Artificial Intelligence in Newsrooms: A Boon for Corporates, Help for Journalists, Bane for Readers

Jayapriyanka J

Sharda University

Abstract: *The rapid integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into newsrooms marks a paradigm shift in contemporary journalism, reshaping editorial practices, economic models, professional identities, and democratic functions. This paper critically examines AI in journalism through the lens of its uneven consequences-positioning AI simultaneously as a boon for corporate news organizations, a practical aid for journalists, and a potential bane for readers. Drawing on global case studies, empirical research, and interdisciplinary theory, the study analyzes how AI technologies-ranging from machine learning and natural language processing to computer vision and optimization systems-reconfigure both the flow of money and the flow of information in news ecosystems. The findings demonstrate that AI enhances efficiency, scalability, and personalization, supporting newsroom sustainability and innovation, particularly under financial strain. However, these gains are accompanied by significant risks, including heightened dependence on major technology platforms, opaque decision-making, ethical vulnerabilities, labor tensions, and indirect distortions of editorial agendas through analytics and recommendation systems. While journalists generally view AI as useful for automating routine tasks, they remain deeply skeptical of its role in judgment, verification, and ethical decision-making, reinforcing the necessity of hybrid human–AI workflows. The paper further reveals that AI complicates audience trust and news consumption in non-linear ways, shaped by ideological alignment and cognitive "machine heuristics." Cross-national comparisons highlight that AI adoption is profoundly shaped by political, cultural, and regulatory contexts, exacerbating global inequalities in journalistic capacity. Overall, the study argues that AI is not merely a technological upgrade but a structural force redistributing power, agency, and accountability in journalism. It concludes that the future of democratic journalism depends on responsible AI governance, transparency, algorithmic literacy, and value-driven integration that prioritizes public interest over purely corporate optimization.*

Keywords: artificial intelligence in journalism, newsroom automation, algorithmic governance, audience trust, media ethics

1. Introduction

The swift pace of innovation and integration of artificial intelligence (AI) has greatly impacted the current state of journalism, transforming newsrooms in terms of newsroom organization, work culture, editorial operations, business models, and social relationships with technology companies. Although journalism has historically been impacted by technology, including digitization and social media, the current innovation in AI technology can be considered a fundamentally different paradigm. Unlike other technology, which can only augment efficiency but not transform it, AI technology possesses capabilities in processing thinking tasks, translation of language, forecasting audience behavior, and making decisions in domains hitherto reserved for human journalists. Therefore, AI technology not only enhances efficiency but alters basic epistemology, ethics, and institutions in journalism.

The application of AI in journalism in the early years mainly revolved around the automation of editorial tasks based on rules, such as template-driven news, labelling, transcription, and search engine optimization. But since 2022, with the advent of generative AI models such as language models and image production solutions, AI integration in journalism has gained momentum. Presently, AI solutions are being used in news production, summarization, content generation, fact-checking, audience segmentation, and content republishing, thus increasing both efficiency and innovative potential, but simultaneously raising immediate concerns related to accuracy, lack of transparency, bias, accountability, and diminishing editorial acumen.

As AI systems integrate into everyday newsroom practices, journalists face dilemmas in regards to occupational identity, autonomy, and trust. Research highlights a sense of pressure among journalists from editorial management, financial supporters, and discourses in the news industry to make use of AI systems with nominal training or ethics in mind. Such a setting brings with it both "AI hype" and "AI panic," utopian discourses of innovation and dystopian discourses of news deskilling and news worker disempowerment. Such expectations are not simply discursive, since research highlights future-oriented discourses of AI as a productive organisational resource, which legitimises financial investment and expenditure, organises actors and acts into coordinated action, all especially in news organisations operating under strained financial circumstances.

