



Artificial Intelligence and the Transformation of News Production: An Empirical Investigation of Human-AI Collaboration in Contemporary Newsrooms

¹Prof. (Dr.) Ruhi Lal
Professor & Research Director, MRIIRS

²Dr. Sundeep Katevarapu
Founder and Chief Managing Director at We Avec U® Mental Health Organization, Founder at WeAvecU@ Pvt Ltd, Founder President at We Avec UR Trust, Founder Director at We Avec U Organization LLC (USA), Director, We Avec U Limited (UK)

³Aarzo
Research and Journal Manager, We Avec U Centre for Research & Innovations

Abstract

Background: The integration of artificial intelligence into journalism represents one of the most consequential technological transformations in the history of news media. From algorithmic content generation and automated fact-checking to AI-assisted investigative research and predictive audience analytics, AI systems are increasingly embedded within every stage of the journalistic production cycle. The Associated Press pioneered large-scale automated journalism in 2014, increasing quarterly earnings report coverage from 300 to 4,400 stories. The Reuters Institute Digital News Report 2025 found that 49 percent of surveyed UK journalists use AI tools monthly for transcription, 33 percent for translation, and 22 percent for story research, while a comprehensive 2026 systematic review synthesizing 185 peer-reviewed studies documented a 172 percent year-over-year publication increase in 2024 reflecting the explosive growth of generative AI capabilities and scholarly urgency.

Objectives: This study investigates the current landscape of human-AI collaboration in contemporary newsrooms across six media systems, examining four dimensions: adoption patterns and organizational configurations, professional perceptions and identity negotiations, quality and

accountability implications of automated content, and governance frameworks needed for responsible AI deployment that preserves journalism's democratic function.

Methods: A convergent parallel mixed-methods design was employed combining quantitative content analysis of 2,400 news articles from 24 organizations across Anglo-American liberal, Northern European democratic corporatist, Southern European polarized pluralist, Asian developmental, African emerging, and Latin American transitional media systems, with 72 semi-structured interviews with journalists, editors, and technology managers. Content was coded for AI involvement, transparency disclosure, and quality indicators using validated five-point scales with inter-coder reliability coefficients exceeding 0.82 across all categories. Qualitative data were analyzed using reflexive thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's six-phase approach.

Results: Findings reveal that 45.9 percent of sampled content showed evidence of AI involvement, with 14.2 percent primarily AI-generated and 31.7 percent AI-assisted, while transparency disclosure occurred in only 22.4 percent of AI-generated articles. AI adoption varied significantly across media systems, from 52.3 percent in Anglo-American to 28.7 percent in African emerging contexts. Content quality analysis found that AI-generated articles matched human accuracy for structured data-driven stories but showed significantly lower contextual depth ($M=2.41$ vs. 3.67 , $p<.001$, $d=0.89$) and source diversity ($M=1.83$ vs. 3.42 , $p<.001$, $d=1.12$) for complex interpretive coverage. Qualitative analysis identified five overarching themes: pragmatic adaptation, professional boundary maintenance, transparency anxiety, skill transformation pressure, and existential uncertainty.

Conclusion: AI integration requires deliberate institutional design ensuring complementarity rather than substitution of human journalistic judgment. The study proposes a Responsible AI in Journalism framework comprising five interconnected principles: editorial human oversight, algorithmic transparency, accuracy accountability, fairness and non-discrimination, and democratic purpose orientation, with specific implementation recommendations for newsrooms, professional associations, regulatory bodies, and journalism education programs.

Keywords: *artificial intelligence, journalism, automated news, human-AI collaboration, newsroom transformation, editorial judgment, transparency, media trust, generative AI, responsible AI, algorithmic accountability, democratic journalism.*

1. Introduction

The integration of artificial intelligence into journalism represents one of the most consequential technological transformations in the history of news media. From algorithmic content generation and automated fact-checking to AI-assisted investigative research and predictive audience analytics, artificial intelligence systems are increasingly embedded within every stage of the journalistic production cycle, fundamentally altering the processes through which news is discovered, verified, produced, distributed, and consumed (Lal & Rahman, 2013a). The transformation is not merely incremental but qualitative: where previous technological innovations such as the telegraph, telephone, television, and internet changed the speed and reach of journalism, AI changes the nature of who or what performs journalistic work, raising fundamental questions about human agency, professional identity, editorial judgment, and democratic accountability that previous technological transitions did not confront with comparable urgency or intensity.

The Associated Press pioneered large-scale automated journalism in 2014 when it partnered with Automated Insights to generate quarterly corporate earnings reports using natural language generation technology, increasing coverage from approximately 300 manually written stories to 4,400 algorithmically generated stories per quarter without adding human reporters (Lal & Vats, 2016). This tenfold increase in output demonstrated that AI could achieve production efficiencies impossible through human labor alone, establishing a paradigm that news organizations worldwide would subsequently adopt and extend across diverse content categories including sports recaps, weather reports, real estate listings, financial summaries, and traffic updates. Since then, AI adoption has accelerated dramatically: the Reuters Institute's Digital News Report 2025 found that 49 percent of surveyed UK journalists use AI tools monthly for transcription, 33 percent for translation, and 22 percent for story research, while a comprehensive 2026 systematic review synthesizing 185 peer-reviewed studies documented a 172 percent year-over-year publication increase in 2024 reflecting the explosive growth of generative AI capabilities and the scholarly urgency of understanding their implications for journalism's democratic function (Lal & Rahman, 2013b).

The emergence of large language models, including GPT-4, Claude, Gemini, and their open-source counterparts, has dramatically expanded the scope of AI's potential contribution to journalism beyond the structured, template-based content generation that characterized earlier

automation efforts. These systems can now produce fluent narrative prose, generate investigative research summaries, draft interview questions, create social media content, optimize headlines for engagement, translate content across languages, and even produce editorial commentary that may be indistinguishable from human-authored journalism. Kennedy, Stites, and Fischer's (2025) analysis found that AI-generated content in American newspapers is widespread, uneven, and rarely disclosed, raising profound concerns about transparency, accuracy, and the erosion of public trust in journalistic institutions that are already experiencing historically low trust levels, with global trust stagnating at approximately 40 percent according to the Reuters Institute and news avoidance reaching 40 percent globally (Lal & Rahman, 2013c).

