JURIS POLITICA

AI's Ethical "BAPT"ism in journalism: Navigating the Pillars of Bias, Accuracy, Privacy, and Transparency

Prof. Haïssam Fadlallah

Professor in Business Law

Faculty of Law, Filière Francophone de Droit, Lebanese University

Orcid No: 0009-0008-4376-7371

(Received: 27 August 2025; Accepted: 24 September 2025; Published: 23 December 2025)

Abstract

The ethical challenges that come with AI use in newsrooms can be framed through four key pillars: Bias, Accuracy, Privacy, and Transparency (BAPT). Even though AI gives journalism quick, widespread, and efficient help in the news creation process, it can also displace the core of that process: journalistic integrity.

This paper seeks to answer a central question: How can the ethical pillars of bias, accuracy, privacy, and transparency be governed to preserve both journalistic integrity and public trust, while allowing AI to achieve its full potential?

Through an ethical study of case studies, this paper tries to analyze how AI changes the core norms and rules of traditional media. This paper uses an analytical approach that includes normative ethics and comparative legal analysis in order to build an actionable framework for ethical AI journalism.

The main findings show that if AI algorithms are not controlled, they are not just tools but forces that can change public trust and democracy. If there is not enough ethical control, journalism could become a tool of spreading false information and public manipulation. The findings of this study conclude with policy suggestions, with a call to action for regulators to unite around a shared ethical mission. Only by fully integrating AI into the BAPT framework can we protect the future of journalism and ensure that it remains the watchdog of democracy throughout the digital revolution.

Keywords: *Accuracy, Artificial Intelligence, Bias, Privacy, Transparency*

1. Introduction

Technological progress in journalism has led to a complete transformation of the industry while changing how people find and understand information. The printing press achieved two major accomplishments by giving people access to information and breaking down the knowledge barriers that forced leaders to reduce their power. Radio served as more than a device for bringing news into homes because it functioned as a consistent and intimate voice, which directly addressed each person who tuned in. The telegraph operated as more than a speedy communication system because it created the initial division between existing limits. This started a new era of instant worldwide communication that eliminated all spatial and temporal boundaries (Katsh, 1995, p. 1375). The changes in news delivery methods transformed into major events, which altered how people communicate publicly while reshaping social standards and changing human connections at their base level. The New York Times Co. v. Sullivan (1964) case demonstrates how changing circumstances affect legal standards while showing how media must adapt to new technology by delivering accurate information to the public (Abdul Rauf, 2023, p. 3).

The arrival of Artificial Intelligence (AI) technology within newsrooms creates a complete transformation which alters how information travels and how news organizations create their content and present it to their audience. The contemporary digital landscape operates through systems which create new obstacles to ethical and legal compliance. The 2018 Belgian deepfake scandal revealed AI technology's negative impact on truth verification and its ability to create biases which requires strict monitoring and clear responsibility standards (Pinheiro de Resende, 2021, p. 2). The current AI-driven period demands journalists to base their work on authentic information, democratic values, and total openness because these elements function as the ultimate protective shield (Ouchchy et al., 2020, p. 935).

The Dartmouth Summer Research Project of 1956 introduced the term "Artificial Intelligence". From that point onward, scholars have defined AI differently; Nils J. Nilsson sees it as enabling intelligent behavior in machines in perception-based environments, while Winston defines it as making computers perform human-like intelligent tasks (Cui, 2020, p. 6). Hence, AI is the study aiming to create machines and programs mirroring human problem-solving and decision-making abilities (Dennehy et al., 2022, p. 1).

AI journalism transforms data into news articles through AI systems, which operate by using Fourth Industrial Revolution technologies for current media content generation. According to Reuters 75% of media platforms use AI journalism. Robots will generate 90% of news content during the next decade, and computers will surpass human brain abilities by 2040 in the technological singularity (Saad & Issa, 2020, p. 1-6).

Consequently, this era of "post-industrial journalism" marks a profound shift in the media landscape, as technology steadily dismantles traditional methods of news production (Chen, 2024, p. 154). AI algorithms in automated journalism function beyond their role as tools because they create a revolutionary system which enables machines to determine news value independently. The transition undermines the basic principles of journalistic honesty and human editorial decision-making (Monti, 2018, p. 3).

Resultantly, in today's rapidly evolving world of AI-driven journalism, the need to baptize AI into the quadruple paradigm of Bias, Accuracy, Privacy, and Transparency (BAPT) is more pressing than ever. Just as civilized societies are built on a foundation of ethical

principles, AI must be similarly grounded in a robust ethical framework to prevent a dystopian future for journalism. The BAPT framework serves as an essential tool to create dependable news content through AI systems, which prevents both human errors and technological misuse (Alzubi, 2024, p. 173).