Empirical research from news companies such as Berlingske Media and projects such as the AP's Local News AI initiative shows that AI receives widely different views in the journalistic profession. While most news professionals see AI in a positive light and thus as an enabler in more in-depth research due to reduced transcription, translation, and reuse, they have serious reservations when it comes to AI hallucinations, AI bias, overestimation of AI, and a lack of AI transparency. Moreover, in some newsrooms, news company communication on AI adoption has led to labour conflict, making it evident how news companies straddle technology, power, employment, and organizational politics.

Issues of ethics and accountability are thus very much at the forefront. A key point journalists have continually reiterated is the need to maintain professional standards such as truth, independence, fairness, and responsibility in their work, primarily in high-risk operations such as validation and fact-

checking. Throughout all these studies, trust in AI systems is lowest during accuracy and judgment evaluation, but this reinforces the need for human mediation in these matters. Meanwhile, the role of AI may affect editorial content indirectly despite editorial control being in the hands of journalists, because of analytics, recommendations, and predictive algorithms used in devising publication and readership strategy.

Outside of newsrooms, AI systems have expanded existing dependencies of news enterprises on large technology companies like Google, Amazon, Microsoft, Meta, and Apple. In fact, these giant companies set forth the agenda in developing AI systems. As news companies make increased use of AI systems offered or operated by these technology companies, they become reliant on them for their core business of news production and delivery. Such 'infrastructure capture' by news platforms not only further expands platform power in news production and delivery but is problematic in terms of news autonomy and governance. News journalists are increasingly being forced to address 'algorithmic publics', which are remote abstractions constructed through algorithms operating outside their control.

AI further alters audience/news interaction. Studies on trust and media consumption, including work on the 2022 French Presidential Election, show a non-linear relationship between trust and usage. Some mainstream media can see increased usage but lower trust levels, and ideological fit is key in both ideological and partisan news spaces. Such studies not only upend traditional views on audience behavior but highlight the need to grasp AI algorithmic effects on selective exposure, polarization, and disengagement. Meanwhile, audience views on AI-generated content are influenced by 'machine heuristics': these can foster overblown trust in AI as an objective and efficient tool or in AI's lack of human empathy and judgment.

On a more theoretical plane, AI shifts balances of power and agency in journalism. As machine learning algorithms undertake an increasing array of communicative and analytical discourses, such as writing, prioritizing, interpreting, AI asserts a major role in news discourses, rather than being a passive technology. Scenario studies indicate a theoretical future in which AI serves human journalism systems, human and AI agency co-create news in hybrid systems, and in other systems, AI takes centre stage in defining news acts. The question of knowledge in news discourses, and accordingly defining news acts, remains fundamentally problematic in AI environments.

The integration of AI is very different from country to country and from organization to organization. Studies have indicated that in countries such as the UK, Switzerland, Canada, and China, among other places, AI integration is influenced by market size, political landscape, cultural beliefs, and government regulation, among other factors. Some institutions are working to incorporate highly innovative AI technology, but others are very selective in their integration of AI, especially in public service media where high expectations of transparency exist with respect to democratic institutions.

Taken cumulatively, these trends establish that AI is far more than a technology revolution for news institutions but a paradigm-shifting phenomenon with wide-ranging implications for the financial underpinnings, information role, professional ethics, and democratic function in news institutions. AI systems impact financial flows and information channels, redefine work and power in news institutions, amplify platform dependencies, and have challenged epistemological underpinnings in news institutions. AI systems have immense potential in increasing news efficiency, news innovation, and news sustainability but have dire consequences for news autonomy.

Therefore, an understanding of the transformations in newsrooms under AI requires a multifaceted approach which takes in organizational behavior, technological capabilities, cultural normativity, power relations in structure, and audience behavior. Research in this field points to a serious need for responsible governance, value-driven design, algorithmic fluency, and a hybrid human-AI work approach. The challenge, therefore, is not if journalism will accommodate AI technology, but if a democratic system can make AI technology an impetus for rather than a threat to a resilient and vital press.