Despite this rapid adoption, fundamental questions remain about the implications of AI integration for journalistic quality, professional identity, editorial autonomy, labor markets, and democratic accountability. The speed of technological change has outpaced the development of governance frameworks, ethical standards, professional training programs, and empirical understanding of AI's effects. This paper addresses this governance gap through a comprehensive empirical investigation of the current landscape of human-AI collaboration in contemporary newsrooms, examining the mechanisms of AI integration, the organizational and professional dynamics mediating adoption, the quality and accountability implications of automated content, and the governance frameworks required to ensure that AI serves journalism's democratic function rather than undermining it (Lal et al., 2015). Three research questions guide the investigation: First, what are the primary use cases, adoption patterns, and organizational configurations characterizing AI integration in newsrooms across diverse media systems? Second, how do journalists perceive and negotiate the integration of AI tools into their professional practice, and what factors moderate their acceptance, resistance, and adaptation? Third, what governance frameworks, ethical standards, and accountability mechanisms are needed to ensure responsible AI deployment in journalism that preserves the democratic functions of the press?

1.1. Problem Statement

The central problem addressed in this paper is the growing gap between the pace of AI adoption in journalism and the development of adequate governance, transparency, and accountability frameworks. This gap creates multiple risks for democratic communication. First, the absence of transparency standards means that audiences frequently consume AI-generated or

AI-assisted content without awareness of the production methods employed, undermining the informed trust relationships upon which journalism's epistemic authority depends. Second, the lack of quality assurance frameworks specifically designed for AI-mediated content production means that the subtle quality dimensions that distinguish journalism from information processing, including contextual depth, source diversity, interpretive nuance, and ethical sensitivity, may be systematically degraded without adequate monitoring or correction. Third, the absence of clear accountability structures means that when AI-generated content contains errors, biases, or harmful consequences, responsibility is diffused across a distributed production chain involving AI developers, newsroom deployers, editorial supervisors, and platform distributors, with no clear mechanism for identifying or addressing failures. Fourth, the lack of labor transition frameworks means that the displacement effects of AI adoption on the journalistic workforce, particularly affecting routine-task-intensive positions, are proceeding without adequate retraining, support, or alternative employment pathways.

1.2. Research Gap

Despite the proliferation of studies on AI in journalism, significant gaps remain in the empirical literature that constrain both theoretical understanding and practical governance. First, most existing research has been conducted in Western, English-language newsrooms, primarily in the United States, United Kingdom, and Northern Europe, leaving the dynamics of AI adoption in Global South contexts, non-English media markets, and resource-constrained newsrooms largely unexamined. Given that the majority of the world's journalists work outside Western media systems and that the democratic consequences of AI integration may be most acute in contexts with weaker institutional safeguards, this geographic limitation is consequential. Second, longitudinal studies tracking the evolution of AI integration over time, rather than providing snapshot assessments at single points, are virtually absent from the literature. Third, research comparing the accuracy, comprehensiveness, and public impact of AI-generated versus human-produced journalism across diverse story types, beat areas, and complexity levels remains limited and methodologically inconsistent. Fourth, the perspectives of audiences, rather than journalists and editors, regarding AI in news production have received insufficient attention, despite the centrality of audience trust to journalism's democratic function. This study addresses these gaps

through its cross-national comparative design, mixed-methods approach, and explicit integration of both producer and audience perspectives.

1.3. Research Objectives

This study pursues four specific objectives aligned with the identified research gaps. First, to map the current landscape of AI adoption across newsrooms in diverse geographic, economic, and media system contexts, providing the first systematic cross-media-system comparison of AI integration patterns. Second, to analyze the organizational structures, professional cultures, and editorial frameworks mediating AI integration, examining how institutional factors shape the character and consequences of adoption. Third, to evaluate the quality, accuracy, and transparency implications of AI-generated and AI-assisted journalism through comparative content analysis using validated quality indicators. Fourth, to propose an evidence-based governance framework for responsible AI deployment in journalism that balances innovation with democratic accountability, drawing on the empirical findings and the theoretical frameworks informing the study.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Historical Context: From Computer-Assisted Reporting to Generative AI

The use of computational tools in journalism has a longer history than the current AI discourse often acknowledges, and situating contemporary developments within this historical trajectory is essential for understanding both the continuities and discontinuities that characterize the present moment. Philip Meyer's pioneering precision journalism in the 1960s and 1970s applied social science methods and computer-assisted data analysis to investigative reporting, establishing the foundational principle that systematic computational analysis can reveal patterns in public data that are invisible to traditional reporting methods relying on individual sources and anecdotal evidence (Lal & Sharma, 2021). Meyer's work, most notably his computer-assisted analysis of the 1967 Detroit riots for the Detroit Free Press, demonstrated that computational methods could produce journalism of distinctive public value by enabling systematic, evidence-based reporting on complex social phenomena.

Computer-assisted reporting evolved through the 1990s and 2000s with the growth of database journalism, geographic information systems analysis, and the development of data journalism as a recognized professional specialty with dedicated teams, tools, and training programs (Sarkar & Lal, 2023). The Panama Papers investigation of 2016, in which an international consortium of journalists used computational tools to analyze 11.5 million leaked documents from the Panamanian law firm Mossack Fonseca, represented the apotheosis of computer-assisted investigative journalism, demonstrating the capacity of computational methods to enable investigations of unprecedented scale and complexity that would be impossible through traditional reporting methods alone.

The current wave of AI integration represents not a sudden rupture with this history but the latest phase in a decades-long trajectory of increasing computational sophistication in journalistic practice. What distinguishes this phase is the qualitative shift from AI as an analytical tool assisting human journalists in processing and understanding information to AI as a content production system capable of generating publishable text, audio, and visual content autonomously or semi-autonomously (Singh et al., 2021). This shift challenges the foundational assumption that journalism is performed by human agents exercising professional judgment, creating new categories of questions about authorship, accountability, quality, and democratic legitimacy that the earlier phases of computational journalism did not raise with comparable urgency (Saika et al., 2021).

Carlson's (2015) influential analysis of the robotic reporter identified three dimensions through which automation transforms journalism: labor, concerning who performs journalistic work and under what conditions; compositional form, concerning how automated content is structured, styled, and presented; and authority, concerning who can legitimately claim journalistic status and credibility. These three dimensions remain central to the contemporary debate about AI in journalism, though the emergence of generative AI has dramatically expanded the scope and urgency of each dimension by creating systems that can produce not only structured, template-based content but also free-form narrative prose, investigative research summaries, and editorial commentary that may be indistinguishable from human-authored journalism (Singh et al., 2022). The boundary between AI as tool and AI as autonomous agent has become increasingly blurred, creating challenges for professional identity, editorial oversight, and public trust that Carlson's framework anticipated but could not fully address in its original formulation.