As AI fundamentally alters journalism, a pivotal question emerges: How can we ethically master the pillars of bias, accuracy, privacy, and transparency to safeguard journalistic integrity and preserve public trust, all while exploiting AI's immense potential?

This research aims to determine the optimal methods for AI to enhance the trustworthiness of news reporting which supports democratic values. AI has shown its ability to support democratic values by providing accurate and accessible diverse and timely news; however, this research specifically investigates how AI can improve journalism credibility (Opdahl et al., 2023, p. 2). In this context, this research explores the ethical dimensions of AI-driven journalism through the lenses of transparency, bias, privacy, and accuracy; collectively termed the "BAPT" pillars. Thus, this paper will delve into the ethical imperatives of AI-driven journalism, structured into two main chapters addressing critical concerns within this field: Chapter 1, "Ethical Imperatives in AI-Driven Journalism," will examine the foundational ethical principles of transparency and bias; while Chapter 2, "Balancing Privacy and Accuracy in AI Journalism," will address how to navigate the delicate balance between privacy concerns and the need for accuracy in news content.

2. Ethical imperatives in AI-driven journalism

2.1. The Crucible of Transparency in AI Journalism

Gyges' ring, which makes you invisible and gives limitless power, serves as a perfect example to show how AI operating without restrictions creates dangerous situations. The analogy presents AI as a contemporary "ring", which provides corporations and media organizations with substantial control, but minimal regulatory supervision (Leib, 2023, p. 234). Accordingly, will they wield this power responsibly, or will AI's cloak of invisibility lead to manipulation and exploitation in the shadows? The Cambridge Analytica scandal demonstrated how Facebook user data from millions of people was collected to manipulate political views through unauthorized data collection, which exposes the dangers of unregulated data management. AI decisions become vulnerable to manipulation because opaque systems conceal both unrecognized biases and corporate interests, which operate without public awareness or approval (Boddington, 2017, p. 20). This instance shows that authorities must implement stronger regulations to stop these types of unauthorized AI and data analytics applications (Chavali et al., 2024, p. 1254)

More precisely, transparency in AI is an ethical and legal necessity, essential for safeguarding fundamental rights. On the one hand, the principle of transparency is not merely a journalistic ideal but is grounded in legal standards that demand accountability from media outlets. This process allows for AI system transparency, which meets legal requirements for open decision-making systems (Abdul Rauf, 2023, p. 5). The Washington Post employs AI technology to validate sources and conduct fact checks which shows how open AI systems can improve journalism standards (The Washington Post, n.d.).

Hence, transparency in AI journalism involves the obligation to disclose the sources of data, akin to the legal duty of revealing sources in traditional journalism. The legal system faces

a challenging situation because it must find a way to show transparency while safeguarding sensitive data, which resembles the protection of whistleblowers through shield laws (Monti, 2018, p. 5).

On the other hand, as AI embeds itself in journalism, concerns grow over the widening divide between those who grasp AI-generated content and those who do not. The unequal access to information creates ethical challenges regarding equal access to information, which requires legal changes to achieve complete transparency for people at all stages of information understanding (Monti, 2018, p. 14). The AI algorithms operating Google News and Facebook News Feed generate digital information spaces that provide users with content which supports their existing beliefs. AI-generated content creates a greater gap between people who can analyze it effectively and those who lack this ability (Kim, 2023, p. 3).

To address this risk, legal safeguards are needed to ensure AI-generated explanations uphold rigorous standards of accuracy. The process would require oversight through regular audits that check both the transparency and factual accuracy of AI system explanations. The evaluation process needs to go beyond basic checklist methods because it requires complete assessments by independent regulatory bodies that have been given authority to make decisions. The evaluation criteria in these assessments need to maintain consistent standards throughout different jurisdictions to prevent regulatory arbitrage and to uphold uniform ethical standards worldwide. AI explanations will lose their usefulness if no unified system exists, because they would only display technical transparency while still providing incorrect information (Opdahl et al., 2023, p. 8).

On this matter, conducting human rights impact assessments (HRIAs) across the AI lifecycle is a crucial legal tool for spotting and mitigating potential harms. These assessments need to be strong, regular, and open so that they create a legal framework to handle any rights violations that occur. Therefore, making these analyses publicly available ensures that the public can hold AI developers and users accountable for their impact on human rights (Haas, 2020, p. 5). Moreover, the HRIAs process needs to continue after deployment because it must be performed throughout the entire operational period and during AI system modifications. The system would enable ethical adjustments to be made instantly based on user behavior patterns and unplanned system results. The oversight system becomes more democratic when civil society organizations team up with legal experts and journalists to base their work on multiple ethical viewpoints. Human-in-the-Loop (HITL) systems function to decrease autonomous AI system risks through human oversight which creates a vital safety mechanism that stops major system failures (Bird et al., 2020, p. 17).