2. Research Objectives

The ambition of this research project is to offer a thorough and critical assessment of the impact of artificial intelligence (AI) on contemporary journalism. Fundamentally, this research project seeks to examine AI technology and assess how such technology is being developed and deployed in newsrooms around the world, using case studies to unlock trends in AI-powered news content production, sharing, and interaction. Of important consideration in this project will be how various AI research threads, including machine learning, natural language processing, computer vision, speech recognition, robotics, expert systems, and optimisation, interact with each other in journalism, which is transforming the conventional news production process from information acquisition and verification to news writing and delivery.

One of the main concerns of this research is the effect of AI on news enterprises' economic dynamics. The research investigates how automation and algorithm-driven systems affect cost structures, revenue models, monetization strategies, and indirect cost effects such as audience behavior shifts. At the same time, this research delves into how AI-driven processing affects information dynamics in journalism, especially agenda-setting and agenda-building. It determines how agenda salience and affective properties such as tone and sentiment are affected by algorithm-driven systems and disseminated from organizational to newsroom agendas.

The research paper equally focuses on the moral, professional, and democratic aspects called for in incorporating AI. The researcher interprets challenges concerning AI in relation to ethics such as transparency, bias, privacy, misinformation, deepfakes, credibility, and accountability, among other effects AI will have on the role of journalism in serving the public. Very intricately linked to these considerations is a discussion surrounding labor and

professionalism in journalism. The research analysis is based on AI's influence on roles, skill sets, and standards in journalism through automation and a combination of human and AI collaboration.

Moreover, a major research objective is to examine news journalists' views and understandings of AI, known as 'algorithmic imaginaries,' and the impact these have on editorial decisions and trust in AI systems. Additionally, this research will examine views on AI and human agency concerning news content creation and fact-checking, taking into consideration cognitive views, a conspiratorial mindset, and misconceptions in algorithmic systems. Moreover, this research will assess the circumstances under which AI outperforms, matches, or fails human news journalists in news content creation and fact-checking.

Institutionally and structurally, this study analyzes how AI adoption is impacted by organizational culture, governance structures, and other important actors such as the AP, while simultaneously addressing the increased dependency in newsrooms resulting from usage of platform-offered AI solutions from companies such as Google, Microsoft, and Meta. A comparative analysis in a global setting, including countries such as Switzerland, China, and Canada, brings forth inequalities in AI adoption globally in terms of technological capabilities and cultural norms.

In essence, this research proposes to synthesise a macro-level of understanding concerning how AI functions collectively to transform these money and information flows in news systems today. Through a combination of empirical research and institutional theory, news sociologies, and human machine communication theory, this research aims to construct a set of recommendations concerning how AI can be incorporated in a responsible and transparent manner that puts people first.

3. Solutions Found

This research illustrates that AI profoundly disrupts the current economic, informational, professional, and institutional cornerstones of modern journalism. Instead of entering newsrooms as a single, homogenous technology, AI arrives as a constellation of interrelated subfields-machine learning, natural language processing, computer vision, optimisation and planning systems, speech recognition, robotics, and expert systems-each with distinct implications for how news is produced, distributed, monetised, verified, and interpreted. Global case studies and empirical analyses demonstrate in this research that challenges and opportunities presented by AI cannot be engaged through stand-alone technological remedies but effective responses emerge through integrated strategies aimed at aligning technological innovation with economic foresight, ethical governance, professional autonomy, and institutional reflexivity.

Strategic and Systemic Integration of AI
One key finding of this study is that most resilient newsrooms approach AI as integral to a larger socio-technical ecosystem rather than a suite of fragmented tools. Through the systematic mapping of AI applications across subfields and stages of the journalistic workflow, news organisations attain clarity on which tasks can be automated, which require hybrid human-AI collaboration, and which must remain firmly under human control. This classification saves redundancies, avoids poorly aligned investments, and fosters long-term operational efficiency. Newsrooms oriented in a strategic direction toward AI are in a better position to integrate new tools coherently, with technological adoption serving to support rather than diminish editorial values.