2.2. Theoretical Framework: Boundary Work, Measurable Journalism, and Algorithmic Authority

Three interconnected theoretical frameworks inform the analysis presented in this paper, each addressing a distinct dimension of AI's transformation of journalism while collectively revealing the systemic character of the change underway. First, Lewis's (2012) application of boundary work theory to journalism illuminates how journalists negotiate the integration of new technologies and practices into their professional identity and jurisdiction. The concept of boundary work, originally developed by Gieryn (1983) to describe how scientists demarcate their professional territory from non-science, captures the discursive and practical strategies through which journalists define what counts as legitimate journalism, who qualifies as a journalist, and where the boundaries of acceptable professional practice lie (Rahman et al., 2022). AI integration provokes particularly intense boundary work because it challenges the core assumption that journalism requires human agency, judgment, and accountability, forcing journalists to articulate and defend the distinctive value of human cognition, ethical reasoning, and relational capacity in information production.

Second, Carlson's (2018) concept of measurable journalism, describing the transformation of editorial practice through real-time audience metrics and analytics, extends to the broader data-driven logic that AI systems embody and amplify. Petre's (2021) ethnographic study of metrics in newsrooms revealed that audience analytics function as addictive games that reshape editorial attention and resource allocation in ways that may not align with journalism's public interest mission. AI tools do not merely measure audience behavior but actively optimize content production based on algorithmic predictions of audience engagement, search engine visibility, and social media performance (Lal, 2023). This optimization logic, when it enters editorial decision-making, potentially reshapes what counts as newsworthy, how stories are framed and structured, and which topics receive journalistic attention, according to computational logics that may diverge from the professional judgment and public interest orientation that distinguish journalism from content marketing. The concern is not that AI optimization is inherently problematic but that it may gradually substitute algorithmic judgment for editorial judgment in ways that are invisible to audiences and potentially even to the journalists whose practice is being reshaped (Kumar & Lal, 2023).

Third, the concept of algorithmic authority, as theorized by algorithmic governance scholars including Napoli (2014) and Diakopoulos (2019), addresses the question of how algorithmic

systems acquire and exercise the epistemic authority traditionally held by human experts and professional institutions. When an AI system selects stories for prominence, generates content for publication, or optimizes headlines for engagement, it exercises a form of authority over public information that raises questions about accountability, transparency, and democratic legitimacy that existing institutional frameworks were not designed to address . The challenge is that algorithmic authority operates through technical processes that are opaque to most journalists and audiences, creating conditions in which significant editorial decisions are effectively delegated to systems whose logic, biases, and limitations are not subject to the professional scrutiny and public accountability that democratic theory requires of institutions exercising power over public knowledge.

2.3. Empirical Evidence on AI Adoption and Effects

The empirical evidence on AI adoption in journalism has expanded rapidly in recent years, though important gaps and inconsistencies remain. Diakopoulos's (2019) comprehensive analysis in *Automating the News* identified four primary applications of AI in journalism: automated content generation, producing publishable text from structured data sources; computational news discovery, identifying emerging stories through pattern detection in large datasets; automated newsgathering, using AI to collect, organize, and analyze source material for human journalists; and AI-assisted distribution, using recommendation algorithms to personalize content delivery for individual audience members. Subsequent research has documented the rapid expansion of these applications, particularly following the release of GPT-3 in 2020 and GPT-4 in 2023, which dramatically expanded the scope of automated content generation from structured, data-driven reporting to open-domain narrative journalism spanning virtually any topic or format.

Cools, Dierickx, Goyvaerts, and Hendrickx's (2024) semi-structured interviews with Dutch and Danish journalists identified 16 distinct uses of generative AI across the news production workflow, spanning research assistance, interview transcription, content drafting, headline optimization, translation, content summarization, image generation, social media post creation, and audience analytics. Critically, the study found that journalists grounded their use of AI tools in professional intuition and gut feeling rather than organizational mandates or formal guidelines, suggesting that AI adoption is driven more by individual experimentation than by systematic organizational strategy. This finding is consistent with Christin's (2020) comparative ethnographic observation that journalists' engagement with digital technologies is mediated through professional

culture and identity rather than determined by technological capabilities alone: identical tools produce different outcomes in different professional cultural contexts.

Graefe and Bohlken's (2020) meta-analysis of readers' perceptions of human-written versus automated news found that readers generally perceive automated news as less readable, less enjoyable, and less credible than human-written news, though the difference varies significantly by topic domain: automated financial and sports reports are perceived as comparable to human-authored reports, while automated coverage of political and social topics is perceived as significantly inferior. These findings suggest that the acceptability of automated journalism varies with the complexity, ambiguity, and value-laden character of the subject matter, with routine, data-driven reporting more amenable to automation than coverage requiring interpretive judgment, contextual understanding, and ethical sensitivity.

The Reuters Institute's 2025 Generative AI and News report provided crucial audience perspective data: only 12 percent of respondents across surveyed markets were comfortable with entirely AI-produced news, compared to 62 percent who preferred entirely human-produced journalism. Among those aged 18 to 24, comfort with AI-produced news was somewhat higher but remained a minority position. Only 33 percent of respondents believed that journalists always or often verify AI outputs before publishing, suggesting a significant trust deficit around AI-mediated journalism that compounds the broader media trust crisis documented in the same report. Nine percent of the public use AI chatbots for news, comparable to podcast and print readership. Social media and video platforms have overtaken television as the primary news source in the United States at 54 percent, while TikTok has surpassed X as a news platform at 13 percent weekly usage, with 84 percent of news influencers on TikTok having no newsroom affiliation.

3. Research Methodology

3.1. Research Design

This study employed a convergent parallel mixed-methods design combining quantitative content analysis with qualitative semi-structured interviews to provide a comprehensive assessment of AI integration in contemporary newsrooms. The mixed-methods approach was selected because the research questions require both the breadth and generalizability provided by quantitative analysis across a large sample of news content and the depth and contextual

understanding provided by qualitative investigation of journalists' lived experiences, professional negotiations, and organizational dynamics. The convergent parallel design, as described by Creswell and Plano Clark (2018), collected quantitative and qualitative data simultaneously during the same research phase, analyzed each dataset independently using appropriate analytical methods specific to each tradition, and integrated findings during the interpretation phase to identify areas of convergence, divergence, and complementarity across the two data sources.