Finally, while the concept of AI accountability is still evolving, it is evident that transparency by itself is not enough. Organizations need to develop algorithms that both experts and decision-affected people including the public can understand (Monti, 2018, p. 14). More specifically, organizations need to treat explainability as a legal requirement because it has moved beyond being a technical advantage. AI systems which operate in public spheres that influence journalism and public communication require specific standards of transparency to enable legal evaluation, community monitoring, and moral opposition when necessary (Boddington, 2017, p. 20). The future of responsible AI journalism hinges not just on innovation but also on a deeply entrenched ethical architecture, one that transforms opaque machine logic into a legally navigable and morally comprehensible terrain (McGraw, 2024, p. 10).

2.2. Confronting and Mitigating Bias in Artificial Intelligence

First, there is a fundamental problem in AI ethics that needs to be addressed: the vulnerability of AI to bias. This problem is rooted in the harsh fact that we create all of our AI, and therefore they are reflections of our society in an unfiltered sense (Diakopoulos, 2021, p. 219). Bias can stealthily seep into the algorithms and data that drive AI, posing a challenge to fairness and objectivity in journalism. The risk of systematic bias is especially high when the data used to train AI are only representative of certain demographic groups or societal biases (Bird et al., 2020, p. 17).

Specifically, when AI is trained on biased or incomplete datasets, it can result in biased outputs in news reporting. This can lead to the spread of misinformation and harm to marginalized communities. The biases in AI can harm journalism's credibility and integrity and erode public trust in news media, and perpetuate harmful stereotypes. In other words, bias is a ticking time bomb within AI systems; since AI is only as objective as the data it is fed. Therefore, if you feed biased data into AI, it will not just produce biased journalism; it will magnify those biases and spread misinformation (Monti, 2018, p. 14).

For these reasons, bias in AI systems directly erodes journalistic credibility by diminishing public trust. Biased AI can perpetuate stereotypes and spread inaccurate information, affecting the quality of news and perpetuating systemic discrimination (Diakopoulos et al., 2024, p. 7). For instance, ProPublica's investigation on COMPAS, an AI used by the American criminal justice system, showed that it was more likely to falsely predict that African American defendants were future criminals. This illustrates how biased algorithms reinforce harmful stereotypes (Angwin et al., 2023).

Accordingly, combating bias in AI goes beyond ethics; it is a mandatory responsibility for developers and journalists alike (Hidayat & Dirantika, 2024, p. 71): only by showing and stopping biases, and using different fair data sets can we protect the truth (Pagano et al., 2023, p. 15). For this reason, the Society of Professional Journalists' (SPJ) Code of Ethics underscores the importance to cause as little harm as possible and keep away from stereotyping ('SPJ Code of Ethics', 2014).

However, ensuring that AI adheres to ethical standards requires a more nuanced understanding of bias. Bias cannot simply be erased; rather, we must determine which biases should be eliminated and which may be necessary to support sound moral judgment. For instance, incorporating forms of empathetic or emotion-aware reasoning is essential if AI systems are to make ethically informed decisions (Tretter, 2024, p. 3).

At this point, it might be helpful to acknowledge "constructive bias," or intentional bias deployed in the spirit of acknowledgment of historical wrongs or structural inequities. Sometimes neutral data is not enough; sometimes justice requires tilting the scales to make sure those who have not been heard can now be heard. When we introduce these sorts of positive biases, it is not a matter of bias winning over objectivity; rather, it is a matter of rebalancing the moral scales in a world where neutrality is fundamentally unfair. Consequently, removing context in journalism in the name of neutrality can be a form of bias (Bareis, 2024, p. 1).

The need for diversity in AI development teams is further highlighted by this complexity. Diversity of thought is critical to identifying and controlling biases and thus ensuring that AI systems are always equipped to make complex ethical decisions most

optimally (Boddington, 2017, p. 16). For instance, a lack of diversity in the development of Google News algorithms was criticized for curating news feeds that underrepresented minority perspectives. A more diverse team could have identified and controlled for these biases (Evans, 2023, p. 1686).

Therefore, to mitigate bias, it is crucial to encourage diversity in AI training datasets. The models need to reflect the whole spectrum of society, requiring careful compilation of varied data sources. For instance, when Reuters used AI to produce news summaries, the company ensured that its datasets included diverse perspectives to avoid biased reporting (Somorin & Ademola, 2024, p. 33). Given this, identifying and correcting bias requires thorough testing, with robustness through fairness audits and bias mitigation techniques.

These fairness audits should be standardized, made public, and rise to robust legal thresholds that also define ethical standards. Without legally enforceable accountability, the best-designed audits could devolve into box-checking exercises (Koshiyma, 2024, p. 4). Legislatures will need to intervene to provide binding benchmarks for AI journalistic tools. These benchmarks can be evolving, but they must be binding and enforceable through meaningful legal sanctions. In addition to sanctions, ethical certifications could become a prerequisite for the use of AI tools in media environments (as seen with GDPR compliance).