The study also reveals that innovation is strongest where newsrooms diversify beyond the already-dominant AI applications such as machine learning and natural language processing. increasingly, organisations are testing computer vision for image and video verification, drone-assisted reporting through robotics, and optimization systems for newsroom planning of schedules and workflows. Such diversification allows storytelling innovation, strengthens verification practices, and reduces dependence on any single technological pathway. Multifunctional AI portfolios enhance organizational resilience in a rapidly changing technological environment, while mitigating risks associated with technological bottlenecks or vendor lock-in.

Restructuring in the Economy and Cash Flow
AI has also reshuffled newsroom economics in three crucial ways: cost, labor, and revenues. Automation of routine, resource-intensive work-transcription, translation, standard data extraction, rote reporting, and even content distribution-allows journalists to devote more time to investigation, interpretation, and public-interest reporting. In that respect, AI underwrites economic sustainability by preserving the core value proposition of journalism while lessening operational stress.

Meanwhile, AI-driven personalization systems have turned central in monetization strategies, allowing for targeted advertising, tailored subscription models, churn prediction, and dynamic paywalls. These systems illustrate how AI simultaneously shapes the flow of information and the flow of money by the direction of audience attention in support of financial viability. However, insights from the AI-IMPACT framework underline a critical tension: economic optimization via personalization may be in conflict with user well-being and long-term trust. Where AI nudges audiences toward excessive consumption or manipulative engagement patterns, it risks undermining journalism's democratic and ethical responsibilities. The study therefore identifies responsible personalization - wherein financial incentives are aligned with user welfare and transparency - as a stabilizing solution for sustainable newsroom economics.

One recurring economic safeguard identified in the study is AI literacy on the part of newsroom leadership and decision-makers. Ill-informed investments based on hype, obscure promises by vendors, or the fear of losing out to competitors can destabilize an already precarious financial situation for newsrooms. Leaders who understand the mechanics of algorithms, data flows, and platform dynamics are better placed to make assessments of risk, negotiate contracts, and resist exploitative dependencies. AI literacy thereby operates not only as a professional competency but also as a form of economic governance.

Volume 14 Issue 12, December 2025
Fully Refereed | Open Access | Double Blind Peer Reviewed Journal
www.ijsr.net

Paper ID: SR251215210730   DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.21275/SR251215210730   1176

Information Governance and Agenda Dynamics

Beyond financial, AI strongly influences information governance in journalism. Agenda-setting and agenda-building analyses demonstrate how the AI-mediated monitoring tools strengthen the recursivity between organizational communication and newsroom agendas. Times-series analyses indicate that organizations often influence issue salience in news, but journalists retain more freedom over the affective framing and interpretation. This "agenda dance" is becoming increasingly complicated as AI accelerates feedback loops, tracks sentiment in real-time, and amplifies visibility pressures.

Newsrooms manage such dynamics through the increasing deployment of AI-driven analytics to monitor shifting topics, sentiment, and influence. Used reflexively, these tools enhance editorial autonomy by rendering patterns of influence visible, rather than invisible. But if left unexamined, they run the risk of aligning news priorities with algorithmic metrics, rather than public interest values.

AI-driven verification tools, in particular those emanating from computer vision and natural language processing, emerge as critical solutions in combating misinformation, detecting deepfakes, and authenticating multimedia content. Embedding verification AI early in editorial workflows helps protect informational integrity and prevents manipulated content from circulating widely. However, the uneven distribution of such tools across the world's newsrooms cements existing inequalities: well-resourced organisations can absorb the financial and technical costs of advanced verification systems, while smaller outlets struggle to access comparable capabilities.

Personalisation, Trust, and Audience Dynamics

The study further indicates that AI complicates traditional assumptions relating to audience trust of and news consumption. Empirical results show that trust and usage do not function universally reinforcing each other. For some outlets, repeated exposure erodes trust, while in others, trust precedes and motivates use. These asymmetries challenge one-size-fits-all engagement strategies and underscore the need for outlet-specific interventions.

