises not only the information consumer but also constrains editors' capacity to attribute responsibility when errors or biases occur. This gives rise to two interrelated challenges. First, there is a pressing need for technical disclosure requirements that are appropriate to the news environment and amenable to independent audit to ensure algorithmic explainability. Second, there is a need to develop comprehensive legal frameworks that clearly define the responsibilities of technology providers, media organisations, and editors.

The social and political dimensions of algorithmic bias warrant particular attention. Generative outputs do not emerge in a vacuum; rather, they reflect biases embedded within training datasets and the design choices made during model engineering. In practice, this can result in the reproduction of systemic inequalities and the underrepresentation of marginalised groups within the public sphere. These risks are further exemplified by phenomena such as "filter bubbles" and the fragmentation of the public sphere, in which unregulated personalisation algorithms restrict exposure to diverse perspectives and sources. Such dynamics undermine the free circulation of ideas and compromise the democratic function of the press.

Consequently, addressing algorithmic bias requires a combination of technical and institutional measures. Technical measures include corrective interventions aimed at mitigating bias in data and models, such as rebalancing training datasets and conducting systematic fairness assessments. Institutional measures involve ensuring the participation of diverse knowledge communities and social groups in the design, deployment, and evaluation of algorithms, implementing independent algorithmic audits, and ensuring explainability to facilitate the tracing of error and bias sources. In other words, technical solutions alone are insufficient; they must be embedded within participatory editorial and professional frameworks that safeguard the fair representation of communities and protect the public sphere from fragmentation and closure.

The impact of artificial intelligence on the journalism labour market is twofold. While automation creates opportunities to reallocate resources toward higher-value tasks, it may also precipitate job losses or the erosion of certain professional skills if not accompanied by policies to foster upskilling and the integration of digital competencies. Accordingly, news organisations should adopt operational policies that regulate the redistribution of tasks within newsrooms and implement continuous professional development programmes. Such measures are essential to ensure the resilience of journalistic workforces and to preserve their capacity to perform tasks that cannot be automated.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

A review of the technical and ethical transformations associated with integrating information technology and artificial intelligence into journalistic production environments reveals that artificial intelligence constitutes a double-edged sword. While it offers considerable opportunities to enhance editorial efficiency, personalise content, and broaden coverage, it simultaneously raises profound challenges related to transparency, editorial accountability, algorithmic bias, intellectual property rights, privacy, and its impact on the journalism labour market (UNESCO, 2023; Vosoughi et al., 2023; Binder et al., 2023).

An effective response to these challenges necessitates an integrated framework that combines institutional controls, human oversight within production processes (‘human-in-the-loop’), independent auditing mechanisms, professional capacity-building programmes, and multilateral regulatory frameworks that balance technological innovation with the preservation of core journalistic values (Marconi & Siegman, 2021; Arc XP, 2024). The absence of methodological clarity and robust internal policies undermines the ability of media organisations to manage risks and erodes public trust. Accordingly, ethical governance and transparency must be positioned at the core of any responsible strategy for the adoption of these technologies (Burrell, 2016; Oh & Jung, 2025).

Practical and Institutional Recommendations

Adopt the human-in-the-loop principle at all stages of deployment

* Classify content generated or processed by artificial intelligence and require final human editorial review.

* Proposed measurement indicator: Percentage of AI-generated or AI-processed content that has undergone human review prior to publication.

2. Establish clear transparency and disclosure policies for users

* Publish detailed explanations regarding the use of artificial intelligence, the sources of training data, and the factors determining reliance on AI in coverage.

* Proposed measurement indicator: Availability of a published AI policy and public access to it (UNESCO, 2023).

3. Implement periodic and independent algorithmic audits

* Commission external parties or multidisciplinary teams to assess algorithms for bias, accuracy, and social impact.

* Proposed measurement indicator: Number of annual audit reports published, and corrective actions undertaken (Beckett & Yassin, 2023).

4. Professional capacity building and digital/ethical literacy for journalists

* Provide regular training courses on understanding model mechanisms, detecting hallucinations, and prompt engineering.