For example, the Associated Press employs regular audits to maintain the impartiality and accuracy of their AI-generated content (Diakopoulos et al., 2024, p. 36). Enforcing rigorous guidelines for AI-generated content and nurturing accountability cultures among developers and journalists alike ensures that AI advances journalistic integrity (Cachat-Rosset & Klarsfeld, 2023, p. 718).

3. Balancing privacy and accuracy in AI journalism

3.1. Safeguarding Privacy in the Era of AI Journalism

Privacy turns out to be one of those tricky ideas that covers a lot of ground. It includes physical and mental limits people set for themselves. It also involves personal freedom and the protection of one's personal information: these issues face real threats now in this time of AI (Zahid Huriye, 2023, p. 38). Moreover, the whole idea of privacy has long been a challenging legal matter, and its subjective side makes it even harder to define clearly (Reis et al., 2024, p. 74). Back in the day, people saw it as a basic human right. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 put it on the books for the first time in Article 12. These days, over 150 countries have included the right to privacy into their laws in one way or another.

In the digital age and with the rise of AI, protecting information has become an even greater challenge. Informational privacy means you get to decide how your personal data gets gathered, handled, and passed around (Zostant & Chataut, 2023, p. 185). Let us take the United States as an example. The Privacy Act of 1974 focused on how federal agencies could use personal info. It laid the foundation for privacy rights just as digital records were becoming increasingly significant (Gutterman, 2023, p. 2).

In this setup, AI brings up real privacy worries. These center on a tough choice between people keeping hold of their own data and big tech firms pursuing profit from that same data. Companies use AI to extract personal info all the time. This tips the balance between personal privacy and corporate gain in a risky way. This situation calls for swift ethical and legal interventions to address these challenges (James & Lucas, 2024, p. 10). It also highlights the

difficulty of protecting individuals, who often have little control over how their data is used. People share data without thinking much about it. That includes spots they go, pictures they take, who they know, and even body scans like fingerprints (Lao & Baker, 2021, p. 159). The real issue comes down to setting up rules that prevent unauthorized access to data (Elliott & Soifer, 2022, p. 1).

On a closer look, these fears over how personal data gets misused grow stronger in the media environment. This happens because media groups have wide reach in grabbing data. Their powers often go way beyond what single users can do. Big players in tech, such as Google and Facebook, illustrate these privacy problems clearly (Baker & Robinson, 2021, p. 17): there is a swap of privacy for free apps and services (Jain & Jain, 2019, p. 35).

The truth is data powers AI in every way, and forms the base of the online world. Ultimately, outfits like Facebook, Snapchat, and Google do more than social platforms or handy tools. Their main business is focused on handling data (Mukhtar, Vigneshwari, & Mohan, 2022, p. 40).

Hence, AI usage has raised data privacy concerns as it can access information that the user did not actually share (Devineni, 2024, p. 40). As a result, AI enhances the mass surveillance capability of social media platforms, by enabling an automated and indiscriminate collection of data on individuals (Msbah et al., 2024, p. 10). Governments and private entities such as the media conduct such practices covertly and on a large scale, involving almost all individuals who use smartphones or devices and applications within the Internet of Things (Elliott & Soifer, 2022, p. 4). In addition, AI can generate sensitive information from non-sensitive data, causing many privacy leakage problems.

Moreover, the ability of the AI to collect big data in an extensive manner creates new ethical challenges in journalism. That is, how do we protect individual privacy without jeopardizing the public interest? As AI becomes more advanced, the disparity between surveillance and media ownership intensifies. This will shape the ethical journalism's overall future (Al-Zoubi, Ahmad, & Abdul Hamid, 2024, p. 404). This ethical conflict between privacy and public interest is a key concern in journalistic ethics and raises difficult legal issues. At the heart of this dilemma is the principle of proportionality stating that any interference with the individual's privacy must be justified by a correspondingly important public interest (Ranjan, 2024, p. 32). For example, exposing the misconduct of a public figure might be considered justifiable if the information serves to protect the public or uphold democratic accountability. However, when it comes to private individuals, the threshold for what constitutes public interest must be considerably higher to avoid unwarranted harm (Dove, 2023, p. 17).

The complexity intensifies further as AI becomes engaged in automating the extraction of data from private digital spaces; such as social media, search histories, biometric inputs, and so on, creating profiles of individuals without their consent. In this regard, journalism cannot afford to become complicit in algorithmic encroachment. A responsible journalist must act as a gatekeeper for ethics, rejecting data that may be legally accessible but ethically impermissible (Syahri, 2020, p. 3).

