



**ICA 2025 Preconference**

**Artificial Intelligence in Journalism  
from a Global Perspective:  
Past, Present, and Future**

**Edited by Maximilian Eder and Helle Sjøvaag**

ICA 2025 Preconference  
Artificial Intelligence in Journalism from a Global Perspective:  
Past, Present, and Future

Edited by Maximilian Eder and Helle Sjøvaag



# ICA 2025 Preconference Artificial Intelligence in Journalism from a Global Perspective: Past, Present, and Future

Edited by Maximilian Eder and Helle Sjøvaag



Universitätsbibliothek  
Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

Published by

**University Library of Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München**

Geschwister-Scholl-Platz 1, D-80539 Munich

Sponsored by the Volkswagen Foundation (grant agreements no. 9B390 & 9B418).

### **Citation**

Eder, M., & Sjøvaag, H. (Eds.). (2025). *Artificial intelligence in journalism from a global perspective: Past, present, and future*. Open Publishing LMU.

© Copyright 2025 by the authors. All rights reserved.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution BY 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>). Graphics, tables and figures may have different licenses. These will have been identified in the caption to relevant content

Printing and distribution on behalf of the authors:

Buchschmiede von Dataform Media GmbH, Wien

Julius-Raab-Straße 8

2203 Großebersdorf, Österreich

Contact in accordance with the EU Product Safety Regulation:

[info@buchschmiede.at](mailto:info@buchschmiede.at)



### **Bibliographic information of the German National Library**

The German National Library lists the title in the German National Bibliography; to view detailed bibliographic information, visit <http://dnb.dnb.de>

To read for free, open access version of this book online, visit:

<https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:bvb:19-epub-128038-6>

<https://doi.org/10.5282/epub.128038>

ISBN 978-3-99181-766-6

# Contents

## Introduction

|                                         |   |
|-----------------------------------------|---|
| Maximilian Eder and Helle Sjøvaag ..... | 1 |
|-----------------------------------------|---|

## Panel 1

|                                                           |   |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|---|
| Perceptions of AI from journalists and the audience ..... | 5 |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|---|

### News audiences and generative AI: Experiences, issues, and expectations

|                                                         |   |
|---------------------------------------------------------|---|
| T. J. Thomson, Ryan J. Thomas, and Rebecca Venema ..... | 7 |
|---------------------------------------------------------|---|

### Writing in the age of AI: A multi-method study on the impact of ChatGPT on writing experiences and text quality of future journalists

|                                        |   |
|----------------------------------------|---|
| Jeroen Schreurs and Ilse Vranken ..... | 9 |
|----------------------------------------|---|

### The credibility gap: How Chinese news readers perceive AI-generated news compared to traditional journalism

|                    |    |
|--------------------|----|
| Xueshan Zhao ..... | 13 |
|--------------------|----|

### The future of AI-generated news: How AI-generated articles shape reader perceptions across different audiences and news topics

|                                        |    |
|----------------------------------------|----|
| Ilse Vranken and Jeroen Schreurs ..... | 17 |
|----------------------------------------|----|

## Panel 2

|                                                              |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| AI and its impact on content creation and distribution ..... | 21 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|----|

### AI, community-engagement and local reporting: Lessons from an NPR experiment

|                     |    |
|---------------------|----|
| Claire Wardle ..... | 23 |
|---------------------|----|

### How news workers' AI use reinforces the degradation of journalism: An ethnographic study

|                                |    |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Jocelyn McKinnon-Crowley ..... | 27 |
|--------------------------------|----|

### Analyzing Indian elections through the lens of AI

|                        |    |
|------------------------|----|
| Shivangi Asthana ..... | 31 |
|------------------------|----|

## Panel 3

Regulatory challenges and policy responses to AI in journalism ... 35

"Good enough" news? Model substitution for local reporting

Nicholas Hagar and Sachita Nishal ..... 37

Rosy-cheeked piggy banks, armed beavers, and fantastic futures:

A qualitative examination of editorial guidelines on the use of  
generative AI-visuals in Swiss newsrooms

Seraina Tarnutzer and Sina Blassnig ..... 41

Paper as justice, digital as deception: AI, nostalgia, and the persistence  
of print in Japanese news media

Kaori Hayashi ..... 49

AI governance and journalism: Guidelines on the use of  
generative AI in US newsrooms

Silvia DalBen Furtado and Tina Lassiter ..... 51

## Panel 4

The future of AI in shaping journalism practice..... 55

Inauthentic journalism: The contested boundaries and ethical  
standards of AI-generated fake bylines

Michael Serazio ..... 57

AI, journalism, and epistemic justice: Digital citizenship  
beyond the liberal ideal

Eddy Borges-Rey ..... 61

# Introduction

Maximilian Eder and Helle Sjøvaag

Over the past two decades, there has been a notable shift towards automation and data-driven news production processes in many countries worldwide, partially supported by artificial intelligence (AI). Research on AI in journalism addresses a broad field of applications, with AI applied as “an umbrella term for a range of technologies such as automated statistical data analysis, machine learning, and natural language processing” (Deuze & Beckett, 2022, p. 1914).

Initially, early applications of AI were utilized for automated tasks such as data analysis and news aggregation to alleviate routine journalistic tasks, allowing news organizations to streamline their operations and produce content more efficiently (Napoli, 2014). AI’s role in journalism has since grown significantly and introduced new possibilities and challenges within the news ecosystem. Today, especially with the emergence of generative AI models such as OpenAI’s ChatGPT in 2022, these technologies can now assist journalists with “a wide range of activities such as interview transcription, workflow automation, content generation, and personalization” (Sirén-Heikel et al., 2023, p. 355).

Looking ahead, the future of AI in journalism holds further promises. As AI-based technologies continue to advance, there are possibilities for entirely new approaches to journalism through hyper-person-

---

Maximilian Eder  
Department of Media and Communication  
LMU Munich  
Munich, Germany  
maximilian.eder@ifkw.lmu.de

Helle Sjøvaag  
Department of Media and Social Sciences  
University of Stavanger  
Stavanger, Norway  
helle.sjovaag@uis.no

alized news ecosystems where content is tailored in real time based on individual user preferences (Gartry, 2024). However, these advancements will likely come with new challenges related to the ethical dimensions of AI decision-making and editorial independence (Becker, 2023), as well as the impact of AI on jobs within the journalism industry (Simon, 2024). Moreover, the relationship between AI and the public's trust in media will further become an issue as societies must grapple with questions about the role of AI-generated content in maintaining the credibility and integrity of news sources (Fletcher & Nielsen, 2024).

The academic abstracts collected in this edited volume are the result of a preconference held on 12 June 2025 at Metropolitan State University (MSU) Denver before the 75<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of the International Communication Association (ICA). The preconference entitled *Artificial Intelligence in Journalism from a Global Perspective: Past, Present, and Future* was organised by Maximilian Eder (LMU Munich) and Helle Sjøvaag (University of Stavanger) as part of an international project on responsible AI for local journalism funded by the Volkswagen Foundation. The event marks the second time our project team has hosted such an event, following the preconference to the 72<sup>nd</sup> Annual ICA Conference in Paris on the dynamics of (ir)responsible AI in journalism and algorithmically shaped news flows.

This year's preconference focused on understanding and studying AI- and algorithm-based technologies concerning journalism to provide an opportunity for discussing the past, present, and future of the complex relationship between technologies and journalism from various perspectives. Moreover, the event addressed the specific uses of (generative) AI in countries from the Global South and Asia, which have sometimes been late adopters of such technologies.

A key focus of the program was to address the transformative AI shift happening in the news media industry in many countries worldwide, through different lenses within communication science, namely computational communication, journalism studies, audience studies, information law, and ethics. To achieve this aim, the preconference brought together young, emerging, and senior scholars working with innovative research designs and qualitative or quantitative methods.

The 14 accepted abstracts, of which 13 are published in this edited volume, were selected after a double-blind peer review process. The submissions come from different countries on five continents, including Australia, China, Germany, the Netherlands, the USA, Switzerland, and Qatar.

The organising committee wants to thank the Volkswagen Foundation for funding the preconference and this volume. We would also like to extend a special thank you to the local organising committee at MSU Denver, P. Mukherjee, E. James, and J. Kirby, for their support.

