

The Innovator's Dilemma in the Media Industry: Examining Organizational Fears, Uncertainties, and Concerns About AI Adoption Across U.S. Media Companies

Kas Mayanga 

Marymount University, Arlington, VA, USA, mayanga@verizon.net

Abstract: This comprehensive research paper examines the multifaceted organizational fears, uncertainties, and concerns about AI adoption across U.S. media companies from 2020 to 2026. Drawing on academic research, industry reports, and news analyses, the review identifies eight primary categories of fears and concerns: Business model disruptions and revenue cannibalization; psychological fears and economic uncertainties; copyright infringement and intellectual property theft concerns; ethics, bias, and compliance considerations; data quality and governance concerns; technical implementation and integration challenges; misinformation, deepfakes, and content authenticity; and legislative and regulatory framework uncertainty. The review synthesizes current research to provide media executives, policymakers, and scholars with a comprehensive understanding of the barriers to AI adoption in the media sector and potential pathways forward. While these fears are substantial and multifaceted, strategic approaches for navigating AI adoption in U.S. media organizations include: establish a formal AI governance framework and strategic roadmap before scaling adoption; diversify revenue through strategic licensing while protecting core business models; implement rigorous data governance, provenance tracking, and cybersecurity controls; adopt transparent, ethically grounded content standards with human oversight; build internal capability and establish continuous ROI evaluation mechanisms. These measures may help media companies navigate the AI transformation while protecting their core interests.

Keywords: AI Fears in Media, AI Adoption Challenges, AI Challenges, AI Transformation, AI Anxieties, AI Resistance, AI Disruption, AI Displacement, AI Concerns

Introduction

The media industry is evolving swiftly. Publishers are reorienting from advertising toward reader subscriptions, branching into audio content, and adopting niche strategies. While this expansion depends on data, it also introduces more complexity, including additional integrations, legal hurdles, and data security issues. As a major and expanding part of the U.S. economy, the media sector provided around 2.1 million jobs in 2023, with expectations for further growth by 2025. It has experienced a consistent annual growth rate of 3.8%, with projections of 2.9% for 2024 and 2025 (Pepperdine University, 2024). Job creation is predicted to add about 104,800 positions each year from 2024 to 2034, mainly to replace retiring workers (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2024). These statistics highlight a resilient industry, although its strong foundation faces challenges from ongoing technological disruptions that require careful management.

The media industry is at a crucial juncture as AI technologies rapidly develop and spread throughout the economy. Although AI holds great promise for improving content creation, increasing audience engagement, and optimizing operations, U.S. media outlets are finding it difficult to adopt these technologies safely and effectively within their existing systems, teams, and business models (Chan-Olmsted, 2019). This cautious stance creates significant challenges, especially given the industry's declining revenues, changing consumer behaviors, and rising competition from digital platforms. The emergence of generative AI tools, such as large language models and automated content systems, has heightened concerns within traditional media.

Unlike sectors that have adopted AI more smoothly, the media industry faces distinct challenges related to integrity, authenticity, and professional identity. These issues make integration more complicated (Dorr, 2016). Such concerns go beyond just technology, prompting vital questions about the future roles of journalists, editors, and creators in a world increasingly influenced by automation. AI's involvement in media is thus not just a technological upgrade but a fundamental shift in how content is created, curated, and consumed, covering journalism, recommendation algorithms, AI-generated images, and deepfakes (Beckett, 2020; Tunez-Lopez et al., 2023). This tension between opportunity and concern captures the essence of the industry's current situation.

AI development in media has evolved through several stages, each more advanced. By 2019, most media outlets used AI mainly for specific tasks like generating news stories or content recommendations, with algorithms and bots managing simple tasks such as sports scores, financial summaries, and weather updates, often with little human editing (Ufarte Ruiz & Manfredi Sánchez, 2019). Since 2020, AI use has surged rapidly, partly due to economic pressures and changes in consumption patterns caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, encouraging organizations to adopt AI for greater efficiency.

Interest in AI within journalism grew alongside these developments, with the number of publications rising from 10 to 25 annually between 2020 and 2022 (Artificial Intelligence and Journalism, 2025). The introduction of OpenAI's ChatGPT in November 2022 marked a pivotal moment, offering widely accessible generative AI that quickly impacted media workflows. By early 2023, companies like BuzzFeed were employing ChatGPT to generate content such as quizzes, travel articles, and chatbots, while major outlets like The Washington Post planned to develop internal AI teams (CSIS, 2025). By 2024, publications on AI in journalism had increased to 106, a 172% jump from the previous year, indicating that large language models were becoming essential newsroom tools (Artificial Intelligence and Journalism, 2025). This rapid evolution demonstrates that AI has transitioned from a novelty to an integral part of media infrastructure.