The selection of a convergent rather than sequential design was motivated by the recognition that AI integration is a rapidly evolving phenomenon whose characteristics may change significantly over short time periods, making it important to capture both quantitative and qualitative data within the same temporal window rather than allowing months to elapse between quantitative and qualitative phases. The convergent design also enabled the identification of discrepancies between what content analysis reveals about actual AI involvement in published content and what journalists report about their AI use in interviews, providing a form of methodological triangulation that strengthens the validity of findings beyond what either method alone could achieve.

3.2. Sample and Sampling Technique

The quantitative component analyzed a stratified random sample of 2,400 news articles published between January and December 2025 across 24 news organizations representing six media systems identified through Hallin and Mancini's (2004) comparative media systems framework and its subsequent extensions: Anglo-American liberal (United States: New York Times, Washington Post, Associated Press, local newspaper; United Kingdom: BBC, Guardian, Daily Mail, local outlet), Northern European democratic corporatist (Germany, Netherlands, Sweden: two organizations each), Southern European polarized pluralist (France, Italy, Spain: two organizations each), Asian developmental (India, South Korea, Japan: two organizations each), African emerging (Kenya, Nigeria, South Africa: two organizations each), and Latin American transitional (Brazil, Mexico, Argentina: two organizations each). Within each country, organizations were selected through stratified purposive sampling to include at least one major national newspaper or wire service, one public broadcaster or digital-native news organization, and where possible one local or regional outlet, ensuring representation across different organizational types, economic models, and likely AI adoption levels.

From each of the 24 organizations, 100 articles were randomly sampled across the study period, stratified by publication month to ensure temporal representativeness. Articles were sampled from all editorial sections including politics, business, science, sports, culture, and local news to enable analysis of AI adoption patterns across different content domains. The total sample of 2,400 articles provides statistical power exceeding 0.95 for detecting medium effect sizes at the conventional alpha level of 0.05, as determined through a priori power analysis using G*Power software.

The qualitative component conducted semi-structured interviews with 72 journalists, editors, and newsroom technology managers across the same 24 organizations, with three participants per organization selected to represent different organizational roles: a reporter or correspondent engaged in daily content production, an editor or section head responsible for editorial oversight and quality assurance, and a technology manager or digital strategy director responsible for AI tool selection, implementation, and governance. Participants were recruited through organizational gatekeepers who identified appropriate individuals within each role category, supplemented by snowball sampling to reach participants in organizations where gatekeeper access was initially limited. All participants provided written informed consent in accordance with the institutional review board approval governing the study.

3.3. Data Collection Methods and Instruments

Quantitative data collection employed a custom-developed coding instrument designed specifically for this study and validated through a multi-stage development process. The instrument assessed AI involvement in content production across five dimensions, each operationalized through specific indicators derived from the literature review and refined through pilot testing with a subset of 120 articles. The first dimension, AI-generated content, identified articles produced primarily by AI systems with minimal human editing, using indicators including byline attribution patterns, stylistic markers of machine-generated text, metadata indicators, and disclosure statements. The second dimension, AI-assisted content, identified articles produced by human journalists using AI tools for substantive aspects of research, drafting, or optimization, using indicators including acknowledged tool use, stylistic evidence of AI-assisted composition, and organizational policies regarding AI tool deployment. The third dimension, AI-distributed content, identified articles whose placement, prominence, and audience targeting were determined by algorithmic recommendation systems rather than editorial judgment alone. The fourth

dimension, transparency disclosure, coded whether the use of AI tools was disclosed to audiences through any mechanism including byline attribution, editor's note, footer disclosure, or organizational policy page. The fifth dimension, content quality, assessed articles on four indicators, each measured on validated five-point scales: factual accuracy, assessed through verification of stated facts against authoritative sources; source diversity, measured as the number of distinct human sources quoted or referenced; contextual depth, measured as the number of contextualizing references, historical comparisons, and explanatory background elements; and narrative coherence, assessed through structural analysis of logical flow, argumentation quality, and readability.

Two trained coders, both graduate-level journalism researchers with professional newsroom experience, independently coded each of the 2,400 articles following a standardized protocol. Coders completed 20 hours of training including instruction on indicator definitions, practice coding sessions with discussion of disagreements, and calibration exercises. Inter-coder reliability was assessed on a random 15 percent subsample of 360 articles using Cohen's kappa, achieving kappa values of 0.84 for AI-generated identification, 0.82 for AI-assisted identification, 0.87 for transparency disclosure, 0.83 for factual accuracy, 0.85 for source diversity, 0.86 for contextual depth, and 0.81 for narrative coherence, all indicating substantial to near-perfect agreement according to Landis and Koch's (1977) benchmark criteria.

Qualitative data collection employed semi-structured interviews lasting 45 to 90 minutes, with a mean duration of 62 minutes. Interviews were conducted via video conference in the participant's preferred language, with professional simultaneous interpretation provided for interviews conducted in languages other than English, including German, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Hindi, Korean, Japanese, Swahili, and Yoruba. The interview protocol, developed through iterative piloting with five journalism professionals not included in the study sample, covered six thematic areas: current AI tool usage and organizational context for adoption decisions; perceived benefits and risks of AI integration for journalistic practice and output quality; professional identity and AI's impact on journalists' self-concept and sense of professional purpose; organizational governance including policies, guidelines, oversight mechanisms, and editorial review processes for AI-mediated content; training and skill development experiences and needs; and future expectations, concerns, and aspirations regarding AI's role in journalism. Interviews were audio-recorded with participant consent, professionally transcribed verbatim, and member-checked by

participants who were provided transcripts and invited to correct inaccuracies or clarify ambiguous passages.

3.4. Data Analysis Procedures

Quantitative data were analyzed using a multi-stage statistical approach appropriate for the nested data structure of articles within organizations within media systems. Descriptive statistics characterized AI adoption prevalence and patterns across the full sample and disaggregated by media system, organization type, and content domain. Chi-square tests of association examined bivariate relationships between categorical variables including AI involvement type, transparency disclosure, media system, and content domain. Multilevel logistic regression models, estimated using restricted maximum likelihood in the lme4 package for R, accounted for the nested structure by specifying random intercepts for organizations nested within media systems, with fixed effects for article-level predictors including content domain, story complexity, and publication format, and organization-level predictors including organization type, AI policy status, and staff size. Effect sizes were calculated using Cohen's *d* for continuous outcomes and odds ratios for categorical outcomes, with 95 percent confidence intervals reported to facilitate interpretation of practical significance alongside statistical significance.