## References

- Becker, K. B. (2023). New game, new rules: An investigation into editorial guidelines for dealing with artificial intelligence in the newsroom. *Journalism Research*, 6(2), 133–152. <https://doi.org/10.1453/2569-152X-22023-13404-en>
- Deuze, M., & Beckett, C. (2022). Imagination, algorithms and news: Developing AI literacy for journalism. *Digital Journalism*, 10(10), 1913–1918. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2022.2119152>
- Fletcher, R., & Nielsen, R. K. (2024). *What does the public in six countries think of generative AI in news?* Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.
- Napoli, P. M. (2014). Automated media: An institutional theory perspective on algorithmic media production and consumption. *Communication Theory*, 24(3), 340–360. <https://doi.org/10.1111/comt.12039>
- Gartry, L. (2024). *Protecting public interest journalism while personalising the news*. Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.
- Simon, F. M. (2024). *Artificial intelligence in the news: How AI retools, rationalizes, and reshapes journalism and the public arena*. Tow Center for Digital Journalism.
- Sirén-Heikel, S., Kjellman, M., Lindén, C.-G. (2023). At the crossroads of logics: Automating newswork with artificial intelligence—(Re) defining journalistic logics from the perspective of technologists. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 74(3), 354–366. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24656>



## Panel 1

Perceptions of AI from journalists  
and the audience



# News audiences and generative AI: Experiences, issues, and expectations

T. J. Thomson, Ryan J. Thomas, and Rebecca Venema

As newsrooms grapple with questions around the place of AI in journalism, the way audiences experience AI in news and how they expect it ought (or ought not) to be used has to date received comparatively little attention. This study acknowledges this imbalance and explores what news audiences want from AI in journalism. It does this through interviews with sixty news consumers in Germany and Australia and asks about their experiences with AI-edited or -generated journalism, the ethical and legal issues they perceive to be relevant, and their expectations regarding how AI should be used. This study also attends to news audiences' perceptions of and reactions to a diverse array of use cases across three domains of use that demonstrate how AI is—or could be—used in journalism.

We find that only a minority of participants were confident they had encountered AI-generated or -edited journalistic content, but a sizeable portion suspected they had. News audiences were most concerned

---

T. J. Thomson  
School of Media and Communication  
RMIT University  
Melbourne, Australia  
t.j.thomson@rmit.edu.au

Ryan J. Thomas  
Edward R. Murrow College of Communication  
Washington State University  
Pullman (WA), USA  
ryan\_thomas@wsu.edu

Rebecca Venema  
University of Amsterdam  
Amsterdam, Netherlands  
r.k.venema@uva.nl

about truth and accuracy, intellectual property, and labour issues when news outlets use AI. Participants wanted news outlets to have guidelines that govern how they use AI and to transparently communicate with audiences when, where, and how AI is used. We also find that the news audiences we interviewed are, overall, most comfortable with (primarily behind-the-scenes) brainstorming and enriching use cases, followed by editing and creating use cases. However, comfort levels differed markedly depending on how AI was used, how transparent the use was, whether the use impacted the accuracy of the depiction, and whether legal and other ethical considerations were appropriately attended to. Paying attention to news audience experiences, perceptions, and expectations regarding AI in journalism is vital to ensure that newsrooms' use (or non-use) of AI is professionally and socially responsible.

# Writing in the age of AI: A multi-method study on the impact of ChatGPT on writing experiences and text quality of future journalists

Jeroen Schreurs and Ilse Vranken

Artificial intelligence (AI) is reshaping journalism (Newman et al., 2024), with journalists using AI for various tasks, including news production and distribution (Newman et al., 2024; Cools & Diakopoulos, 2024). While AI improves efficiency, journalists also raise concerns about, for instance, ethical issues and the loss of authenticity (Naudts et al., 2024). The next generation of journalists (i.e., undergraduate journalism students) will inherit and redefine AI's role in the newsroom in the future. Despite AI's increased presence in journalism education, little is known about whether future journalists embrace AI or perceive it as a threat. This study explores how journalism students experience (dis)advantages when writing journalistic reports (Study 1, RQ1).

Additionally, journalists, researchers, and teachers have expressed their concerns about the diminished news quality due to the use of AI (Baptista & Gradim, 2023; Graefe et al., 2018; Newman et al., 2024). A preliminary study (Study 2) aimed to address this concern by examining (1) whether (non-)professional news readers can detect the AI-written

---

Jeroen Schreurs  
Department of Media and Tourism Research  
PXL University of Applied Sciences and Arts  
Hasselt, Belgium  
jeroen.schreurs@pxl.be

Ilse Vranken  
Department of Media and Tourism Research  
PXL University of Applied Sciences and Arts  
Hasselt, Belgium  
ilse.vranken@pxl.be

content of Study 1 and (2) whether the AI-generated texts of Study 1 influence reader perceptions regarding language quality.

## Study 1

To answer RQ1, second-year journalism students ( $N=13$ ,  $M_{\text{age}}=20$ ), who did not yet extensively use AI tools during their education, wrote two journalistic reports about two events in February 2024. One report was written with the use of ChatGPT, the other without. The writing time was recorded. Next, students participated in an online cross-sectional study with open-ended questions about their experiences.

Results showed an average time saving of 20% when students used ChatGPT. Thematic analysis on the answers in the cross-sectional study revealed positive and/or negative experiences related to (1) time efficiency, (2) creativity, (3) personal development, and (4) text connection. A clear advantage was that students experienced time savings because ChatGPT helped them to, for instance, structure the text and create catchy titles. Regarding creativity and personal development, mixed findings emerged. While some students indicated that ChatGPT enhanced their creativity (e.g., getting inspiration from suggestions), others indicated that ChatGPT made them less creative. Similarly, while some students noticed that ChatGPT helped them in their personal development as a journalist (e.g., learning new words), others indicated the opposite (e.g., “ChatGPT makes them lazy”). A drawback was the lack of connection to the text, with students missing a “sense of ownership”.

## Study 2

To answer RQ2, a preliminary within-subjects experimental study was conducted in which adult news readers ( $N=20$ ) and professional journalists ( $N=2$ ) read all the texts ( $N=26$ ) of the journalism students in Study 1. After reading each text, they judged spelling, grammar, creative language use (Baptista & Gradim, 2023; Graefe et al., 2018), and the extent to which they believed the text was written with ChatGPT on 5-point Likert scales. While no significant differences emerged regarding creative language use, texts written with the use of ChatGPT were

slightly better judged in terms of spelling and grammar. News readers and professional journalists were, on average, unsure if a text was written with ChatGPT.

## Conclusion

News organizations must consider AI's role in journalism, balancing its efficiency benefits and language proficiency with challenges regarding creativity. The integration of AI in journalism education is equally crucial, as training programs should equip future journalists with the skills needed to effectively use AI in journalistic tasks while upholding journalistic values (e.g., creativity, language proficiency).

## References

- Baptista, J. P., & Gradim, A. (2024). Are journalists no longer needed? Comparative analysis of the perceived quality of real news and ChatGPT news. In J. A. de Carvalho Gonçalves, J. L. Sousa de Magalhães Lima, J. P. Coelho, F. J. García-Peñalvo & A. García-Holgado (Eds.), *Proceedings of TEEM 2023: The eleventh International Conference on Technological Ecosystems for Enhancing Multiculturality* (pp. 989–997). Springer.
- Cools, H., & Diakopoulos, N. (2024). Uses of generative AI in the newsroom: Mapping journalists' perceptions of perils and possibilities. *Journalism Practice, ahead-of-print*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2024.2394558>
- Graefe, A., Haim, M., Haarmann, B., & Brosius, H. B. (2018). Readers' perception of computer-generated news: Credibility, expertise, and readability. *Journalism, 19*(5), 595–610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884916641269>
- Naudts, J., Ooms, T., Wullaert, D., & Spek, S. (2024). *AI Media Barometer 2024*. Artevelde Hogeschool.
- Newman, N., Fletcher, R., Eddy, K., Robertson, C. T., & Nielsen, R. K. (Eds.). (2024). *Reuters Institute Digital News Report 2024*. Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.



# The credibility gap: How Chinese news readers perceive AI-generated news compared to traditional journalism

Xueshan Zhao

Fake news and false information, often designed to exploit negative emotions for attention, have become even more problematic in the AI era, as the technology enables the mass production of deceptive content with almost no cost. For example, Deepfake is an algorithm-driven video-modifying method that can make vivid videos showing a real person doing something they never did. It has raised the concern of disrupting people's perception of public information and the credibility of political campaigns (Giansiracusa, 2021).

Public sectors and scholars believe increasing public awareness of media literacy is the most efficient way to navigate the complex information environment in the long run (Kozyreva et al., 2020). However, previous research found that AI tools can generate news content that readers consider to be at least as credible as, or more credible than, news stories written by humans (Kreps et al., 2022). An experiment testing the veracity of AI- or human-generated fake news also found no significant difference in people's willingness to share these contents (Bashardoust et al., 2024). This raises concerns about the potential flood of AI-generated fake content, which could overwhelm media literacy efforts and further distort public discourse.