AI-driven recommendation systems amplify these dynamics as they shape the pattern of selective exposure, tighten ideological alignment, or fragment the information environment. Solutions identified in this research run from algorithmic transparency and editorial oversight over automated distribution to periodic diversity audits that ensure personalisation does not undermine journalism's democratic function.

Audience responses to AI-generated or AI-verified content further complicate trust dynamics. Cognitive heuristics such as Positive and Negative Machine Heuristics influence whether audiences see AI as objective and credible or cold and untrustworthy. Notably, high-conspiratorial-orientation individuals respond more positively to AI fact-checking than human fact-checkers, perceiving machines as neutral and rule-based. This represents perhaps that segmented, context-sensitive approaches may be superior to uniform strategies in misinformation correction.

Ethical Governance and Professional Autonomy

Ethical challenges, such as bias, opacity, privacy risks, hallucinations, and deepfake manipulation, are currently among the most persistent concerns associated with AI adoption. The study finds that ethical frameworks are most effective when they move beyond abstract principles and are embedded in everyday newsroom practice. Hybrid human–AI workflows emerge as a central ethical solution: AI supports research, monitoring, drafting, and verification, while humans retain final editorial authority.

However, the study finds a severe disconnect between ethical discourse and concrete practice. Many newsrooms have vague or symbolic guidelines on AI without mechanisms that would enforce them, resulting in risks of ethics-washing. This gap becomes wider due to the growing invisibility of AI within newsroom software, where interventions are often unlabeled or poorly explained. Journalists often express uncertainty over when AI intervention is at work, which leads to automation bias or uncritical reliance on outputs.

As a result, increasing the visibility and intelligibility of AI systems should, therefore, form part of the solution. Practical measures would include clear labelling of AI-assisted functions, explanatory interfaces, and design cues that indicate algorithmic involvement. Transparency enables journalists to spot AI's involvement, assess its appropriateness, and retain editorial control.

Journalistic Labour, Identity and Boundary Work

The notion that AI will replace the profession of journalism wholesale is not considered accurate in most contexts. What journalists do find happening with AI is a destabilizing force that shifts and redistributes authority, challenges professional identity, and upsets norms. Journalists appreciate the way in which AI is able to speed up less desirable activities and facilitate creativity, but they are more skeptical about its actual role in editorial judgment. Generative AI is perceived as the more serious jurisdictional threat compared with its predecessor forms of automation because of its fluency, speed, and breadth of application.

In response, journalists practice boundary work to protect the distinctiveness of their labour. They highlight fact-checking, contextualisation, ethical judgment, emotional intelligence, and institutional accountability as uniquely human qualities beyond the reach of AI. AI writing is often characterised as competent but predictable, devoid of personality, depth, and immediacy. Some journalists have called for clear labeling or tagging of AI-generated stories in an attempt to protect professional boundaries and audience trust.

Meanwhile, most of them suggest a "cybernetic" or "centaur" newsroom model where AI enhances rather than replaces human effort. Hybrid workflows-where journalists post-edit AI drafts, oversee verification systems, and retain decision-making authority-offer a practical compromise between efficiency and autonomy.

Platform Dependence and Structural Power

The most consequential of these findings relates to the deepening dependency of news organisations on major technology platforms. Publishers depend upon platforms

Volume 14 Issue 12, December 2025
Fully Refereed | Open Access | Double Blind Peer Reviewed Journal
www.ijsr.net

Paper ID: SR251215210730　　　DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.21275/SR251215210730　　　1177

directly - through AI services including translation, OCR, moderation, and language models - and indirectly - through cloud infrastructure, data storage, and machine-learning frameworks. For many, this dependency is hard to avoid due to cost, scale, and technical complexity.

While AI provided by the platforms enables innovation, it also creates considerable risks: Black-box systems limit transparency, vendor lock-in constrains choice, changing terms of service threaten stability, and publishers' data contributes to strengthening platform power. This is a concern for publishers as generative AI becomes embedded in search and interface design-complete bypass. Publishers fear losing visibility and revenue.