In today's digital ecosystem, information travels faster than lawyers or editors can handle. Hence, a single AI-generated headline based on misread private data could go viral in moments, doing immediate reputational harm. This requires a fresh model of anticipatory ethics, whereby editorial teams anticipate not only what is legal but also what may cause trouble

for publication. In the age of AI, a rights-respecting newsroom should build digital ethics protocols into the editorial pipeline, combining the journalist's instinct with the algorithmic foresight (Shi & Sun, 2024, p. 590).

Due to this complex legal and ethical landscape, journalists must weigh transparency against privacy infringement. In other terms, journalists are forced to strike a balance between informing the public and respecting personal privacy (Olayinka & Odunayo, 2024 37). In fact, breach of privacy can lead to severe results, particularly in cases of defamation and violations of data protection laws. Conversely, failing to disclose important information can weaken the credibility of journalism with the public. In AI-driven journalism, these stakes are higher than ever (Ademola, 2024, p. 3).

3.2. Ensuring Accuracy in AI-Crafted News Content

To begin with, credibility in AI journalism depends on the accuracy and reliability of the data. In contrast, reporting based on flawed data can misinform people, undermine public trust, and even create legal liability for defamation or falsehood (Luo et al., 2023, p. 286). Within this context, media outlets remain legally obliged to ensure the accuracy of the content they publish; the use of AI does not reduce this responsibility (Monti, 2018, p. 14).

With the emergence of AI technologies, especially GANs, ensuring accuracy in journalism became more challenging. These tools create false media that violate verifiability standards. The use of deepfakes, highly realistic fake audio, video, and images, makes it hard for media to prove the truthfulness of events, blurring the line between what is real and what is not (Helmus, 2022, p. 3). If misused, the public may start believing fake news, ultimately undermining trust in journalism. One example is a deepfake of former President Obama created using GANs. This shows the extent to which information can be faked (Sheehan, 2024, p. 15). In the video, Obama was manipulated to appear as if he said things he never actually said. The virality of such content illustrates how easily deepfakes can be used to distort reality. The increasing creation of deepfakes raises legal concerns, including defamation, privacy breaches, and intellectual property violations, compelling the law to adapt. To address these challenges, advanced detection systems leveraging deep-image analysis and GAN-based techniques should be developed (Opdahl, 2023, p. 6).

Hence, these systems should comply with the regulatory framework, which should be evolving with the technology. Legal responses may become irrelevant if not integrated at this stage. Collaboration is necessary among policymakers, tech professionals, and media regulators for the designing of adaptive legal frameworks to identify and respond to AI-mediated deception in real time (Walter, 2024, p. 14).

In parallel, an ethical framework should be developed to ensure the legality of journalism through the embedding of verification processes in AI news reporting to counter misinformation and inaccuracies in content (Sarkar & Ghosh, 2024, p. 167). The core defense against the danger of misinformation generated by AI is fact-checking, which is nothing less than verifying the veracity of a statement. Inculcating a culture of verification of facts will prevent disinformation and thereby help retain trust in the media. To review and audit the algorithms used for fact-checking ensuring that no bias, error, or contextual gap exists, news organizations should establish an AI ethics board (Al-Zoubi, Ahmad & Abdul Hamid, 2024, P. 405).

AI, especially Natural Language Processing (NLP), is central to modern fact-checking. AI can accelerate the speed at which claims are fact-checked and make the process more accurate. This is achieved through the automation of claim detection, evidence retrieval and truth evaluation (Johnstone & Klaas, 2024, p. 12). NLP enables in-depth text analysis, offering speed and scalability far beyond manual verification. However, these models often lack sufficient transparency for easy interpretation. It is therefore reasonable to assume that AI models used in journalism should be explainable and auditable.

Finally, AI can cross ethical and legal boundaries when content generation is left unrestricted. For this reason, continuous verification by humans prevents serious mistakes and can maintain journalistic standards (Helberger et al., 2022, p. 1620). If no humans are involved, the potential for media organization liability for inaccurate or misleading information damaging outcomes arises.

4. Conclusion

The use of AI in journalism represents a significant shift in how news is produced and disseminated, while also introducing new legal and ethical challenges. This article inspects four key ethical principles that must be observed as journalism evolves, aimed at maintaining integrity in the field (Zaragoza, 2023, p. 10).

First, when using AI for journalism, it is important to be transparent about its application and to use open algorithms. This is justified by the fact that AI could be hard to understand. Hence, openness is important for both technological and ethical reasons. Readers should always know when AI helped in generating or selecting news (de-Lima-Santos, Yeung, & Dodds, 2024, p. 11)

Second, it is important to address bias in AI. AI uses historical data to learn and often repeats the biases contained within it. This article stresses the importance of solid techniques to stop bias, including using different kinds of training data and continuously auditing algorithms. Since the media influences the public, any bias in AI generated content can have serious effects. Hence, addressing bias in AI systems becomes a priority (Liao, 2024, p. 83).