---

Xueshan Zhao  
Amsterdam School of Communication Research  
University of Amsterdam  
Amsterdam, Netherlands  
xueshanz@outlook.com

This study conducts experiments in China examining the use of AI tools for generating fake news content and comparing audience credibility perceptions between AI-generated text and established media reporting. Using environmental and political news as case studies, a pilot online experiment with 238 participants examines how they perceived fabricated content created by ChatGPT-4o compared to verified, credible human-written news articles.

The first step of the study was to test the capacity of AI to generate fake news. ChatGPT refuses direct instructions of making up fake news due to its ethical guidelines. However, simple instructions can bypass the ethical guidelines by inputting misinformation. For example, if asking ChatGPT to generate a news reporting “LA donates equipment to Ukraine when fighting California fires”, which is misinformation, it will write a comprehensive fake news report, even with fabricated quotes.

The experiment compared two categories, political news and environmental news, with each category containing both verified reporting from traditional media sources and fake news content generated by ChatGPT. Analysis of 238 valid responses revealed that AI-generated content was rated lower in average credibility. However, the credibility rating of fake content also received a higher standard deviation, suggesting greater disagreement and individual differences. This variability can be the consequence of different levels of media literacy or opinion polarization. Additionally, there is an interaction effect between the news type and veracity, indicating that people’s perception of AI-generated fake news differs by the topics.

The research revealed the necessary next steps for generative AI models to address ethical challenges related to fake content. Developers should leverage search functionality to combat misinformation by implementing fact-checking and content verification procedures. To minimize harm to public trust, it is essential to enhance media literacy education that equips people to navigate AI technologies and fosters greater awareness about how AI-generated content is produced and distributed.

## References

- Bashardoust, A., Feuerriegel, S., & Shrestha, Y. R. (2024). Comparing the willingness to share for human-generated vs. AI-generated fake news. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 8(CSCW2), Article 489. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3687028>
- Giansiracusa, N. (2021). Deepfake deception: What to trust when seeing is no longer believing. In N. Giansiracusa (Ed.), *How algorithms create and prevent fake news: Exploring the impacts of social media, deepfakes, GPT-3, and more* (pp. 41–66). Apress.
- Kozyreva, A., Lewandowsky, S., & Hertwig, R. (2020). Citizens versus the internet: Confronting digital challenges with cognitive tools. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 21(3), 103–156. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100620946707>
- Kreps, S., McCain, R. M., & Brundage, M. (2022). All the news that's fit to fabricate: AI-generated text as a tool of media misinformation. *Journal of Experimental Political Science*, 9(1), 104–117. <https://doi/10.1017/XPS.2020.37>



# The future of AI-generated news: How AI-generated articles shape reader perceptions across different audiences and news topics

Ilse Vranken and Jeroen Schreurs

Artificial intelligence (AI) is increasingly being integrated into journalism (Naudts et al., 2024; Newman et al., 2024). One practice is the automated generation of text for online news articles (Naudts et al., 2024). The extent to which AI-generated news articles affect readers' perceptions regarding news quality—a multidimensional concept encompassing news credibility and readability—remains unclear (Baptista & Gradim, 2023; van der Kaa & Krahmer, 2014). While some studies suggested that AI-generated news articles are perceived as having a higher news quality compared to human-written articles, other studies fail to support this claim (Baptista & Gradim, 2023; van der Kaa & Krahmer, 2014). Further research is required to examine under which conditions AI-generated news influences readers' news quality perceptions differently than human-written news.

We employ a 2 (actual source: AI vs. human-written) X 2 (declared source: AI vs. human-written) between-subjects experimental design to examine the effects of actual and declared sources on news credi-

---

Ilse Vranken  
Department of Media and Tourism Research  
PXL University of Applied Sciences and Arts  
Hasselt, Belgium  
ilse.vranken@pxl.be

Jeroen Schreurs  
Department of Media and Tourism Research  
PXL University of Applied Sciences and Arts  
Hasselt, Belgium  
jeroen.schreurs@pxl.be

bility and readability perceptions of adult readers (RQ1). Additionally, this study explores whether news topics (i.e., politics, economics, sports, celebrities, RQ2) matter. Readers are more sceptical about AI-generated content in hard news domains that require objectivity and human expertise (e.g., politics, economics), but seem to be more accepting towards AI-generated soft news (e.g., sports, celebrities) (Newman et al., 2024). This may affect how readers judge the credibility and reliability of news that is (1) actually generated or (2) declared as generated by AI. Finally, this study considers attitudes towards AI as a moderator in the relationships under scrutiny (RQ3).

For news companies, these insights can help them navigate the integration of AI. Understanding who and when readers accept AI-generated news articles can help optimize AI-related news strategies.

Data for this experiment is currently being collected. Participants are being recruited via offline flyers and via social media. A priori power analyses ( $1 - \beta = 0.90$ ,  $\alpha = 0.05$ ) for detecting a medium effect size revealed a minimum sample size of  $N=302$ .

Participants were randomly exposed to one condition: (1) human-written news articles correctly declared as human-written, (2) human-written articles incorrectly declared as AI-written, (3) AI-written articles correctly declared as AI-written, and (4) AI-written articles incorrectly declared as human-written. In each condition, participants read four online news articles (i.e., economic-, political-, celebrity-, and sports news).

For the first two conditions (i.e., actual human-written articles), four news articles of approximately 450 words were selected from the most popular newspaper in Belgium (i.e., HLN (Naudts et al., 2024). Following prior research (Baptista & Gradim, 2023; van der Kaa & Krahmer, 2014), we selected keywords focusing on the most important information of the original articles. ChatGPT-4.5 was used to write new articles based on these keywords. These AI-written articles were used as stimulus materials for conditions three and four (i.e., AI-written articles). Participants received a cover story to mask our manipulations and were asked to provide active consent. Following prior research (Baptista & Gradim, 2023), participants answered questions regarding their background (e.g., sex), news consumption frequency, interest in news topics,

and attitudes towards AI (Babiker et al., 2025). After random exposure to one condition, participants rated message credibility and readability of each article (Graefe et al., 2018; Wischniewski & Krämer, 2024).

MANCOVA analyses will be run in SPSS, while controlling for sex, frequency of news consumption, and interest in news topics. The results will be presented during the preconference. Attention will be given to implications for news companies.

## References

- Babiker, A., Alshakhsi, S., Al-Thani, D., Montag, C., & Ali, R. (2024). Attitude towards AI: Potential influence of conspiracy belief, XAI experience and locus of control. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 41(13), 7939–7951. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2024.2401249>
- Baptista, J. P., & Gradim, A. (2024). Are journalists no longer needed? Comparative analysis of the perceived quality of real news and ChatGPT news. In J. A. de Carvalho Gonçalves, J. L. Sousa de Magalhães Lima, J. P. Coelho, F. J. García-Peñalvo & A. García-Holgado (Eds.), *Proceedings of TEEM 2023: The eleventh International Conference on Technological Ecosystems for Enhancing Multiculturality* (pp. 989–997). Springer.
- Graefe, A., Haim, M., Haarmann, B., & Brosius, H. B. (2018). Readers' perception of computer-generated news: Credibility, expertise, and readability. *Journalism*, 19(5), 595–610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884916641269>
- Naudts, J., Ooms, T., Wullaert, D., & Spek, S. (2024). *AI Media Barometer 2024*. Artevelde Hogeschool.
- Newman, N., Fletcher, R., Eddy, K., Robertson, C. T., & Nielsen, R. K. (Eds.). (2024). *Reuters Institute Digital News Report 2024*. Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.
- van der Kaa, H. A., & Krahmer, E. J. (2014, October 24–25). *Journalist versus news consumer: The perceived credibility of machine written news*. Computation + Journalism Symposium 2014, New York, United States.

- Wischnewski, M., & Krämer, N. (2024). Does polarizing news become less polarizing when written by an AI? Investigating the perceived credibility of news attributed to a machine in the light of the confirmation bias. *Journal of Media Psychology: Theories, Methods, and Applications, ahead-of-print*. <https://www.doi.org/10.1027/1864-1105/a000441>

## Panel 2

AI and its impact on content creation  
and distribution



# AI, community-engagement and local reporting: Lessons from an NPR experiment

Claire Wardle

Within journalism studies, the opportunities and challenges of community-engaged journalism have been widely explored, particularly in the US context (Wenzel, 2017, 2019, 2020, 2021; Belair-Gagnon et al., 2019; Zahay et al, 2021). Scholars have demonstrated the ways in which it can make visible under-represented voices and can increase trust with those same communities, but how community engagement strategies have struggled to take hold in many newsrooms because of the resources required to build and maintain authentic relationships with different communities. Similarly, the role of AI tools in assisting reporting has received significant attention (Broussard et al., 2019; Miroshnichenko, 2018; Nishal & Diakopoulos, 2024; Quinonez & Meij, 2024; Simon, 2024) with researchers exploring the mechanisms by which these technologies are able to save journalists' time, while also highlighting serious ethical concerns within newsrooms and some apprehension from audiences.