* Proposed measurement indicator: Percentage of participants in training programmes and total number of training hours per year (García-Peñalvo & Vázquez-Ingelmo, 2023).

5. Data governance policies and respect for intellectual property and privacy

* Establish clear rules for the use of protected material, including procedures for obtaining consent and providing compensation where appropriate.

* Proposed measurement indicator: Existence of contracts or licences for data use, with documented legal provisions and implications.

6. Adopt a phased and disciplined approach to technology adoption

* Implement AI technologies initially in low-risk applications, evaluate their impact, and scale up implementation in accordance with fairness and quality criteria.

* Proposed measurement indicator: Percentage of pilot projects transitioned to full implementation following demonstrated impact assessments (Arc XP, 2024).

7. Multistakeholder mechanisms for developing flexible regulatory frameworks

* Establish advisory boards comprising editors, data engineers, legal experts, and representatives of civil society to develop sector-specific guidelines.

* Proposed measurement indicator: Number of regionally or internationally adopted joint agreements or guidelines (WAN-IFRA, 2022).

8. Promote experimental research and evaluative follow-up

* Encourage academia and relevant institutions to conduct experimental field studies to assess the effects of artificial intelligence on news quality, public trust, and employment within journalism.

* Proposed measurement indicator: Number of published empirical studies and their influence on institutional policies (Anantrasirichai et al., 2025).

In conclusion, the integration of these recommendations necessitates adopting a strategic vision that places journalistic values at its core, utilising artificial intelligence as a tool to complement human skills rather than replace them. Transparency, accountability, and professional capacity building are essential to ensuring that digital media continues to serve the public reliably in an era in which algorithms increasingly shape the public sphere.

Yazar Katkısı: Tek yazarlı çalışmadır.
Çıkar Çatışması: Yazarlar çıkar çatışması beyan etmemişlerdir.

KAYNAKÇA

Anantrasirichai, N., Zhang, F., & Bull, D. (2025). *Artificial intelligence in creative industries: Advances prior to 2025*. http://arxiv.org/abs/2501.02725

Arc XP. (2024). *AI in media: Transforming audience engagement with personalization and community. Arc XP connect event*. https://www.arcxp.com/2024/11/06/ai-in-media-transforming-audience-engagement-with-personalization-and-community/

Ashton, B. (2024, August 20). *How the BBC is using artificial intelligence*, Media news. Journalism.Co.Uk., https://www.journalism.co.uk/news/how-the-bbc-is-using-artificial-intelligence/s2/a1168901/

Barnes, S. B. (2012). Barbie Zelizer. About to die: How news images move the public. *Mass Communication and Society*, 15(5), 782–785. https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2012.672616

Bauder, D. (2023, November 29). *Sports illustrated is latest media company damaged by AI experiment*. AP News. The Associated Press. https://apnews.com/article/journalists-ai-counterfeit-writers-479cc3869c0638df5bbb26d4b1e4f18f

Beckett, C., & Yaseen, M. (2023). *Generating change a global survey of what news organisations are doing with AI*. LSE.

Bertolini, J. (2024). *Copyright and Generative AI Sustainable Cultural Futures "Digitalisation of Culture"*, Case Study 2 Sustainable Cultural Futures.

Brown, P., & Jaźwińska, K. (2025). Journalism Zero: How Platforms and Publishers are Navigating AI. *Tow Center for Digital Journalism*, 1–84.

Burrell, J. (2016). How the machine 'thinks': Understanding opacity in machine learning algorithms. *Big Data and Society*, 3(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951715622512

Carlson, M. (2018). Automating judgment? Algorithmic judgment, news knowledge, and journalistic professionalism. *New Media and Society*, 20(5), 1755–1772. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444817706684

David, E. (2024, January 30). *The New York Times is building a team to explore AI in the newsroom* | The Verge. https://www.theverge.com/2024/1/30/24055718/new-york-times-generative-ai-machine-learning

Diakopoulos, N. (2019). *Automating the news how algorithms are rewriting the media*. Harvard University Press, 12–40.