Third, in our discussion on privacy, we emphasized the importance of safeguarding personal information in the era of AI journalism. The potential for AI to infringe on privacy through mass data collection and analysis is significant (Gilbert & Gilbert, 2024, p. 10). Journalistic practices must adapt to protect individuals' rights, balancing the need for public information with the imperative to respect personal privacy.

Fourth, accuracy is crucial in journalism, and it has a dual effect on it. On the positive side, AI strengthens fact-checking and helps journalists verify content more easily. On the negative side, AI can spread more misinformation if not harnessed properly. Thus, when using AI, we must ensure its outputs are reliable by having humans in the loop and committing to uphold the highest standards in factual reporting.

In closing, we are at the intersection of AI and journalism, where AI should be baptized into the quadruple pillars of Bias, Accuracy, Privacy, and Transparency (BAPT). Doing so is not only a moral imperative; it is, in fact, the only way to keep AI from driving journalism toward a dystopian future. Just as a civilized human is baptized into a code of ethics, AI must undergo a quadruple baptism into a four-cornered code of ethics, ensuring its powers are tamed into only producing trustworthy, reliable journalistic outcomes. Not only does the quadruple

BAPT framework keep AI safe from human misconduct, but it also keeps humans safe from AI's technological misuse. The result is a framework that paves the way for the creation, consumption, collection, and dissemination of AI-powered journalism that upholds the highest standards of truth, integrity, and public trust.

Bibliography

Abdul Rauf, H. (2023). The application of artificial intelligence in journalism: Exploring opportunities, challenges, ethical considerations, and human-machine collaboration strategies (HMC). *ResearchGate*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/380095704_The_Application_of_Artificial_Intelligence_in_Journalism_Exploring_Opportunities_Challenges_Ethical_Considerations_and_Human-Machine_Collaboration_Strategies_HMC

Ademola, O. (2024). Detailing the stakeholder theory of management in the AI world: A position paper on ethical decision-making. *Humanities Management, Arts, Education and Social Studies Research Journal, 10*(1), 1-8.

Ali, I. (2024, December). AI transparency and explainability. *Seminar Talk*, Frankfurt University of Applied Sciences, 1-5. *ResearchGate.* Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/386416207_AI_Transparency_and_Explainability

Al-Zoubi, O., Ahmad, N., & Abdul Hamid, N. (2024). Artificial intelligence in newsrooms: Ethical challenges facing journalists. *Studies in Media and Communication, 12*(1), 401-409.

Alzubi, S. F. (2024). Challenges of using the ChatGPT application in journalism work. *Jurnal Komunikasi: Malaysian Journal of Communication, 40*(4), 164–180.

Angwin, J., Larson, J., Mattu, S., & Kirchner, L. (2016, May 23). Machine Bias—There's Software Used across the Country to Predict Future Criminals. And It's Biased against Blacks. *ProPublica*, Online Edition. Retrieved from http://www.antoniocasella.eu/nume/Angwin_2016.pdf

Baker, D.-J., & Robinson, P.-H. (2021). Emerging technologies and the criminal law. In D. J. Baker & P. H. Robinson (Eds.), *Artificial intelligence and the law – Cybercrime and criminal liability* (pp. 1-31). London, UK: Routledge.

Bareis, J. (2024). The trustification of AI: Disclosing the bridging pillars that tie trust and AI together. *Big Data & Society, 11*(2), 1–14.

Bird, E., Fox-Skelly, J., Jenner, N., Larbey, R., Weitkamp, E., & Winfield, A. (2020). *The ethics of artificial intelligence: Issues and initiatives*. Brussels, Belgium: European Union. doi: 10.2861/6644

Boddington, P. (2017). *Towards a code of ethics for artificial intelligence.* Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

Cachat-Rosset, G., & Klarsfeld, A. (2023). Diversity, equity, and inclusion in artificial intelligence: An evaluation of guidelines. *Applied Artificial Intelligence, 37*(1), 717-744.

Carnegy-Arbuthnott, H. (2023). Privacy, publicity, and the right to be forgotten. *Journal of Political Philosophy, 31*(4), 494-516.

Chavali, D., Baburajan, B., Gurusamy, A., Dhiman, V. K., & Katari, S. C. (2024). Regulating artificial intelligence: Developments and challenges. *International Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences, 2*(3), 1250–1261.

Chen, L. (2024). Digital transformation and innovation of the news media. *International Journal of Education and Humanities, 17*(1), 154–158.

Cui, Y. (2020). *Artificial intelligence and judicial modernization.* Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

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

Dennehy, D., Griva, A., Pouloudi, N., Dwivedi, Y. K., Mäntymäki, M., & Pappas, I. O. (2022). Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Information Systems: Perspectives to Responsible AI. *Information Systems Frontiers, 25*, 1-7.

Devineni, S. K. (2024). AI in data privacy and security. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence & Machine Learning, 3*(1), 35-49.