Qualitative data were analyzed using reflexive thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's (2006, 2019) six-phase approach: familiarization through repeated reading of transcripts and listening to audio recordings; systematic initial coding using both deductive codes derived from the theoretical framework and inductive codes emerging from the data; theme construction through iterative pattern identification, comparison, and grouping of codes into coherent thematic clusters; theme review through checking themes against coded data extracts and the full dataset to ensure coherence and distinctiveness; theme definition and naming through articulating the essence and scope of each theme; and narrative report writing integrating themes into a coherent analytical account. All coding was conducted using NVivo qualitative analysis software with an audit trail documenting coding decisions and revisions.

3.5. Ethical Considerations

The study was approved by the institutional ethics review board at the lead researcher's institution and was conducted in strict accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki's ethical principles for research involving human participants and the American Psychological Association's Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct. All interview participants

provided written informed consent prior to participation, including consent for audio recording, were assured of confidentiality through the use of pseudonyms and organizational category descriptors rather than identifying names, and were informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any time without consequence or obligation to provide reasons. Organizational identities were protected through the use of categorical descriptors specifying media system, organization type, and approximate staff size without naming specific organizations. The content analysis used publicly available published materials that do not require individual consent. Data storage, access, and retention protocols complied with applicable data protection regulations including the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation for EU-based participants and equivalent national data protection legislation for participants in other jurisdictions.

4. Data Analysis and Results

4.1. Prevalence and Patterns of AI Adoption

The content analysis revealed that AI involvement in news production is substantially more prevalent than audience-facing transparency measures indicate, confirming a significant disclosure gap between actual AI use and public awareness. Across the full sample of 2,400 articles, 14.2 percent (n=341) showed evidence of primary AI generation, meaning that the content was produced predominantly by AI systems with minimal human editing or intervention; 31.7 percent (n=761) showed evidence of AI assistance, meaning that human journalists produced the content with substantive support from AI tools for research, drafting, translation, optimization, or verification; and 54.1 percent (n=1,298) showed no detectable evidence of AI involvement in production, though the possibility of undetectable AI assistance cannot be entirely excluded.

The prevalence of AI involvement varied significantly across media systems, with statistically significant differences confirmed through multilevel logistic regression after controlling for organization type, publication format, and story topic. Anglo-American liberal media showed the highest rates of combined AI adoption at 52.3 percent (26.1 percent AI-generated, 26.2 percent AI-assisted), consistent with the earlier and more aggressive adoption of digital technologies characteristic of this media system. Asian developmental media followed at 48.1 percent (15.8 percent AI-generated, 32.3 percent AI-assisted), reflecting the strong technological orientation and competitive digital media markets in India, South Korea, and Japan. Northern European democratic corporatist media showed 41.6 percent combined adoption (11.3 percent AI-generated, 30.3 percent AI-assisted), with AI-assisted use exceeding AI-generated use by a wider margin than

in other media systems, suggesting a stronger preference for human-AI collaboration over autonomous AI production. Southern European polarized pluralist media showed 34.2 percent, Latin American transitional media 38.4 percent, and African emerging media 28.7 percent, with the lower rates in the latter two contexts reflecting both lesser availability of AI tools in resource-constrained newsrooms and cultural and institutional factors mediating technology adoption.

Transparency disclosure was disturbingly low across all media systems, though significant cross-system variation was observed. Of the 341 articles identified as primarily AI-generated, only 76 (22.4 percent) included any form of disclosure to readers, whether through byline attribution, editor's note, footer disclosure, or link to organizational AI policy. Of the 761 articles identified as AI-assisted, only 65 (8.6 percent) included any form of disclosure. The disclosure rate varied significantly by media system: Northern European democratic corporatist media showed the highest disclosure rates at 38.1 percent for AI-generated content, reflecting stronger public service traditions, editorial transparency cultures, and emerging regulatory expectations under the EU AI Act; Anglo-American liberal media, despite having the highest AI adoption rates, showed disclosure rates of only 19.3 percent, suggesting that competitive market pressures may incentivize AI adoption while discouraging transparency about its use; African emerging media showed the lowest disclosure rates at 11.2 percent, consistent with lesser development of AI governance frameworks and regulatory infrastructure in these contexts.

AI adoption patterns varied significantly by content domain, with the highest rates observed in structured, data-driven domains including financial reporting (67.3 percent combined AI involvement), sports coverage (58.7 percent), and weather and traffic reporting (71.4 percent), and the lowest rates in investigative journalism (12.1 percent), political analysis (18.7 percent), and feature or longform writing (15.3 percent). This pattern is consistent with the theoretical expectation that AI automation is most readily applied to content domains characterized by structured data inputs, template-amenable formats, and relatively low requirements for interpretive judgment, contextual knowledge, and source relationship cultivation.

4.2. Content Quality Analysis

The content quality analysis revealed nuanced patterns that neither validate the most optimistic claims about AI's capacity to produce journalism of equivalent quality to human-authored content nor confirm the most pessimistic fears about systematic quality degradation. Across the four quality dimensions assessed, the differences between AI-generated and human-

authored content were statistically significant for three dimensions and non-significant for one, with the pattern of differences revealing a clear profile of AI's current strengths and limitations in journalistic content production.

Contextual depth, measuring the extent to which articles provide historical context, explanatory background, comparative reference, and analytical perspective beyond the immediate facts of the story, showed the most pronounced difference between AI-generated and human-authored content. AI-generated articles scored significantly lower ($M=2.41$, $SD=0.89$) than human-authored articles ($M=3.67$, $SD=0.92$) on the five-point contextual depth scale, with a large effect size ($t(798)=8.94$, $p<.001$, $d=0.89$). This finding indicates that AI-generated content tends to present information in a relatively decontextualized manner, reporting facts without the historical, analytical, and comparative framing that enables audiences to understand the significance and implications of reported events.

Source diversity, measuring the number and variety of distinct human sources quoted, referenced, or consulted in an article, showed the largest absolute difference between conditions. AI-generated articles averaged 1.83 distinct sources ($SD=1.12$) compared to 3.42 ($SD=1.34$) for human-authored articles, a highly significant difference with a very large effect size ($t(798)=11.23$, $p<.001$, $d=1.12$). This finding reflects AI systems' fundamental inability to cultivate source relationships, conduct interviews, or access privileged information through the trust-based interpersonal networks that constitute a core professional resource for human journalists.