This paper examines the intersection of AI and community engagement in journalism, a relatively underexplored application for AI technologies (Brannon et al., 2024). The research draws from qualitative interviews and participant observations of participants involved in a multi-month experimental project between ten local radio stations and an MIT-affiliated nonprofit, Cortico. In fall 2024, ten NPR member sta-

---

Claire Wardle  
Department of Communication  
Cornell University  
Ithaca (NY), USA  
cw736@cornell.edu

tions partnered with Cortico to explore the potential of AI in facilitating community engagement. This initiative involved NPR reporters facilitating thirty structured conversations with different communities (including a Demolition Derby group in upstate New York, a group of Muslim women in Florida, and recent immigrants in Colorado). The central objective was to connect with audiences traditionally disengaged from NPR content, in the hope of leading to richer storytelling and deepening trust with these communities.

While AI played a supporting role in identifying themes and connections across the thirty conversations, the project's success ultimately stemmed from the dedicated efforts of journalists facilitating these discussions. The participating journalists were instrumental in identifying underrepresented communities, fostering open-ended dialogue, and ensuring that participants felt heard. AI tools helped extract key insights from the conversations, revealing common themes such as loneliness, immigration, housing crises, and systemic prejudices. However, the process required substantial human input—tagging, annotating, and interpreting transcripts—reinforcing the necessity of a “journalist-in-the-loop” approach.

The project's outcomes also hold implications for newsroom strategies. While AI-enabled “sense-making”—identifying recurring themes and highlighting key excerpts—was beneficial in managing the extensive qualitative data, the initiative's effectiveness ultimately depended on the commitment of journalists. The most impactful storytelling emerged in stations where reporters had established relationships with their communities and possessed strong engagement skills. These findings suggest that AI can enhance, but not replace, the human elements of journalism: trust-building, empathy, and contextual understanding.

This study contributes to the growing discourse on AI in journalism by illustrating that successful integration requires significant human oversight and editorial judgment. As news organizations seek to balance efficiency with “authentic” audience growth initiatives, this project underscores the necessity of investing in community engagement efforts alongside technological advancements. Moving forward, journalism can benefit from AI tools that support, rather than supplant, the essential work of fostering meaningful connections between reporters and the

communities they serve. This paper emphasizes that while AI can assist in processing and analyzing qualitative data, it is not a substitute for the labor-intensive work of meaningful community engagement.

## References

- Batsell, J. (2015). *Engaged journalism: Connecting with digitally empowered news audiences*. Columbia University Press.
- Belair-Gagnon, V., Nelson, J. L., & Lewis, S. C. (2019). Audience engagement, reciprocity, and the pursuit of community connectedness in public media journalism. *Journalism Practice*, 13(5), 558–575. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2018.1542975>
- Brannon, W., Beeferman, D., Jiang, H., Heyward, A., & Roy, D. (2024, November). AudienceView: AI-Assisted Interpretation of Audience Feedback in Journalism. In R. Farzan & C. López (Eds.), *Companion publication of the 2024 conference on computer-supported cooperative work and social computing* (pp. 65–68). Association for Computing Machinery.
- Broussard, M., Diakopoulos, N., Guzman, A. L., Abebe, R., Dupagne, M., & Chuan, C. H. (2019). Artificial intelligence and journalism. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 96(3), 673–695. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077699019859901>
- Miroshnichenko, A. (2018). AI to bypass creativity: Will robots replace journalists? (The answer is “yes”). *Information*, 9(7), 183. <https://doi.org/10.3390/info9070183>
- Nishal, S., & Diakopoulos, N. (2024). Envisioning the applications and implications of generative AI for news media. *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.18835>
- Quinonez, C., & Meij, E. (2024). A new era of AI-assisted journalism at Bloomberg. *AI Magazine*, 45(2), 187–199. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aaai.12181>
- Simon, F. M. (2024). *Artificial intelligence in the news: How AI retools, rationalizes, and reshapes journalism and the public arena*. Tow Center for Digital Journalism.
- Wenzel, A. (2017). Public media and marginalized publics: Online and offline engagement strategies and local storytelling networks.

- Digital Journalism*, 7(1), 146–163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2017.1398594>
- Wenzel, A. (2019). Engaged journalism in rural communities. *Journalism Practice*, 13(6), 708–722. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2018.1562360>
- Wenzel, A. (2020). *Community-centered journalism: Engaging people, exploring solutions, and building trust*. University of Illinois Press.
- Wenzel, A. D., & Crittenden, L. (2021). Reimagining local journalism: A community-centered intervention. *Journalism Studies*, 22(15), 2023–2041. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2021.1942148>
- Zahay, M. L., Jensen, K., Xia, Y., & Robinson, S. (2021). The labor of building trust: Traditional and engagement discourses for practicing journalism in a digital age. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 98(4), 1041–1058. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077699020954854>

# How news workers' AI use reinforces the degradation of journalism: An ethnographic study

Jocelyn McKinnon-Crowley

AI and journalism research typically focuses on news organizations in big cities, where journalists work for large, resourced companies (Ioscote et al., 2024). This means that several hundred U.S. local news organizations with limited resources and limited technical capabilities get overlooked (Metzger, 2024). Audiences and news workers outside of large U.S. metropolitan areas can have limited technology access and limited technology capabilities (Abernathy & Stonbely, 2023; Foà et al., 2024; Jones et al., 2022).

Additionally, newswriters at digital-native organizations have additional burdens on their time that can impact how they use tools at work (Buschow, 2020). Given that the work of new digital-native news organizations is built on precarity (Lincoln, 2024; Chadra & Steiner, 2022), this research is situated under a labor process theory approach (Nielsen, 2025; Braverman, 1974), examining how new technologies are integral to the degradation of news work. This research asks: What does AI and machine-learning technology use look like in smaller newsrooms? And how do the conditions of the workplace affect how journalists are able to use digital tools?

To answer these research questions, I conducted months-long ethnographic fieldwork in 2024 with a digital-native, small local newsroom in the Northeast U.S. This method allowed me to compare what jour-

---

Jocelyn McKinnon-Crowley  
Newhouse School of Public Communication  
Syracuse University  
Syracuse (NY), USA  
jmckin02@syr.edu

nalists say they do with observations of their actual day-to-day practices (Burawoy, 1998; Laureau, 2021) to understand the unspoken norms in the newsroom around technology (Broersma & Singer, 2020).

I observed that AI technology used in the newsroom was considered a disposable, secondary curiosity, mostly suitable for non-journalistic tasks. For example, when presented with advanced AI tools as part of the Google News Initiative, the managing editor complained about having to make an account, put off registering, speed-clicked through the tool introduction, and then never used those tools ever again.

In line with previous research (Wu, 2024), the most common use of AI tools was simple, rote work, like AI-powered transcription services. When privacy concerns about these transcription tools made the news, journalists were not concerned and swapped tips about which replacement apps. For non-journalistic tasks like resizing images or structuring newsletters, journalists relied on recommendations from their informal network and used those tools regardless of their AI capacities.

From a labor process theory perspective, while the AI technology is not removing the need for journalists in small local newsrooms, newswriters will uncritically use AI tools if it helps them meet the ever-increasing demands of management. The everyday concern of the worker is not whether or not the tool will take their job, but is constantly focused on the expectation to make work better, faster. Because of the hectic nature of operating a small news organization, there was no time spent on intentional technology strategy. I argue the degradation of the news workplace in requiring so much work to be done by so few, removes the opportunity from journalists to use new digital tools for creativity and instead reinforces the use of new AI-digital tools as agents of efficiency.

## References

- Abernathy, P., & S. Stonebely. (2023). *The state of local news 2023: Vanishing newspapers, digital divides and reaching underserved communities*. Medill School of Journalism at Northwestern University.