Reactions to platform dependence are varied, but a majority of the publishers show growing concern that has been informed by past negative experiences with the platforms. Possible ways of mitigating this could be diversification of suppliers, investing in open-source alternatives, and building internal capacity. In addition, industry-wide alliances may be formed to bargain for transparency and contractual protections. These solutions, however, are not equally available, and they reproduce the inequalities between large and small news organizations.

Global Inequalities and Contextual Variation

It epitomizes large global differences in AI adoption that are shaped by economic resource, political environment, and cultural norms. Low trust in news in Switzerland brings extra caution towards the use of AI and raises concerns about misinformation more frequently. In Canada, definitional confusion and inconsistent communication impede coherent ethical standards. In China, AI is packaged in techno-nationalist narratives while journalists balance pragmatic use against political constraint. These variations persuasively illustrate how AI adoption is never solely technical but always implicated in national and institutional contexts.

This, in turn, makes collaborative networks such as JournalismAI vital capacity-building solutions. Shared resources, tools, and expertise mean that these networks democratize access to AI, decrease the financial onus, and drive context-sensitive innovation. Multidisciplinary collaboration between journalists, technologists, economists, and ethicists further strengthens alignment between AI systems and journalistic values.

4. Conclusion and Scope for Future Research

In short, this research concludes that the influence of AI on journalism is deep, disparate, and dynamic. AI reworks the channels of money and information, recasting imbalances of power in relationships between humans and machines, and recasting relationships among journalists, publics, and sites. The most productive strategies are not simply technological but socio-technical: increasing visibility, improving literacies, developing ethics, encouraging participation, sustaining hybrid practices, and decelerating dependency.

The role of journalism in democracy is not altered in the AI age. However, how this role can be fulfilled in a manner suitable for a civilized nation in an AI-enabled future is a matter of constant negotiation and balance between innovation and integrity. Journalistic integrity can be protected in news media through critical engagement with AI technology rather than passive acceptance or resistance.

One way in which this research illustrates the profoundly transformative role of AI in journalism is by highlighting how AI is not simply a technical fix or an efficiency-driven tool, but rather a vector through which a whole new dynamic of power, dependency, and influence is being introduced into journalism. AI personalization, financial optimization, agenda-setting influence, and automated decision-support systems are all affecting and will continue to affect increasingly how information flows, how people interact with news, and how money is made in journalism. While these developments present a whole new menu of opportunities for innovation in journalism, they raise deep and important questions concerning control, autonomy, and whose interest is being served in AI-enabled journalism.

One of the main strengths of this research is in defying expectations concerning trust and news consumption. Here, rather than being part of an intertwined circular relationship, each can sometimes be a function of an asymmetric one. In mainstream media, a preponderance of exposure can foster an increasing level of trust, but pre-existing trust can be a main impetus in ideologically distinct and alternative media. In taking a dynamic rather than static media entity into consideration, this research proffers a far more accurate insight into media audience behavior than previous studies have hitherto achieved. The implications in this redefinition concerning methods in news production and subsequent studies into media behavior can hardly be overemphasized.

The research also points to a major role of expectations in AI research and adoption. Journalism researches and adopts AI technology not in terms of technology proven efficacy but in terms of stories of innovation, survival, and change. Sociologically speaking, these expectations can coalesce financial, technical, and institutional support, raising people such as technologists and AI project managers in news organization organizational charts. At the same time, these expectations can mask a dysfunctional status quo with a shiny new ideology in journalism technologically, where the limits of technology threaten news media with an organizational mismatch in AI adoption if expectations outrun achievements. The research puts a sociology-of-expectations perspective into this research and finds AI future visions have a major impact on news organizational decisions in the present.