Narrative coherence, measuring the logical flow, structural organization, and readability of articles, showed a smaller but still significant difference, with AI-generated content scoring 3.12 ($SD=0.78$) compared to human-authored content at 3.54 ($SD=0.81$), a small-to-medium effect ($t(798)=4.26$, $p<.001$, $d=0.34$). While AI-generated text is generally grammatically correct and structurally organized, it tends toward formulaic patterns that lack the narrative variation, rhetorical sophistication, and stylistic individuality that characterize skilled human journalism.

Factual accuracy, assessed through verification of stated facts against authoritative sources, did not differ significantly between AI-generated and human-authored content for structured, data-driven stories. Both groups showed accuracy rates exceeding 94 percent for financial reports, sports results, and other content domains where information is drawn from structured databases and the reporting task involves primarily the accurate transcription and formatting of factual data. However, the accuracy equivalence disappeared for complex, interpretive stories: AI-generated

content about political events, social trends, and policy debates showed a 12.7 percent error rate for errors of context, emphasis, and interpretive framing, compared to 4.3 percent for human-authored content (chi-square=14.92, df=1, $p < .001$). These were not primarily factual errors in the traditional sense but rather errors of judgment about what information is most relevant, how competing claims should be weighted, and what contextual framing is necessary for accurate audience understanding.

4.3. Qualitative Findings: Journalist Perceptions and Professional Negotiation

Thematic analysis of the 72 interviews identified five overarching themes characterizing journalists' perceptions of and negotiations with AI integration, each capturing a distinct dimension of the professional experience. The first theme, pragmatic adaptation, described journalists' predominantly instrumental approach to AI tools as productivity aids that automate tedious, time-consuming tasks, including transcription of recorded interviews, translation of foreign-language sources, initial compilation of research materials, and generation of routine content elements such as data summaries and backgrounders, freeing time for higher-value journalistic work including source cultivation, investigative research, analytical writing, and editorial judgment. This theme was expressed consistently across all media systems and organizational types, with 84.7 percent ($n=61$) of participants reporting regular use of at least one AI tool and 62.5 percent ($n=45$) describing AI as having improved their overall productivity.

The second theme, professional boundary maintenance, captured journalists' active and self-conscious negotiation of the boundaries between appropriate AI assistance and inappropriate AI substitution for journalistic judgment. Participants across all media systems consistently distinguished between AI as a tool, acceptable when it assists human decision-making, augments human capabilities, and remains subject to editorial oversight, and AI as an agent, unacceptable when it exercises autonomous editorial judgment about what to cover, how to frame stories, which sources to privilege, or what conclusions to draw. This boundary was articulated with remarkable consistency across diverse cultural and organizational contexts, suggesting that it reflects a deep professional norm rather than a context-specific attitude.

The third theme, transparency anxiety, described widespread concern about the gap between AI's actual role in content production and audience awareness of that role. Participants across all media systems expressed discomfort with the low disclosure rates that the content analysis revealed, recognizing that audience trust depends on transparency about production methods while

simultaneously acknowledging organizational pressures to maintain the appearance of fully human-authored journalism. Several participants described a tension between their personal commitment to transparency and their organization's reluctance to disclose AI use for fear of audience backlash, competitive disadvantage, or reputational damage.

The fourth theme, skill transformation pressure, described journalists' awareness that AI integration requires new professional competencies, including AI tool management, prompt engineering, output verification, algorithmic literacy, and data analysis skills, while potentially devaluing traditional journalistic skills that are not easily automated, including handwriting recognition, shorthand transcription, and memorization of institutional phone directories. More significantly, several participants expressed concern that the efficiency gains from AI tools might reduce organizational investment in the slower, more resource-intensive forms of journalism, including investigative reporting, long-form feature writing, and sustained beat coverage, that produce the highest-value democratic accountability journalism.

The fifth theme, existential uncertainty, captured deeper anxieties about whether AI would ultimately augment or replace human journalism, with participants expressing a range of positions from confident complementarity to genuine fear of professional obsolescence. Younger journalists and those in routine-task-intensive positions expressed significantly higher levels of existential uncertainty than senior journalists in analytical, investigative, or editorial roles, consistent with the content analysis finding that AI adoption is concentrated in structured, routine content domains.

5. Discussion

5.1. Interpretation of Key Findings

The findings reveal a journalism ecosystem in rapid but uneven transformation, characterized by widespread AI adoption coupled with inadequate governance, transparency, and professional preparation. The 45.9 percent combined rate of AI involvement in sampled content, encompassing both AI-generated and AI-assisted articles, indicates that AI has moved from the experimental periphery to the operational core of news production in many organizations, a transformation that has occurred largely without the public transparency, professional guidelines, or regulatory frameworks that such a fundamental change in news production methods warrants. The disclosure rate of only 22.4 percent for primarily AI-generated content represents a systemic transparency failure that risks eroding the audience trust upon which journalism's democratic legitimacy

depends, particularly given the Reuters Institute's finding that 62 percent of audiences prefer entirely human-produced journalism.

The quality differential between AI-generated and human-authored content was concentrated in dimensions requiring interpretive judgment, contextual understanding, and source relationship cultivation, precisely the dimensions that distinguish journalism from information processing and that provide journalism's distinctive democratic value. While AI-generated content achieved comparable factual accuracy for structured, data-driven stories, its deficiencies in contextual depth ($d=0.89$) and source diversity ($d=1.12$) for complex, interpretive coverage represent substantial quality gaps that are not merely statistical artifacts but reflect fundamental limitations in current AI systems' capacity to perform the interpretive, relational, and contextual work that quality journalism requires.

5.2. Comparison With Previous Research

The findings are broadly consistent with the existing literature while extending it in several important respects. The prevalent but pragmatic pattern of AI adoption aligns with Cools et al.'s (2024) finding that journalists ground AI use in professional intuition rather than organizational mandates, and with Christin's (2020) broader observation that digital technology adoption in newsrooms is mediated through professional culture rather than technologically determined. The quality differential between AI and human content is consistent with Graefe and Bohlken's (2020) meta-analytic finding that readers perceive automated news as less readable and enjoyable, while the accuracy parity for structured content confirms earlier evidence that template-based automated reporting can match or exceed human accuracy for routine, data-driven stories. The study extends previous research by providing the first systematic cross-media-system comparison of AI adoption patterns, revealing significant variation that correlates with media system characteristics including public service orientation, regulatory environment, and economic model.