- Braverman, H. (1974). *Labor and monopoly capital: The degradation of work in the Twentieth Century*. Monthly Review Press.
- Broersma, M., & Singer, J. B. (2020). Caught between innovation and tradition: Young journalists as normative change agents in the journalistic field. *Journalism Practice*, 15(6), 821–838. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2020.1824125>
- Burawoy, M. (1998). The extended case method. *Sociological Theory*, 16(1), 4–33. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0735-2751.00040>
- Buschow, C. (2020). Why do digital native news media fail? An investigation of failure in the early start-up phase. *Media and Communication*, 8(2), 51–61. <https://doi.org/10.17645/mac.v8i2.2677>
- Chadha, K., & Steiner, L. (Eds.). (2022). *Newswork and precarity*. Routledge.
- Foá, C., Couraceiro, P., & Pinto-Martinho, A. (2024). Decoding algorithmic literacy among journalists. *Observatorio (OBS\*)*, 18(5). <https://doi.org/10.15847/obsobs18520242433>
- Ioscote, F., Gonçalves, A., & Quadros, C. (2024). Artificial intelligence in journalism: A ten-year retrospective of scientific articles (2014–2023). *Journalism and Media*, 5(3), 873–891. <https://doi.org/10.3390/journalmedia5030056>
- Jones, B., Jones, R., & Luger, E. (2022). AI “everywhere and nowhere”: Addressing the AI intelligibility problem in public service journalism. *Digital Journalism*, 10(10), 1731–1755. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2022.2145328>
- Lareau, A. (2021). *Listening to people: A practical guide to interviewing, participant observation, data analysis, and writing it all up*. University of Chicago Press.
- Lincoln, L. (2024). “A hard road with personal costs”: How digital-first nonprofit news founders navigate precarity. *Digital Journalism, ahead-of-print*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2024.2333847>
- Metzger, Z. (2024). *The state of local news 2024: Expanding deserts, shifts in ownership, and expanded digital coverage*. Medill School of Journalism at Northwestern University.
- Neilson, T. (2025). The labor of news work and journalism. In M. Powers (Ed.), *Oxford Encyclopedia of Communication* (pp. 1–23). Oxford University Press.

Wu, S. (2024). Journalists as individual users of artificial intelligence: Examining journalists' "value-motivated use" of ChatGPT and other AI tools within and without the newsroom. *Journalism, ahead-of-print*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14648849241303047>

# Analyzing Indian elections through the lens of AI

Shivangi Asthana

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into India's electoral processes signifies a pivotal shift in political communication and engagement, profoundly impacting the field of journalism. As one of the world's largest democracies, India conducts elections involving approximately 1.4 billion citizens, making AI's role in this context both significant and complex. The recent 2024 Lok Sabha elections exemplify this transformation, with AI-driven campaigns introducing innovative methods for candidates to connect with the electorate and for journalists to analyze and report these developments. For instance, AI-powered avatars and chatbots, such as those utilized in Prime Minister Narendra Modi's *NaMo* app, have facilitated personalized dissemination of political messages and government policies to millions of voters, challenging journalists to adapt to new forms of political communication. Additionally, predictive analytics and data-driven strategies have been employed to segment voter bases, tailor messages, and optimize outreach efforts, which journalists must understand and communicate effectively.

This technological advancement presents numerous opportunities for journalism, such as improved access to data, enhanced storytelling through personalized communication, and the ability to analyse campaign strategies more effectively (Howard & Hussain, 2013). However, it also introduces significant challenges, particularly regarding ethical implications and the potential misuse of AI that journalists must navigate (Tufekci, 2017). The controversy surrounding the AI-generated

---

Shivangi Asthana  
School of Communication  
Hong Kong Baptist University  
Hong Kong, China  
22481877@life.hkbu.edu.hk

audio clip mimicking Delhi's former Chief Minister, Arvind Kejriwal, highlights the dangers of misinformation and manipulation that accompany AI technologies, posing critical questions about the role of journalism in safeguarding democratic processes. This study aims to contribute to this discourse by examining the role of AI in the 2024 election campaign, investigating the potential for AI misuse in voter manipulation, and highlighting the implications for journalism.

The impact of technology on political communication and journalism has been widely examined. Howard and Hussain (2013) highlighted how digital technologies transform engagement and information flow, while also presenting challenges for journalists. Allcott and Gentzkow (2017) emphasized the dangers of misinformation in the digital era, stressing the need for journalists to critically assess sources. McGregor and Kreiss analyzed the role of AI in shaping campaign strategies and voter engagement, calling for strong ethical guidelines to help journalists navigate this evolving landscape (McGregor, 2018; Kreiss, 2016). Collectively, these studies reveal AI's dual role as a powerful tool for democratic enhancement and a source of ethical challenges in journalism.

This research draws on McLuhan's theory of technological determinism, which examines how technology shapes social structures and cultural values (McLuhan, 1994). This theory provides a lens for understanding the media's impact on political communication, including its implications for journalism. Ethical governance frameworks will also be crucial in assessing the moral and ethical considerations involved in deploying AI in political contexts, highlighting the need for journalists to strike a balance between innovation and accountability and public interest (Smith & Marx, 1994). The research employs qualitative methods, including secondary data analysis to compare AI election news coverage in mainstream media vs alternative media, and expert interviews, to provide insights into the challenges and opportunities presented by AI in Indian elections.

## References

- Allcott, H., & Gentzkow, M. (2017). Social media and fake news in the 2016 election. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 31(2), 211–236. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.31.2.211>
- Howard, P. N., & Hussain, M. M. (2013). *Democracy's fourth wave? Digital media and the Arab Spring*. Oxford University Press.
- Kreiss, D. (2016). Seizing the moment: The presidential campaigns' use of Twitter during the 2012 electoral cycle. *New Media & Society*, 18(8), 1473–1490. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814562445>
- McGregor, S. C. (2017). Personalization, social media, and voting: Effects of candidate self-personalization on vote intention. *New Media & Society*, 20(3), 1139–1160. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816686103>
- McLuhan, M. (1994). *Understanding media: The extensions of man*. MIT Press.
- Smith, M. R., & Marx, L. (1994). *Does technology drive history? The dilemma of technological determinism*. MIT Press.
- Tufekci, Z. (2017). *Twitter and tear gas: The power and fragility of networked protest*. Yale University Press.



## Panel 3

Regulatory challenges and policy responses to AI in journalism



# “Good enough” news? Model substitution for local reporting

Nicholas Hagar and Sachita Nishal

Large language models (LLMs) now semi-autonomously write news for reputable outlets, with widely varying results. While some implementations have proved disastrous—as with Sports Illustrated’s generative AI “reporters” (Bauder, 2023) and Quartz’s subpar “Intelligence Newsroom” (Bellan, 2025)—others like Semafor’s A.I.-powered breaking news feed have shown more promise (Smith & Chua, 2024).

This discrepancy suggests that LLMs cannot (yet) succeed as journalists without careful scaffolding. They require human-led design and engineering patterns to meet professional newsroom standards (Diakopoulos et al., 2024; Cools & Diakopoulos, 2024). But this is a softer constraint than newsroom tools have faced in the past. Prior computational journalism tools could produce news copy, but only within the confines of datasets, templates, and vocabularies explicitly provided by newsrooms (Jones & Jones, 2019). They were, in other words, limited by a blend of organizational, technical, and value-laden constraints controlled entirely by the news publisher (Diakopoulos, 2019).

LLMs do not face these constraints. They are technically unbounded, capable of producing work in a wide range of styles and forms that, at face value, appear convincing. Compared to prior computational news-

---

Nicholas Hagar  
Knight Lab  
Northwestern University  
Evanston (IL), USA  
nicholas.hagar@northwestern.edu

Sachita Nishal  
Amaral Lab  
Northwestern University  
Evanston (IL), USA  
sachita.nishal@northwestern.edu

room tools, this means the limitations on their deployment shift from a hard constraint (i.e., “The model can’t do that”) to a soft one (i.e., “We shouldn’t let the model do that”).

That shift from hard to soft constraints is particularly consequential in resource-constrained environments operating under market pressures. In organizations subject to capital logics, as many U.S. newsrooms are, soft constraints provide far weaker guardrails against automation than their technical predecessors (McChesney, 2014; Carlson, 2015). When faced with financial pressure, organizations may adopt automated systems that are merely “good enough” rather than optimal (Carlson, 2015; McChesney, 2012).

Local news represents a particularly vulnerable target for this dynamic. Local publishers face ever-worsening financial conditions, with many outlets—especially those serving economically disadvantaged areas—struggling to maintain basic reporting resources (Metzger, 2024). These conditions create the possibility for uneven automation, where LLM-based systems disproportionately replace human journalists in lower-income communities that can least afford to invest in quality local coverage. While some outlets claim that LLM-generated coverage of under-served communities is better than nothing (Jones, 2024), the actual quality of this coverage and its comparability to what human journalists might create remains unseen.

To understand the implications of this shift toward automated local journalism, we analyze the Good Daily network (Deck, 2025), which operates over 350 local newsletters across the United States, generated entirely by AI systems without human editorial oversight. Our research addresses three key questions: (1) How do the topic selection and coverage patterns of LLM-generated local news differ from human-produced local journalism? (2) To what extent do these AI systems reproduce or deviate from traditional editorial judgment in local news? and (3) What are the implications of these differences for local news ecosystems, particularly in economically disadvantaged areas? By analyzing both the content and editorial patterns of these fully automated newsletters, this research provides crucial insights into the capabilities and limitations of LLM-driven local journalism, while highlighting potential consequences for democratic discourse and community information needs.