Diakopoulos, N. (2020). Computational news discovery: Towards design considerations for editorial orientation algorithms in journalism. *Digital Journalism*, 8(7), 945–967. https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2020.1736946

Diakopoulos, N., & Johnson, D. (2021). Anticipating and addressing the ethical implications of deepfakes in the context of elections. *New Media and Society*, 23(7), 2072–2098. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444820925811

Doembana, I. (2025). *A Systematic literature review of artificial intelligence in journalism: Global trends, regulatory challenges, and ethical framework* (Vol. 2, Issue 2).

Epstein, Z., Hertzmann, A., Akten, M., Farid, H., Fjeld, J., Frank, M. R., Groh, M., Herman, L., Leach, N., Mahari, R., Pentland, A., Russakovsky, O., Schroeder, H., & Smith, A. (2023). Art and the science of generative AI. *Science*, 380(6650), 1110–1111. https://doi.org/10.1126/SCIENCE.ADH4451

Fomenko, M. (2025, July 29). *ChatGPT statistics in companies [August 2025].* Master of Code Global. https://masterofcode.com/blog/chatgpt-statistics

Gabino-Campos, M., Baile, J. I., & Padilla-Martínez, A. (2025). Social biases in AI-Generated creative texts: A Mixed-methods approach in the Spanish context. *Social Sciences*, 14(3). https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci14030170

Graefe, A. (2016). *Guide to automated journalism*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/289529155

Gutiérrez-Caneda, B., Lindén, C. G., & Vázquez-Herrero, J. (2024). Ethics and journalistic challenges in the age of artificial intelligence: talking with professionals and experts. *Frontiers in Communication*, 9. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2024.1465178

Henriksson, T. (2025, April 14). *AI in journalism: Balancing innovation, ethics, and human oversight - WAN-IFRA*. World Association of News Publishers. https://wan-ifra.org/2025/04/ai-in-journalism-balancing-innovation-ethics-and-human-oversight/

Hoss, D. (2024, October 11). *How AI is helping media companies attract and engage audiences - Digital content next*. Digital Content. https://digitalcontentnext.org/blog/2024/11/11/how-ai-is-helping-media-companies-attract-and-engage-audiences/

Kalfeli, P., & Angeli, C. (2025). The Intersection of AI, ethics, and journalism: Greek journalists' and academics' perspectives. *Societies*, 15(2). https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15020022

Kevin-Alerechi, E., Abutu, I., Oladunni, O., Osanyinro, E., Ojumah, O., & Ogundele, R. (2025). AI and the newsroom: Transforming journalism with intelligent systems. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning and Data Science*, 3(1), 1629–1633. https://doi.org/10.51219/jaimld/elfredah-kevin-alerechi/426

Lewis, S. C., Guzman, A. L., Schmidt, T. R., & Lin, B. (2025). Generative AI and its disruptive challenge to journalism: an institutional analysis. *Communication and Change*, 1(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s44382-025-00008-x

Lim, J. S., Shin, D., Zhang, J., Masiclat, S., Luttrell, R., & Kinsey, D. (2023). News audiences in the age of artificial intelligence: Perceptions and behaviors of optimizers, mainstreamers, and skeptics. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 67(3), 353–375. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2022.2162901

Lipka, M. (2025, April 28). *Americans think AI will have a bad effect on news, journalists | Pew Research Center*. Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2025/04/28/americans-largely-foresee-ai-having-negative-effects-on-news-journalists/

Lucchi, N. (2025). Generative AI and copyright training, creation, regulation policy European Parliament, Department for Justice, Civil Liberties and Institutional Affairs, Directorate-General for Citizens' Rights.

Marconi, F., Siegman, A., & Machine Journalist. (2021). *The Future of augmented journalism: A guide for newsrooms in the age of smart machines.*

Mathias Felipe. (2024). *Guiding the Way- A comprehensive examination of AI guidelines in global media.*

McDougall, A. (2023, February 9). *Men's journal corrects errors in AI-Generated health story*. The Daily Beast Company LLC. https://www.thedailybeast.com/mens-journal-corrects-errors-in-ai-generated-health-story/

McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding media the extensions of man*. McGraw-Hill.