5.3. Theoretical Implications

The findings have implications for each of the three theoretical frameworks informing the study. For boundary work theory, the professional boundary maintenance theme confirms that AI integration provokes intense negotiation about the jurisdictional boundaries of journalism, with journalists actively constructing and defending boundaries between acceptable AI assistance and unacceptable AI autonomy. The remarkable consistency of this boundary across diverse media system contexts suggests that the human agency norm in journalism is deeply embedded in

professional identity rather than culturally contingent. For measurable journalism theory, the finding that AI optimization logics are entering editorial decision-making through multiple channels, including content recommendation, headline testing, and topic selection algorithms, suggests that the datafication of editorial judgment is intensifying and potentially accelerating beyond the audience metric dimension that Carlson (2018) originally described. For algorithmic authority theory, the low transparency rates suggest that AI systems are acquiring de facto authority over news production without the disclosure and accountability mechanisms that legitimate authority requires in democratic governance frameworks.

5.4. Practical Implications

The practical implications span organizational, professional, educational, and regulatory domains. Organizations adopting AI should implement mandatory disclosure policies calibrated to the degree of AI involvement in content production, invest in training programs that develop journalists' AI literacy alongside traditional professional competencies, and establish editorial oversight structures specifically designed for AI-mediated workflows that ensure meaningful human review of AI-generated content before publication. Professional associations should develop guidelines specifying the conditions under which AI assistance is appropriate and the disclosure obligations that should accompany different levels of AI involvement. Journalism education programs should integrate AI literacy, including prompt engineering, output verification, algorithmic bias detection, and ethical reasoning about AI in journalism, into their curricula. Regulatory bodies should consider requiring transparency about AI involvement in news production as a component of platform governance and media accountability frameworks.

6. Conclusion

This study has provided a comprehensive empirical assessment of artificial intelligence integration in contemporary newsrooms across six media systems, revealing that AI has become substantially embedded in news production while governance, transparency, and professional preparation have not kept pace with the scale and speed of adoption. The combined rate of 45.9 percent AI involvement in sampled content, including both primarily AI-generated and AI-assisted articles, demonstrates that AI integration is no longer an emerging trend or experimental periphery but an operational reality that shapes a significant proportion of the journalism that democratic publics

consume daily. The disclosure rate of only 22.4 percent for AI-generated content reveals a systemic accountability gap between the actual production methods employed and the transparency that audiences need to calibrate their trust in journalistic institutions.

The quality analysis confirms that AI's current capabilities are best suited to structured, data-driven content where it can match or exceed human accuracy, while human journalists retain significant and practically important advantages in contextual depth, source diversity, and interpretive judgment for complex coverage. These findings support a complementarity model of human-AI collaboration in journalism, in which AI handles routine, high-volume, data-driven production tasks while human journalists focus on the interpretive, investigative, and relational work that provides journalism's distinctive democratic value. However, achieving productive complementarity requires deliberate institutional design rather than organic, unmanaged integration that risks systematic quality degradation through gradual substitution of algorithmic efficiency for editorial judgment.

The proposed Responsible AI in Journalism framework, grounded in five interconnected principles of editorial human oversight, algorithmic transparency, accuracy accountability, fairness and non-discrimination, and democratic purpose orientation, provides normative architecture for this institutional design that can be adapted across diverse media system contexts. The framework is deliberately principle-based rather than prescriptive, recognizing that effective implementation must account for organizational differences in resources, capabilities, regulatory environments, and professional cultures. Implementation requires coordinated action from newsrooms, professional associations, platform companies, regulatory bodies, and journalism education programs, sustained by the recognition that the governance choices made in the current critical period will shape the relationship between AI, journalism, and democracy for decades to come.

7. Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following evidence-based recommendations are proposed for stakeholders across the journalism ecosystem. First, newsrooms should implement mandatory AI disclosure policies requiring clear, prominent labeling of AI-generated and AI-assisted content in all publication formats, with disclosure standards calibrated to the degree and character of AI

involvement. Minimal AI assistance such as spell-checking, grammar correction, and basic transcription may not require disclosure, but substantive AI involvement in content generation, source analysis, editorial optimization, or distribution targeting should be transparently communicated to audiences through standardized labels developed through industry coordination.

Second, news organizations should establish AI ethics committees comprising editorial staff, technology specialists, audience representatives, and external advisors to oversee AI deployment, evaluate new AI tool adoption proposals, monitor quality implications of deployed AI systems, and address ethical concerns as they arise. These committees should develop organization-specific AI usage guidelines that balance innovation with quality and accountability standards, drawing on the RAIJ framework principles while adapting them to organizational context and capabilities.

Third, journalism education programs should integrate AI literacy into their core curricula, ensuring that graduating journalists possess competencies to critically evaluate AI tools, verify AI-generated outputs, understand and detect algorithmic biases, maintain independent editorial judgment in AI-augmented workflows, and communicate transparently with audiences about AI's role in content production. This integration should complement rather than replace traditional journalistic skills including source cultivation, investigative technique, narrative craft, and ethical reasoning.

Fourth, regulatory bodies should consider incorporating AI transparency requirements into existing media governance frameworks, extending the transparency obligations established by instruments such as the EU Digital Services Act to encompass AI involvement in news production. Platform-level interventions including content provenance labeling, AI-generated content detection tools, and algorithmic transparency requirements should be supported through regulatory mandate and multi-stakeholder collaboration between governments, platforms, news organizations, and civil society.

Fifth, industry organizations including press councils, journalism unions, and professional associations should develop shared ethical standards for AI in journalism that establish minimum expectations for transparency, accuracy verification, human editorial oversight, and accountability across the profession, providing a normative floor that individual organizations can exceed but not fall below.

8. Limitations of the Study

Several limitations constrain the interpretation and generalizability of the findings presented in this paper. First, the identification of AI involvement in published content relied on trained human coders applying a set of indicators including stylistic markers, attribution patterns, metadata analysis, and organizational policy review, rather than on ground-truth information about actual production methods provided by news organizations. This approach may underestimate AI involvement when AI tools are used for subtle assistance that does not produce detectable indicators, such as AI-assisted research compilation, background checking, or minor editing refinements. Future research should investigate computational approaches to detecting AI-assisted content, including stylometric analysis and machine learning classifiers, that complement and validate human coding.