## References

- Bauder, D. (2023, November 29). *Sports Illustrated found publishing AI generated stories, photos and authors*. PBS News. <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/economy/sports-illustrated-found-publishing-ai-generated-stories-photos-and-authors>
- Bellan, R. (2025, January 27). *Quartz has been quietly publishing AI-generated news articles*. Tech Crunch. <https://techcrunch.com/2025/01/27/quartz-has-been-quietly-publishing-ai-generated-news-articles>
- Carlson, M. (2015). The robotic reporter: Automated journalism and the redefinition of labor, compositional forms, and journalistic authority. *Digital Journalism*, 3(3), 416–431. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2014.976412>
- Cools, H., & Diakopoulos, N. (2024). Uses of generative AI in the newsroom: Mapping journalists' perceptions of perils and possibilities. *Journalism Practice, ahead-of-print*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2024.2394558>
- Deck, A. (2025, January 27). *Inside a network of AI-generated newsletters targeting "small town America"*. Nieman Lab. <https://www.niemanlab.org/2025/01/inside-a-network-of-ai-generated-newsletters-targeting-small-town-america>
- Diakopoulos, N. (2019). *Automating the news: How algorithms are rewriting the media*. Harvard University Press.
- Diakopoulos, N., Cools, H., Li, C., Helberger, N., Kung, E., & Rinehart, A. (2024). *Generative AI in Journalism: The evolution of newswork and ethics in a generative information ecosystem*. The Associated Press.
- Jones, R., & Jones, B. (2019). Atomising the news: The (in)flexibility of structured journalism. *Digital Journalism*, 7(8), 1157–1179. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2019.1609372>
- Jones, T. (2024, September 9). *Breaking down ESPN's decision to use AI to write some game stories*. Poynter. <https://www.poynter.org/commentary/2024/espn-artificial-intelligence-poll-nwsl-coverage>
- McChesney, R. W. (2012). Farewell to journalism? Time for a rethinking. *Journalism Studies*, 13(5-6), 682–694. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2012.683273>
- McChesney, R. W. (2014). *Digital disconnect: How capitalism is turning the internet against democracy*. The New Press.

- Metzger, Z. (2024). *The state of local news 2024: Expanding deserts, shifts in ownership, and expanded digital coverage*. Medill School of Journalism at Northwestern University.
- Smith, B., & Chua, G. (2024, February 5). *Introducing Semafor Signals*. Semafor. <https://www.semafor.com/article/02/05/2024/introducing-semafor-signals>

# Rosy-cheeked piggy banks, armed beavers, and fantastic futures: A qualitative examination of editorial guidelines on the use of generative AI-visuals in Swiss newsrooms

Seraina Tarnutzer and Sina Blassnig

Visuals – e.g., photos, images, and videos – are integral to contemporary journalism and shape audience perceptions (Geise & Maubach, 2024). The rise of visual generative AI technologies capable of generating seemingly photorealistic visual content has intensified concerns about dis/misinformation, fake news, and trust in journalism, highlighting the need for guidelines (Thomson et al., 2024) to ensure the responsible and ethical use of AI technologies (de-Lima-Santos et al., 2024). Prior research on (generative) AI in journalism highlights transparency, accountability, human oversight, and ethical standards as key guideline elements (Becker et al., 2023; Calvo-Rubio & Rojas-Torrijos, 2024; Porlezza, 2023). However, the visual dimension of these guidelines remains understudied. Exceptions like Thomson et al. (2024) and Thomson & Thomas (2023) note the lack of formal policies on generative visual AI, stressing the need for clearer regulations.

---

Seraina Tarnutzer  
Department of Communication and Media Research  
University of Fribourg  
Fribourg, Switzerland  
seraina.tarnutzer@unifr.ch

Sina Blassnig  
Department of Communication and Media Research  
University of Fribourg  
Fribourg, Switzerland  
sina.blassnig@unifr.ch

Therefore, we ask: How do editorial guidelines in Swiss newsrooms reflect emerging journalistic norms regarding the use of generative visual AI in journalism, and what do these norms reveal about the adaptation of journalistic visual practices to this new technology? Switzerland is a particularly compelling context as it is a highly innovative and digitized country (IMD, 2023), yet Swiss media professionals and the public have been sceptical towards AI in news production (Blassnig et al., 2024; Vogler et al., 2024). We analyze guidelines against the theoretical background of institutional logics (March & Olsen, 2013) and journalistic norms, denoting fundamental values that journalists should follow in their everyday practices, building and reinforcing the ethical foundation in journalistic institutions (Cools & Diakopoulos, 2024; de-Lima-Santos et al., 2024).

We examined editorial guidelines from 21 Swiss news outlets, differing in financial models, target audiences, geographic scopes, publishing house affiliation, political orientations, and language regions (see Table 1) (fög, 2023). Our sample included 11 guidelines in German, French, and Italian, obtained via desk research and directly contacting news outlets (October/November 2024). We employed qualitative thematic analysis (Kuckartz, 2014) using MAXQDA.

Table 1: Sample overview

| Geographic focus | Outlet type        | DE-CH                                  | FR-CH                          | IT-CH                                                   |
|------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| Supra-regional   | Public service     | SRF (SRG SSR)                          | RTS (SRG SSR)                  | RSI (SRG SSR)                                           |
|                  | Ad-based/ commuter | 20 Minuten (Tamedia)                   | 20 minutes (Tamedia/ TX Group) | 20 minuti/ tio.ch (Ticin Online SA, Tamedia/ laRegione) |
|                  | Ad-based/ tabloid  | Blick (Ringier)                        | Lematin.ch (Tamedia/ TX Group) |                                                         |
|                  | Subscription-based | Neue Zürcher Zeitung (NZZ Media Group) | Le Temps (Fondation Aventinus) | Corriere del Ticino (Centro Stampa Ticino SA)           |

|          |                    |                                                     |                                                          |                                               |
|----------|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Regional | Subscription-based | Tages-Anzeiger<br>(Tamedia/<br>TX Group)            | 24 heures<br>(Tamedia/<br>TX Group)                      |                                               |
|          |                    | Südostschweiz<br>(SOMEDIA)                          | Le Nouvelliste<br>(ESH Médias<br>Editions SA)            | laRegion<br>(Regiopress<br>SA)                |
|          |                    | Aargauer Zei-<br>tung (CH Media)                    | Arcinfo<br>(ESH Médias<br>Editions SA)                   |                                               |
| Local    |                    | Bajour.ch<br>(Verein Bajour)<br>Community-<br>based | Heidi.news<br>(Heidi Media SA)<br>Subscription-<br>based | TicinoNews<br>(MediaTI<br>Web SA)<br>Ad-based |

Note. Publishers are mentioned in brackets.

Our findings reveal (1) that the acceptability of genAI visuals depended on the type of visuals, functions of communication, and the context and topic depicted - e.g., a “symbolic” genAI visual of a rosy-cheeked piggy bank accompanying financial news, a “decorative” AI-illustration of an armed beaver in news about endangered species protection, and AI-visualizations for future scenarios (see Figures 1-3) were deemed perfectly acceptable – as opposed to photo-realistic AI-images in hard news topics, e.g., war contexts. We also find (2) varying accessibility, scope, and visual focus in guidelines across outlets; (3) a tendency to downplay genAI’s novelty by linking it to established practices and norms, aiming at reinforcing a sense of cautiousness and responsible integration; (4) a strong emphasis on challenges like transparency measures, data protection, copyright, and privacy, prioritizing visual authenticity and factuality; (5) the framing of genAI as a tool helpful to enhance journalism, e.g., by improving efficiency, experimenting, or enhancing visual quality.

Ultimately, our research illuminates how news organizations navigate and set standards for genAI visuals, deepening our understanding of evolving visual journalism practices and the ethical challenges shaping the current media landscape (Cools & Diakopoulos, 2024).

## References

- Becker, K. B., Simon, F. M., & Crum, C. (2025). Policies in parallel? A comparative study of journalistic AI policies in 52 global news organisations. *Digital Journalism*, ahead-of-print. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2024.2431519>
- Blassnig, S., Strikovic, E., Mitova, E., Urman, A., Hannák, A., de Vreese, C., & Esser, F. (2025). A balancing act: How media professionals perceive the implementation of news recommender systems. *Digital Journalism*, 13(4), 745–773. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2023.2293933>
- Calvo-Rubio, L.-M., & Rojas-Torrijos, J.-L. (2024). Criteria for journalistic quality in the use of artificial intelligence. *Communication & Society*, 37(2), 247–259. <https://doi.org/10.15581/003.37.2.247-259>
- Cools, H., & Diakopoulos, N. (2024). Uses of generative AI in the newsroom: Mapping journalists' perceptions of perils and possibilities. *Journalism Practice*, ahead-of-print. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2024.2394558>
- de-Lima-Santos, M.-F., Yeung, W. N., & Dodds, T. (2024). Guiding the way: A comprehensive examination of AI guidelines in global media. *AI & Society*, 40, 2585–2603. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-024-01973-5>
- fög - Forschungszentrum Öffentlichkeit und Gesellschaft (Ed.). (2023). *Jahrbuch Qualität der Medien 2023*. Schwabe. <https://doi.org/10.24894/978-3-7965-4894-9>
- Geise, S., & Maubach, K. (2024). Catch me if you can: How episodic and thematic multimodal news frames shape policy support by stimulating visual attention and responsibility attributions. *Frontiers in Communication*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2024.1305048>
- IMD. (2023). *World Digital Competitiveness Ranking*. <https://www.imd.org/centers/wcc/world-competitiveness-center/rankings/world-digital-competitiveness-ranking>
- Kuckartz, U. (2014). *Qualitative text analysis. A guide to methods, practice and using software*. SAGE Publications.
- March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (2013). The logic of appropriateness. In R. E. Goodin (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of political science* (pp. 478–497). Oxford University Press.