Montal, T., & Reich, Z. (2017). I, robot. you, journalist. Who is the author?: Authorship, bylines and full disclosure in automated journalism. *Digital Journalism*, 5(7), 829–849. https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2016.1209083

Moravec, V., Hynek, N., Skare, M., Gavurova, B., & Kubak, M. (2024). Human or machine? The perception of artificial intelligence in journalism, its socio-economic conditions, and technological developments toward the digital future. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 200. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2023.123162

Noble, S. Umoja. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression : how search engines reinforce racism*. New York University Press.

Oh, S., & Jung, J. (2025). Harmonizing traditional journalistic values with emerging AI technologies: A Systematic review of journalists' perception. *Media and Communication*, 13. https://doi.org/10.17645/mac.9495

Parratt-Fernández, S., Mayoral-Sánchez, J., & Mera-Fernández, M. (2021). The application of artificial intelligence to journalism: An analysis of academic production. *Profesional de La Informacion*, 30(3). https://doi.org/10.3145/epi.2021.may.17

Pitluk, A., Wilson, J., & Inman, J. (2025). Helpful or hurtful: Legacy magazine journalism wrestles with the advent of AI technology in newsrooms. *Journalism Practice*. https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2025.2458608

Scheffauer, R., Gil de Zúñiga, H., & Correa, T. (2024). Algorithmic news versus non-algorithmic news: Towards a principle-based Artificial Intelligence (AI) theoretical framework of news media. *Profesional de La Informacion*, 33(1). https://doi.org/10.3145/epi.2024.0009

Seward, M. Z. (2024, March 13). *AI news that's fit to print: The New York Times' editorial AI director on the current state of AI-powered journalism*, Nieman Journalism Lab. Nieman Foundation at Harvard. https://www.niemanlab.org/2024/03/ai-news-thats-fit-to-print-the-new-york-times-editorial-ai-director-on-the-current-state-of-ai-powered-journalism/

Sonni, A. F., Hafied, H., Irwanto, I., & Latuheru, R. (2024). Digital newsroom transformation: A Systematic review of the impact of Artificial Intelligence on journalistic practices, News Narratives, and Ethical Challenges. *Journalism and Media, 5(4)*, 1554-1570. https://doi.org/10.3390/journalmedia5040097

Spyridou, P., & Danezis, C. (2024). Do algorithms do it better? Analysing occupational ideology in the age of computational journalism. *Journalism Studies*, 25(13), 1573–1597. https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2024.2372429

Spyridou, P., & Ioannou, M. (2025). Exploring AI amid the hype: A Critical reflection around the applications and implications of AI in journalism. *Societies*, 15(2). https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15020023

Sun, Y., Sheng, D., Zhou, Z., & Wu, Y. (2024). AI hallucination: towards a comprehensive classification of distorted information in artificial intelligence-generated content. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11(1). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03811-x

Thomson, T. J., Thomas, R. J., & Matich, P. (2024). Generative visual AI in news organizations: challenges, opportunities, perceptions, and policies. *Digital Journalism*. https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2024.2331769

Tutivén, I. V. E., & Cano, C. G. (2025). Journalistic ethics in the age of Artificial Intelligence: Towards an update of deontological codes in the Ibero-American Context. *Comunicacao e Sociedade*, 47. https://doi.org/10.17231/comsoc.47(2025).6206

UNESCO. (2021). *The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence*. www.unesco.

UNESCO. (2023). *Guidelines for the governance of digital platforms safeguarding freedom of expression and access to information through a multistakeholder approach.* http://en.unesco.

UNESCO. (2025, May 27). *AI in the Newsroom: UNESCO supports ethical integration in South-East.* https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/ai-newsroom-unesco-supports-ethical-integration-south-east-europe

Ward, S. J. A. (2018). *Reconstructing journalism ethics: disrupt, invent, collaborate 1.*

Zelizer, B. (2019). Why journalism is about more than digital technology. *Digital Journalism*, 7(3), 343–350. https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2019.1571932