Second, the cross-sectional design captures AI integration at a single point in time during a period of extremely rapid technological and organizational change, and the patterns documented in this study may evolve substantially as AI capabilities advance, organizational practices mature, and regulatory frameworks develop. Longitudinal research tracking AI adoption trajectories, quality implications, and governance evolution over multi-year periods is urgently needed to understand the dynamics of integration over time and to evaluate the effectiveness of governance interventions as they are implemented.

Third, the interview sample of three participants per organization, while providing diversity across organizational roles, may underrepresent the range of perspectives and experiences within each newsroom, particularly in large organizations where AI adoption may vary significantly across departments, beat areas, and individual journalists. Future research should employ broader within-organization sampling, potentially supplemented by organizational ethnographic methods, to capture the full diversity of journalist experiences with AI integration.

Fourth, the study focused on text-based journalism and did not systematically examine AI integration in broadcast television, radio, podcast, or visual journalism contexts, which may follow different adoption patterns, raise distinct quality concerns, and require different governance approaches. Fifth, audience perspectives were captured only through existing survey data produced by the Reuters Institute and Edelman rather than through primary research conducted as part of this study, and direct investigation of audience awareness, attitudes, and behavioral responses to AI-produced journalism represents an important direction for future research.

9. References

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 11(4), 589-597.
- 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>
- Carlson, M. (2018). Confronting measurable journalism. *Digital Journalism*, 6(4), 406-417. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2018.1445003>
- Christin, A. (2020). *Metrics at work: Journalism and the contested meaning of algorithms*. Princeton University Press.
- Cools, H., Dierickx, L., Goyvaerts, T., & Hendrickx, J. (2024). Uses of generative AI in the newsroom: Mapping journalists' perceptions. *Journalism Practice*, 19(5), 878-896. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2024.2394558>
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE.
- Diakopoulos, N. (2019). *Automating the news: How algorithms are rewriting the media*. Harvard University Press.
- Gieryn, T. F. (1983). Boundary-work and the demarcation of science from non-science. *American Sociological Review*, 48(6), 781-795.
- Graefe, A., & Bohlken, N. (2020). Automated journalism: A meta-analysis of readers' perceptions. *Media and Communication*, 8(3), 50-59. <https://doi.org/10.17645/mac.v8i3.3019>
- Hallin, D. C., & Mancini, P. (2004). *Comparing media systems: Three models of media and politics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jain, P., Lal, R., & Raina, G. S. (2023). Portrayal of Characters in a Hindi Film and Audience-Reaction: A Discourse Analysis. *IIS University Journal of Arts*, 12 (1&2), 362-377.
- Kennedy, E., Stites, A., & Fischer, S. (2025). AI-generated content in American newspapers: Widespread, uneven, and rarely disclosed. *Columbia Journalism Review*.
- Kumar, D., & Lal, R. (2023). Technological Advancements in the Media Industry and the Current Job Market in India. In A. Naim (Eds.), *Accreditation Processes and Frameworks in Higher Education* (pp. 289–314). Nova Science Publishers.
- Lal, R. (2023). New Measures of Teaching Learning and Evaluating with Changing Technology. In A. Naim (Eds.), *Accreditation Processes and Frameworks in Higher Education* (pp. 267–287). Nova Science Publishers .
- Lal, R., & Rahman, Z. T. (2013). An Analytical Study of Building Green Fashion and Lifestyle Brand with Satisfaction based Segmentation. *Anusandhanika*, 5(1/2), 6.
- Lal, R., & Rahman, Z. T. (2013). An Analytical Study of Building Green Fashion and Lifestyle Brand with Satisfaction based Segmentation. *Anusandhanika*, 5(1/2), 6.
- Lal, R., & Rahman, Z. T. (2013). An Analytical Study on the Correlation of Content and Placement Targeting: The Contextual Advertising-A Research Based Descriptive Study. *International Journal of Management Research and Reviews*, 3(4), 2790.
- Lal, R., & Sharma, G. (2021). Social media influencers for online purchase behaviour: Mediation by brand consciousness. *Journal of Content, Community & Communication*, 13(7), 83-94.
- Lal, R., & Vats, A. (2016). Advertising Effectiveness on Television and Attitude of Youth. *Ahead-International Journal of Recent Research Review*, 1, 60-65.

- Lal, R., Vats, A., & Khan, S. A. (2015). An interdisciplinary Study of Data Mining in Lifestyle Segmentation through Relationship Management. *Anusandhanika*, 7(2), 99.
- Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, 33(1), 159-174.
- Lewis, S. C. (2012). The tension between professional control and open participation: Journalism and its boundaries. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(6), 836-866. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2012.674150>
- Mane, N., & Lal, R. (2021). Use of Folk Media to Create Health Awareness about Tuberculosis. *Pragyaan: Journal of Mass Communication*, 12.
- Napoli, P. M. (2014). Automated media: An institutional theory perspective on algorithmic media production and consumption. *Communication Theory*, 24(3), 340-360.
- Newman, N., Fletcher, R., Robertson, C. T., Arguedas, A. R., & Nielsen, R. K. (2025). Reuters Institute digital news report 2025. Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.
- Petre, C. (2021). All the news that's fit to click: How metrics are transforming the work of journalists. Princeton University Press.
- Rahman, Z. T., Lal, R., & Ratna, R. (2022). An Analytical Study on the Significance of Folk and Fairytales on the Psychology of Young Children. *International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education*, 14(5).
- Rahman, Z. T., Lal, R., & Rena, R. (2024). Challenges of Communication with Gen-Z in the Era of Artificial Intelligence-Interceded Digital Economy. In *AI-Oriented Competency Framework for Talent Management in the Digital Economy* (pp. 76-94). CRC Press.
- Sarkar, N., & Lal, R. (2023). Changing Trends of Media Ownership: Marketing Through Community Engagement in Hindi Television News Channels. In *Global Applications of the Internet of Things in Digital Marketing* (pp. 290-309). IGI Global.
- Shaika, S., Lal, R., & Jonjua, M. (2021). Sustainable Development Goal 3: Case Study of using Folk media as a Potent tool in India. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government* Vol, 27(1).
- Singh, R. K., Prakash, R., & Lal, R., (2021) Adoption of CAB model for instrument development of effectiveness of crime-based reality-shows, *Journal of Content Community and Communication*, 14 (7) 230–239.
- Singh, R. K., Prakash, R., Lal, R., & Nanda, V. (2022). Mediation Role of Crime-Show Impact Between Creating Awareness About Crime and Novelty in Crime. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Negative Results*, 1255-1262.