- Porlezza, C. (2023). Promoting responsible AI: A European perspective on the governance of artificial intelligence in media and journalism. *Communications*, 48(3), 370–394. <https://doi.org/10.1515/commun-2022-0091>
- Thomson, T. J., & Thomas, R. J. (2023). Generative visual AI in newsrooms: Considerations related to production, presentation, and audience interpretation and impact. *Journalism Research*, 6(3), 318–328. [https://doi.org/10.1453/2569-152X-3\\_42023-13639-en](https://doi.org/10.1453/2569-152X-3_42023-13639-en)
- Thomson, T. J., Thomas, R. J., & Matich, P. (2024). Generative visual AI in news organizations: Challenges, opportunities, perceptions, and policies. *Digital Journalism*, ahead-of-print. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2024.2331769>
- Vogler, D., Fürst, S., Eisenegger, M., Ryffel, Q., Udris, L., & Schäfer, M. S. (2024). *Künstliche Intelligenz im Journalismus: Wie sich die Akzeptanz in der Schweizer Bevölkerung entwickelt* (Jahrbuch Qualität der Medien Studie 2 / 2024). fög - Forschungszentrum Öffentlichkeit und Gesellschaft. [https://www.foeg.uzh.ch/dam/jcr:1794bd24-3212-48ea-9437-67d613f6c396/JB\\_2024\\_Studie\\_II\\_KI\\_im\\_Journalismus\\_final.pdf](https://www.foeg.uzh.ch/dam/jcr:1794bd24-3212-48ea-9437-67d613f6c396/JB_2024_Studie_II_KI_im_Journalismus_final.pdf)



**Figure 1:** Rosy-cheeked piggy bank

Note. Picture generated with DALL-E 3 using a verbal prompt from the SRF guidelines “Sparschwein mit Schweizerflagge als Symbolbild für die persönliche Vorsorge in der Schweiz/Piggy bank with Swiss flag as a symbol for personal pension provision in Switzerland.” No visual example was provided in the guidelines; the picture was created based on the verbal prompt by the authors.



**Figure 2:** Armed beaver

Note. Picture generated with DALL-E 3 using a verbal prompt from the SRF guidelines “Fantastische oder klar erkennbar absurde Darstellungen: Biber mit Stahlhelm und Gewehr, umgeben von Stacheldraht als Bebilderung des Themas ‘Schutz bedrohter Tierarten’/Fantastic or clearly recognizable absurd depictions: Beaver with steel helmet and rifle, surrounded by barbed wire as an illustration of the theme ‘protection of endangered species.’” No visual example was provided in the guidelines; the picture was created based on the verbal prompt by the authors.



**Figure 3:** Fantastic futures

Note. Picture generated with DALL-E 3 using a verbal prompt from the SRF guidelines “Bilder mit utopischen Zukunftsszenarien/Pictures with utopian future scenarios.” No visual example was provided in the guidelines; the picture was created based on the verbal prompt by the authors.



# Paper as justice, digital as deception: AI, nostalgia, and the persistence of print in Japanese news media

Kaori Hayashi

In Japan, major newspaper companies, led by the nation's largest daily, Yomiuri Shimbun, have approached AI with deep suspicion, primarily due to concerns over the unauthorized use of their journalistic content. However, this wariness reflects a broader anxiety toward digitization itself. Even as digital transformation becomes inevitable, print newspapers continue to be framed as bastions of journalistic integrity (Villi & Hayashi, 2017)—defenders against fake news, online hate speech, and AI-generated plagiarism. This paper critically examines the persistence of this print-digital binary, in which print is idealized as a medium of justice, while digital media are cast as inherently untrustworthy, ephemeral, and corrupt.

Drawing from media theory (Marvin, 1988; Gitelman, 2006) and critical AI studies (Finn, 2017; Bellanova, Irion et al., 2021), I argue that nostalgia for print is not merely resistance to technology but a symptom of deeper epistemological and economic anxieties. The framing of print as a safeguard against digital deception reinforces the myth of objective journalism (Zelizer, 2004), obscuring how newspapers have historically shaped public perception, filtered information, and exercised ideological power (Mindich, 2000).

This study analyzes policy papers issued by the Japan Newspaper Publishers and Editors Association, alongside editorials and opinion

---

Kaori Hayashi  
Graduate School of Interdisciplinary Information Studies  
The University of Tokyo  
Tokyo, Japan  
hayashik@iii.u-tokyo.ac.jp

columns on AI published in print newspapers, to critically examine the persistence of the print-digital divide. I argue that Japanese media continue to equate journalistic justice and truth with the medium of print rather than the content it conveys. Furthermore, I propose that traditional newspaper companies construct both print and digital media as contested spaces—shaped by biases, market forces, and shifting power dynamics—rather than recognizing their shared values, vulnerabilities, and ethical responsibilities.

Through this analysis, I challenge prevailing narratives about AI's role in journalism, which have primarily framed it as a tool for editing or labor replacement. Instead, I highlight how media industries negotiate technological change through the lens of institutional memory and economic survival. Ultimately, this paper calls for a critical reassessment of how print nostalgia constrains the future of Japanese journalism in an AI-driven age.

## References

- Bellanova, R., Irion, K., Lindskov Jacobsen, K., Ragazzi, F., Saugmann, R., Suchman, L. (2021). Toward a critique of algorithmic violence. *International Political Sociology*, 15(1), 121–150. <https://doi-org./10.1093/ips/olab003>
- Finn, E. (2017). *What algorithms want: Imagination in the age of computing*. MIT Press.
- Gitelman, L. (2006). *Always already new: Media, history, and the data of culture*. MIT Press.
- Marvin, C. (1988). *When old technologies were new: Thinking about electric communication in the late Nineteenth Century*. Oxford University Press.
- Mindich, D. T. Z. (2000). *Just the facts: How “objectivity” came to define American journalism*. New York University Press.
- Villi, M., & K. Hayashi (2017). “The mission is to keep this industry intact”: Digital transition in the Japanese newspaper industry. *Journalism Studies*, 18(8), 960–977. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2015.1110499>
- Zelizer, B. (2004). When facts, truth, and reality are God-terms: On journalism's uneasy place in cultural studies. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 1(1), 100–119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1479142042000180953>

# AI governance and journalism: Guidelines on the use of generative AI in US newsrooms

Silvia DalBen Furtado and Tina Lassiter

The rapid development of artificial intelligence (AI) can lead to significant ethical issues affecting society. The newsroom is no exception. The increased use of generative AI in journalism can potentially cause serious harm, including disinformation, bias, privacy violations, and copyright infringements.

How can we ensure that generative AI is used ethically by journalists? Despite efforts like the Paris Charter on AI and Journalism (RSF, 2023), the lack of adequate regulation and governance remains a challenge. Transparency, fairness, accuracy, and accountability are among some of the values and principles that connect ethical discussions about both artificial intelligence and journalism (de-Lima-Santos et al., 2025; Dierickx et al., 2024).

In the United States, several news outlets have developed their own standards and ethical guidelines to address this issue. This study evaluates the current ethical approaches to using generative AI in US newsrooms and US journalists' perceptions of its impact on journalism. We first analyzed the guidelines of seven US news organizations in this

---

Silvia DalBen Furtado  
School of Journalism and Media  
The University of Texas at Austin  
Austin (TX), USA  
silviadalben@utexas.edu

Tina Lassiter  
School of Information  
The University of Texas at Austin  
Austin (TX), USA  
tinablassiter@utexas.edu

scenario. Then, we conducted a survey (n=310) and interviewed US journalists (n=22) to gain deeper insights into their perspectives on regulation and guidelines for using generative AI in journalism.

Among the journalists that participated in the survey, 160 (51.6%) have at least once experimented with or used GenAI in their work, considering that 11.3% are frequent users (every day / every week), and 30.3% are occasional users (sometimes). GenAI tools are allowed by newsrooms for 137 (44.2%) of our respondents; it is unclear if the use is permitted or not for 107 (34.5%) of them, and it is forbidden for 66 (21.3%).