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*. New York, NY: *Associated Press (AP).*

Diakopoulos, N. (2021). The algorithms beat: Angles and methods for investigation. In J. Gray, L. Bounegru, & M. Chambers (Eds.), *The data journalism handbook* (pp. 219-229). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Dove, E. S. (2023). Confidentiality, public interest, and the human right to science: When can confidential information be used for the benefit of the wider community? *Journal of Law and the Biosciences, 10*(1), 1–53. https://doi.org/10.1093/jlb/lsad013

Elliott, D., & Soifer, E. (2022). AI technologies, privacy, and security. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence, 5*. 826737. https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2022.826737

Evans, R. (2023). Google News and machine gatekeepers: Algorithmic personalisation and news diversity in online news search. *Digital Journalism, 11*(9), 1682-1700.

Gilbert, C., & Gilbert, M. A. (2024). The convergence of artificial intelligence and privacy: Navigating innovation with ethical considerations. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Modern Technology, 3*(9), 9-17.

Gutterman, A. S. (2023, September 09). *Privacy and Data Security* (pp. 1–36). http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4582785

Haas, J. (2020, November 16). Freedom of the media and artificial intelligence. Canada: Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development. Retrieved from https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/4/5/472488.pdf

Helberger, N., et al. (2022). Towards a normative perspective on journalistic AI: Embracing the messy reality of normative ideals. *Digital Journalism, 10*(10), 1605-1626.

Helmus, T. C. (2022). *Artificial intelligence, deepfakes, and disinformation.* RAND Corporation. Retrieved from https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/perspectives/PEA1000/PEA1043-1/RAND_PEA1043-1.pdf

Hidayat, D., & Dirantika, A. (2024). Understanding the role of communication ethics in the flexing phenomenon on social media. *Jurnal Komunikasi: Malaysian Journal of Communication, 40*(3), 58–73.

Jain, S., & Jain, S.-A. (2019). Artificial intelligence: Threat to privacy. *Nirma University Law Journal, 8*(2), 21-36.

James, O., & Lucas, E. (2024). Ethical AI: Balancing innovation and data privacy in the digital business landscape. *ResearchGate*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/384441999_Ethical_AI_Balancing_Innovation_and_Data_Privacy_in_the_Digital_Business_Landscape

Johnstone, C., & Klaas, L. (2024). *Combating disinformation – An agenda for U.S.–Japan cooperation.* Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS).

Katsh, E. (1995). Law in a digital world. *Stanford Law Review, 47*(6), 1375-1403.

Kim, L. (2023). The echo chamber-driven polarization on social media. *Journal of Student Research, 12*(4). https://doi.org/10.47611/jsr.v12i4.2274

Koshiyama, A., Treleaven, P., Rai, P., Sriram, V., Preece, A., Leslie, D., & others. (2024). Towards algorithm auditing: Managing legal, ethical and technological risks of AI, ML and associated algorithms. *Royal Society Open Science, 11*(1), 1–34.

Lao, D., & Baker, D. J. (2021). Rethinking personal data protection in the criminal law of China. In D. J. Baker & P.-H. Robinson (Eds.), *Artificial intelligence and the law – Cybercrime and criminal liability* (pp. 156-179). London UK: Routledge.

Leib, R. (2023). *Exoanthropology: Dialogues with AI.* Punctum Books.

Liao, R. (2024). The impact of AI-generated content dissemination on social media on public sentiment. *Applied and Computational Engineering, 90*(1), 82–88.

Luo, D., Mohd Nor, N. H., Bai, K. G., Adzmi, A. M., & Abdul Rais, S. S. (2023). Fake news sharing among Weibo users in China. *Jurnal Komunikasi: Malaysian Journal of Communication, 39*(4), 284–305.

McGraw, D. K. (2024). Ethical responsibility in the design of artificial intelligence (AI) systems. *International Journal on Responsibility, 10*(1), 1–21.

Mensah, G. B. (2023, November). Artificial intelligence and ethics: A comprehensive review of bias mitigation, transparency, and accountability in AI systems. *EGRC Africa Regulation Research Consortium.* Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/375744287_Artificial_Intelligence_and_Ethics_A_Comprehensive_Review_of_Bias_Mitigation_Transparency_and_Accountability_in_AI_Systems

Monti, M. (2018). Automated journalism and freedom of information: Ethical and juridical problems related to AI in the press field. *Opinio Juris in Comparatione, 1*(1), 2-17.

Msbah, J. M., Barhoom, A. M., Alhabbash, M. I., Harara, F. E. S., Abu-Nasser, B. S., & Abu-Naser, S. S. (2024). AI and ethics in surveillance: Balancing security and privacy in a digital world. *International Journal of Academic Engineering Research, 8*(10), 8–15.

Mukhtar, S., Vigneshwari, K., & Mohan, A. C. (2022). Social media relevance for business, marketing, and preferences for customers. *Manager: The British Journal of Administrative Management, 58*(157), 39-52.