As regards newsrooms, AI integration appears a rather complicated socio-technical issue. Meanwhile, journalists reportedly show a guarded optimism concerning AI capabilities in automating simple tasks such as transcribing, translating, and summarising content, thus leaving more room for investigations and analysis. Even in this case, they are rather concerned with AI black boxes, biases, hallucinations, and an eventual dilution of editorial autonomy. Taking up AI in a responsible manner therefore not only involves a need for tech implementation but is strongly reliant on organizational culture conducive to ethical considerations, AI-enabled case-by-case translucency, and human control. Human–AI mixed systems in which AI will support editorial judgement rather

than replace it have apparently been recognised as a most feasible and ethical course of action.

One of the most important implications of this research regards the increasing dependency of news media on AI infrastructures controlled by social platform giants. Platforms have had a presence in news media since day one, but their influence in AI is a new trend where news media rely less on mediation and more on platform control of core news media functions. Cloud technology, machine learning environments, and generative AI available in giant tech firms can be quite efficient and scale up news media easily; however, this dependency sheds light on a whole set of concerns linked to lock-ins, autonomy, data regulation, and sustainability. Even in the absence of direct editorial control, platform giants structurally govern news media environments because they define terms of news media production. News media have no leverage over their dependency in this case.

The research thus highlights the significance of AI and AI research in making AI more inteligible. Through these interviews, it can be seen that most of the journalists have a perception of AI being both omnipresent and invisible with minimal knowledge of when and how AI algorithmic systems affect them. As such, this unintelligibility hinders these journalists from critically interpreting AI output, challenging biases in AI, and being accurate in their news concerning social significance in AI. Additionally, making AI inteligible through enhanced labelling, explanatory interface design, and a learning process in AI can significantly aid in sustaining editorial judgment in AI.

Audience-oriented AI applications make AI trust dynamics even more complicated. The findings in this study on AI-powered fact-checking indicate that predispositions among the audience, especially a conspiratorial orientation, influence the acceptance of corrective information. While people with a high level of conspiratorial orientation are more receptive to AI-powered fact-checkers because they are seen as objective and neutral, people with a low level of conspiratorial orientation tend to be more receptive to human-powered fact-checkers because of their contextual and relational credibility. Moreover, these findings indicate a need for audience-specific AI interventions rather than a uniform application. They also pose a query on higher-order effects, such as machine heuristics vis-à-vis authority, authorship, and accountability.

Although it makes important contributions, this research acknowledges a set of weaknesses. The status of news consumption and trust indicators used in a binary form lacks analytical depth, and news consumption windows in both versions lack insight into behaviour over time. A case study can have a contextually specific nature in terms of perhaps being less typical of news-dispute research with a critical/negative attitude or with limited resources. Furthermore, in a quick-shifting AI environment, research methodologies are likely to need a temporal dimension.

Such limitations suggest a wide array of research directions in the future. Ethnography in newsrooms is called for to investigate how reporters interact with AI systems when negotiating power, trust, and autonomy. Agenda-building research work will need to move from press releases to digital press rooms, social media sites, and direct communication channels. The AI-IMPACT model provides another chance to analyze how AI affects financial behavior, risk perspectives, and monetization approaches, especially with vulnerable groups in society. Comparative research work will be important in learning inequalities in AI adoption and governance globally.

Integration of AI in journalism is a challenge that is fundamentally human rather than a 'tecnh challenge. Relationship of AI with expectations, dependencies, and judgment brings a dependency on AI in matters of autonomy, subjects of professionalism, and responsibilities towards democracy, but it is not without opportunities of making AI-dependent journalism more efficient, creative, and service-oriented. The future of journalism in an AI age will thus be determined not by technology but by AI-driven decisions based on ethics and transparencies.

References

[1] Gutierrez Lopez, M., Porlezza, C., Cooper, G., Makridis, S., MacFarlane, A. and Missaoui, S. (n.d.) *A question of design: strategies for embedding AI-driven tools into journalistic work routines*. Bristol: Bristol Digital Futures Institute, University of Bristol.

[2] Simon, F.M. (n.d.) *Escape me if you can: how AI reshapes news organisations' dependency on platform companies*. Oxford: Oxford Internet Institute, University of Oxford.