Regarding editorial guidelines and recommendations, 172 journalists (55.5%) confirmed they follow their organization's standards. However, 69 journalists (22.25%) were unaware of the existence of such guidelines, and another 69 (22.25%) stated that their newsroom had not provided any recommendations on this matter.

Journalists share different opinions on how the use of genAI in newsrooms should be governed. 83 (22.6%) believe there should be specific regulations for journalists, while 70 (22.6%) agree that this should be up to each news organization. Another 70 participants (22.6%) prefer uniform non-binding guidelines for journalists but no regulation, and 68 (21.9%) argue that AI regulation should be applicable in the field of journalism, but there should be no separate regulation for journalists. Other 18 (5.8%) suggested other options, while just 1 respondent (0.3%) stated that there should be no regulation.

Our analysis highlights the lack of a standard and the necessity to intensify a discussion about the ethical use of AI systems in U.S. newsrooms to guarantee they will not be misused, emphasize stereotypes, cause harm, potentialize misinformation, and support discrimination. Moreover, there is confusion regarding what AI is, what GenAI is, and which tool could be considered an AI or not. Thus, more than just discussing AI policies, we need to have a clear understanding of the historical evolution of AI as a field and how it has shaped the work done by journalists for decades.

**Acknowledgement:** This study is funded by the Technology and Information Policy Institute at the University of Texas at Austin.

## References

- de-Lima-Santos, M. F., Yeung, W. N., & Dodds, T. (2025). Guiding the way: A comprehensive examination of AI guidelines in global media. *AI & Society*, 40, 2585-2603. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-024-01973-5>
- Dierickx, L., Opdahl, A. L., Khan, S. A., Lindén, C. G., & Guerrero Rojas, D. C. (2024). A datacentric approach for ethical and trustworthy AI in journalism. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 26(4), Article 64. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-024-09801-6>
- RSF (2023, November 10). *RSF and 16 partners unveil Paris Charter on AI and Journalism*. Reporters Without Borders. <https://rsf.org/en/rsf-and-16-partners-unveil-paris-charter-ai-and-journalism>



Panel 4

The future of AI in shaping  
journalism practice



# Inauthentic journalism: The contested boundaries and ethical standards of AI-generated fake bylines

Michael Serazio

As AI tools proliferate, a spate of scandals has revealed various news sites publishing content generated by AI without forthrightly disclosing that provenance. Like the media industries more broadly, journalism finds itself struggling with and negotiating the ethics and trust of AI use: a struggle that cuts to the core of what “real” content is and who (or what) should create it. This project offers a critical textual analysis of the meta-journalistic discourse about these AI-generated fake byline scandals.

Moran and Shaikh (2022) highlight tension between optimistic leaders and funders and pessimistic reporters and editors regarding AI’s inevitability, professional stability, and audience deception. Others forecast more hopeful hybridity: human and nonhuman actors complementarily co-creating news; the former freed to do ambitious, complex projects, while overseeing more formulaic output augmented by the latter (Diakopoulos, 2019; Marconi, 2020). Economic issues animate AI anxieties—chiefly that, like automation innovation in eras prior, replacement will be the workers’ fate, further shrinking mastheads (Simon, 2024). Meanwhile, there’s little consistency or consensus about algorithmic-production disclosure; audiences trust AI-labeled content less, even if evaluated as accurate, fair, and desired (Toff & Simon, 2023). Amidst much AI hype, critical AI scholarship scrutinizes

---

Michael Serazio  
Morrissey College of Arts and Sciences  
Boston College  
Chestnut Hill (MA), USA  
serazio@bc.edu

those myths and discourses, particularly those benefiting already powerful individuals and institutions (Verdegem, 2023).

Meta-journalistic discourse about AI-generated fake bylines was located in 103 stories published between January 2023 and June 2024 and found through Nexis Uni and Google News searches of newspapers, magazines, the trade press, television and radio transcripts, and influential blogs (search terms entered in July 2024: “AI” and “fake” and “journalis\*” and either “Sports Illustrated” or “Gannett AND Reviewed” or “CNET” or “G/O Media AND Inventory,” the sites of scandal).

Industry judgment of these ethical transgressions reveals authenticity—contrary to AI—as a theoretical ideal for journalism. First, “real” journalism must transparently disclose its creation process (and, specifically, the identity of its creator), rather than AI imitating personhood, slithering into content surreptitiously, and violating audience trust in the veracity of both content and creator. Second, “real” journalism cannot be motivated by profit concerns, as these AI scandals were linked to a political economy context: private equity ownership, forecast layoffs, labor organizing retribution, and click-scamming commerce-oriented journalism. Third, “real” journalism ought to be produced bespoke rather than by principles of factory-line rationalization that AI affords: hand-crafted (inefficiently so, if needed) rather than formulaically predictable as is the AI ideal. Finally, “real” journalism should be defined by and for fundamentally human features like emotion and social connection; the discourse protectively sets boundaries around those experiences and processes as yet inaccessible to AI input and, therefore, output.

In an era of much large language model hype and panic—and after a generation of technological and economic upheaval in the news business and ongoing crises of low trust and diminished faith—the analysis documents and interprets how journalism is negotiating and reacting to AI intrusion when it arrives in duplicitous and therefore inauthentic ways.

## References

- Diakopoulos, N. (2019). *Automating the news: How algorithms are rewriting the media*. Harvard University Press.
- Marconi, F. (2020). *Newsmakers: Artificial intelligence and the future of journalism*. Columbia University Press.
- Moran, R. E., & Shaikh, S. J. (2022). Robots in the news and newsrooms: Unpacking meta-journalistic discourse on the use of artificial intelligence in journalism. *Digital Journalism*, 10(10), 1756–1774. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2022.2085129>
- Simon, F. M. (2024). *Artificial intelligence in the news: how AI retools, rationalizes, and reshapes journalism and the public arena*. Tow Center for Digital Journalism.
- Toff, B., & Simon, F. M. (2023). “Or they could just not use it?” *The paradox of AI disclosure for audience trust in news*. Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.
- Verdegem, P. (2023). Critical AI studies meets critical political economy. In S. Lindgren (Ed.), *Handbook of critical studies of artificial intelligence* (pp. 302–311). Edward Elgar.



# AI, journalism, and epistemic justice: Digital citizenship beyond the liberal ideal

Eddy Borges-Rey

Historically, scholarship in journalism studies and political communication has conceptualised journalism as a watchdog institution that holds power to account, safeguards the public interest, and fosters citizen participation, both offline and online. These normative ideals, rooted in liberal democratic traditions, assume that journalism functions as an independent mediator between the state and society, facilitating informed debate and civic engagement. However, growing research on journalism and digital citizenship in the Global South challenges the universality of these principles, arguing that journalism operates within distinct political, economic, and epistemological structures that do not necessarily align with Western democratic models. In many Global South contexts, journalism is embedded in state-driven nationalism, religious governance, and alternative civic frameworks, often serving to reinforce dominant power structures rather than challenge them. Moreover, digital citizenship in these regions manifests in ways that extend beyond participation in deliberative democracy, encompassing state-aligned activism, religious mobilisation, self-censorship, and strategic silence as forms of digital agency.

With the imminent adoption of AI in newsrooms, the relationship between journalism and digital citizenship in the Global South becomes even more complex. AI systems, predominantly trained on

---

Eddy Borges-Rey  
Department of Journalism and Strategic Communication  
Northwestern University in Qatar  
Education City, Qatar  
eddy.borges-rey@northwestern.edu

datasets from the Global North, introduce new challenges in shaping how knowledge is produced, how meaning is constructed, and how ways of knowing are mediated in non-Western societies. Algorithmic bias, content moderation policies, and platform-driven news distribution risk further marginalising local epistemologies, reinforcing digital inequalities, and reshaping civic engagement in ways that favour dominant political and economic interests. This paper seeks to critically examine how AI-driven journalism affects digital citizenship in the Global South, interrogating its role in epistemic justice, media control, and the negotiation of digital agency. By problematising the intersection of AI, journalism, and digital citizenship, this study highlights the need for an inclusive and contextually grounded understanding of how algorithmic systems mediate public discourse and power in non-Western contexts.





This edited volume comprehensively examines the interplay between artificial intelligence (AI) and journalism, a phenomenon that is profoundly reshaping the news media landscape. Through a collection of international scholarly contributions, this book particularly takes a global perspective on the complex interplay between technological innovation and journalistic practices and ethics. With contributions by well-known scholars from five continents, this volume offers a timely analysis of the transformative impact, challenges, and opportunities of AI in journalism.

ISBN 978-3-99181-766-6



Universitätsbibliothek  
Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München