Olayinka, A. P., & Odunayo, S. (2024). The role of media ethics in shaping public perception: A critical analysis of biased reporting and its impact on public opinion. *Journal of African Innovation & Advanced Studies, 3*(2), 31-51.

Opdahl, A. L., Tessem, B., Dang-Nguyen, D. T., Motta, E., Setty, V., Throndsen, E., Tverberg, A. & Trattner, C. (2023) Trustworthy journalism through AI. *Data & Knowledge Engineering*, *146*, 102182 10.1016/j.datak.2023.102182

Ouchchy, L., & al. (2020). AI in the headlines: The portrayal of the ethical issues of artificial intelligence in the media. *AI & Society, 35*, 927-935. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-020-00965-5

Pagano, T. P., Loureiro, R. B., Lisboa, F. V. N., Peixoto, R. M., Guimarães, G. A. S., Cruz, G. O. R., Araujo, M. M., Santos, L. L., Cruz, M. A. S., Oliveira, E. L. S., & Others. (2023). Bias and unfairness in machine learning models: A systematic review on datasets, tools, fairness metrics, and identification and mitigation methods. *Big Data and Cognitive Computing, 7*(1), 15. https://doi.org/10.3390/bdcc7010015

Pinheiro de Resende, S. (2021). *The effects of deepfakes on politics and on data justice issues – A perspective from Brazil and the United States* (Master's thesis, Tilburg University). Tilburg University Repository.

Ranjan, R. (2024). Evolution of the doctrine of proportionality: Assessing its scope and ambit in relation to the right to privacy in India. *Indian Journal of Law and Human Behavior, 10*(1), 31-38.

Reis, O., Eneh, N. E., Ehimuan, B., Anyanwu, A., Olorunsogo, T., & Abrahams, T. O. (2024). Privacy law challenges in the digital age: A global review of legislation and

enforcement. *International Journal of Applied Research in Social Sciences, 6*(1), 73-88.

Saad, S., & Issa, T. (2020). Integration or replacement: Journalism in the era of artificial intelligence and robojournalism. *International Journal of Media, Journalism, and Mass Communication, 6*(3), 1-13.

Sarkar, S., & Ghosh, A. (2024). Leveraging artificial intelligence to enhance media literacy and combat misinformation. *Journal of Novel Research and Innovative Development, 2*(9), 163-187.

Sheehan, M. (2024). *Tracing the roots of China's AI regulations.* Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Syahri, M. (2020). Journalism ethics in local newspaper. *Masyarakat, Kebudayaan dan Politik, 33*(1), 1–14.

Tretter, M. (2024) Equipping AI-decision-support-systems with emotional capabilities? Ethical perspectives. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence, 7*. 1398395. doi: 10.3389/frai.2024.1398395

The Washington Post. (2024). *Policies and standards. The Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/policies-and-standards

Shi, Y., & Sun, L. (2024). How generative AI is transforming journalism: Development, application and ethics. *Journalism and Media, 5*(2), 582–594.

Somorin, K., & Ademola, O. (2024). Ethical imperatives in the era of AI journalism: Navigating the intersection of technology and responsibility. *Humanities Management, Arts, Education and Social Studies Research Journal, 12*(2), 31-36.

SPJ Code of Ethics. (2014, September 6). *Society of Professional Journalists (SPJ)*. Indianapolis, IN: Society of Professional Journalists. Retrieved from https://www.spj.org/spj-code-of-ethics/

Verma, N. (2023). Deepfake technology and the future of public trust in video (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin). https://doi.org/10.26153/tsw/52398

Walter, Y. (2024). Managing the race to the moon: Global policy and governance in artificial intelligence regulation—A contemporary overview and an analysis of socioeconomic consequences. *Discover Artificial Intelligence, 4*(1), 1–24.

Wijaya, B. S., Anitawati, M. T., Suharyanti, & Fortunisa, A. (2022). Media brand reputation in the digital milieu: The effects of online news ethics and logic on media brand image. *Jurnal Komunikasi: Malaysian Journal of Communication, 38*(3), 106–125.

Williamson, S. M., & Prybutok, V. (2024). The era of artificial intelligence deception: Unraveling the complexities of false realities and emerging threats of misinformation. *Information, 15*(6), 299-343.

Zahid Huriye, A. (2023). The ethics of artificial intelligence: Examining the ethical considerations surrounding the development and use of AI. *American Journal of Technology, 2*(1), 37-45.

Zaragoza, P. (2023). *Artificial intelligence and journalism: A multi-modal critical discourse analysis of the Instagram page* (Master's thesis, Malmö University). Malmö University Repository.

Zostant, M., & Chataut, R. (2023). Privacy in computer ethics: Navigating the digital age. *Computer Science and Information Technologies, 4*(2), 183-190.