[3] Amigo, L. and Porlezza, C. (n.d.) '"Journalism will always need journalists": the perceived impact of AI on journalism authority in Switzerland', *[Journal name not provided]*.

[4] Kuai, J. (n.d.) *Navigating the AI hype: Chinese journalists' algorithmic imaginaries and role perceptions in reporting emerging technologies*. Karlstad: Karlstad University.

[5] van Dalen, A. (n.d.) *Revisiting the algorithms behind the headlines: how journalists respond to professional competition of generative AI*. Odense: University of Southern Denmark.

[6] Misri, A., Blanchett, N. and Lindgren, A. (n.d.) '"There's a rule book in my head": journalism ethics meet AI in the newsroom', *[Journal name not provided]*. Toronto: Toronto Metropolitan University.

[7] Sonni, A.F., Hafied, H., Irwanto and Latuheru, R. (n.d.) 'Digital newsroom transformation: a systematic review of the impact of artificial intelligence on journalistic practices, news narratives, and ethical challenges', *[Journal name not provided]*.

[8] Kroon, A.C. and van der Meer, T.G.L.A. (n.d.) *Who takes the lead? Investigating the reciprocal relationship between organizational and news agendas*. *[Journal name not provided]*.

[9] Aharoni, T., Baden, C., Overbeck, M. and Tenenboim-Weinblatt, K. (n.d.) *Re-assessing the dynamics of news use and trust: a multi-outlet perspective*. *[Journal name not provided]*.

[10] Schaetz, N. and Schjøtt, A. (n.d.) *AI hype and its function: an ethnographic study of the Local News AI*

Initiative of the Associated Press. Hamburg: Hamburg University; Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.

[11] Cools, H. and de Vreese, C.H. (n.d.) *From automation to transformation with AI-tools: exploring the professional norms and the perceptions of responsible AI in a news organization*. Amsterdam/Odense: University of Amsterdam and University of Southern Denmark.

[12] Thäsler- Kordonouri, S. and Koliska, M. (n.d.) *Journalistic agency and power in the era of artificial intelligence*. Munich: LMU Munich; Washington, DC: Georgetown University.

[13] Oh, S. and Jung, J. (n.d.) *Harmonizing traditional journalistic values with emerging AI technologies: a systematic review of journalists' perception*. Republic of Korea: Munhwa Broadcasting Corporation and KAIST.

[14] Simon, F.M. (n.d.) *Uneasy bedfellows: AI in the news, platform companies and the issue of journalistic autonomy*. Oxford: Oxford Internet Institute, University of Oxford.

[15] Jones, B., Jones, R. and Luger, E. (2022) 'AI "everywhere and nowhere": addressing the AI intelligibility problem in public service journalism', *Digital Journalism*, 10(10), pp. 1731–1755.

[16] Lan, D., Zhu, Y., Liu, M. and He, C. (n.d.) 'AI agency in fact-checking: role-based machine heuristics and publics' conspiratorial orientation', *[Journal name not provided]*.

[17] Jung, J. and Kim, J.-N. (n.d.) *Rethinking media users in the age of AI and algorithmic mediation*. Republic of Korea and USA: KAIST and University of Oklahoma.

[18] Schapals, A.K. and Porlezza, C. (n.d.) 'Assistance or resistance? Evaluating the intersection of automated journalism and journalistic role conceptions', *[Journal name not provided]*.

[19] Zarouali, B., Helberger, N. and de Vreese, C.H. (n.d.) 'Investigating algorithmic misconceptions in a media context: source of a new digital divide?', *[Journal name not provided]*.

[20] Matich, P., Thomson, T.J. and Thomas, R.J. (2025) 'Old threats, new name? Generative AI and visual journalism', *Journalism Practice*, 19(10), pp. 2402–2421.

Volume 14 Issue 12, December 2025
Fully Refereed | Open Access | Double Blind Peer Reviewed Journal
www.ijsr.net

Paper ID: SR251215210730   DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.21275/SR251215210730   1180