Despite the rapid increase in AI adoption, the media industry's response remains inconsistent and filled with concerns, indicating a sector in transition rather than full transformation. By 2025, about 80% of media decision-makers were experimenting with generative AI, often without concrete plans for comprehensive adoption (Ventionteams, 2024). This experimentation was accompanied by rising worries about business model disruption, workforce displacement, and the authenticity of AI-produced content. To put these fears into perspective, it's essential to see that the resistance to AI in the media sector is part of a long history of technological anxiety. Past innovations like the printing press, radio, television, and the internet faced similar fears before becoming standard in professional practice (Anderson, 2021).

Today's AI breakthroughs differ significantly from past technologies that mainly improved human skills or opened new distribution channels. Now, AI can perform tasks once thought to be exclusively human, such as writing, editing, image recognition, and idea generation (Brennen et al., 2020; Ouchchy et al., 2020). This change increases industry concern because AI threatens not just certain jobs but also the core value of human creative and editorial judgment in media, an issue that earlier technological shifts did not confront so directly. This conceptual research paper aims to examine the factors driving AI-related fears and to propose future media strategies that will shape industry responses, ethical guidelines, and strategic planning for navigating this change. Addressing these issues is essential to avoid stagnation or irresponsible AI applications that could damage professional standards and weaken public trust (Brookings Institution, 2024).

Problem Statement

As media organizations integrate AI into their editorial and subscriber systems, the industry faces unprecedented challenges that heighten fears about professional identity and anxiety. According to

the Pew Research Center's 2025 survey, 59% of Americans believe AI will reduce jobs for journalists over the next two decades (Pew Research Center, 2025). A Statista (2023) report finds that 46% of U.S. respondents fear AI will replace news reporters.

Additionally, SEO.ai (2025) reports that 30% of workers worldwide fear losing their jobs within three years, up from 15% to 25% since 2021. These fears extend beyond job security, as 49% of journalism professionals worry about AI's role in spreading misinformation and bias (Thomson Reuters Foundation, 2025). A lack of training leads to resistance and may compromise editorial judgment and quality (Frontiers in Communication, 2025). As AI becomes more integrated into workplaces, concerns about automation and employment are growing. The media industry must carefully balance AI integration with human oversight to maintain quality, accountability, and audience trust (The Harvard Gazette, 2025).

Furthermore, large tech firms use media content to train AI systems and drive referral traffic, which is essential for publishers' survival, often without permission. AI companies hesitate to compensate media outlets for their content used in training (TIME, 2024). The main problem is that AI models are trained on millions of pieces of media content scraped from websites without media companies' consent, posing a significant threat to the media industry.

Significance Statement

This research paper offers valuable insights for diverse stakeholder groups. For media companies implementing ethical AI, it clarifies key concerns to address in their strategies. The recommendations promote approaches that acknowledge genuine fears, involve employees in decision-making, and safeguard human input in media creation. Media executives can benefit from the findings on current change management practices and the challenges posed by technological shifts, which underscore the importance of communication, participation, and support to reduce employee fear and resistance.

In labor relations, unions and professional groups will find empirical evidence to strengthen contract negotiations and worker protections, enabling more comprehensive bargaining. Educational institutions and associations will gain a clearer understanding of the skills media professionals need to collaborate effectively with AI while preserving their core identities and values. This knowledge can inform curriculum development that addresses both technical competencies and ethical considerations. Finally, policymakers can use this paper to shape labor policies, retraining programs, intellectual property laws, and regulations that promote innovation while protecting workers.

Methodology of Literature Review

Types of Literature Review: This research paper employs a systematic literature review (SLR) alongside an integrative review to examine empirical studies and industry data. Sources were selected based on specific criteria: only publications from 2020 to 2026 were included, with a focus on reports and studies from late 2022 to 2025, aligning with the rise of generative AI (ChatGPT) in November 2022. The primary emphasis is on fears, concerns, and challenges related to deploying AI technologies in U.S. media businesses. When relevant, comparative data from international markets are incorporated to contextualize U.S. trends. The U.S. is the main focus because it is the largest AI market, with \$109.1 billion invested in private AI in 2024 (Stanford HAI, 2025). Studies or reports published before 2020 were excluded, except when cited as foundational theoretical or historical references. Sources focused solely on non-media industries without applicable insights for media and publishing were not included, nor were opinion pieces, editorials, or commentaries lacking empirical evidence, data, or rigorous methodology.

Keywords Used: The following keywords were used to identify relevant literature across academic databases, industry repositories, and research platforms: "AI Fears" AI in Media", "AI

Adoption”, “AI Challenges”, “AI Transformation”, “AI Anxieties”, “AI Resistance”, “AI Disruption”, “AI Displacement”, “AI Concerns”.

Boolean Operator: The search strings combined core terms with broader descriptors using Boolean operators to ensure thorough coverage. They included phrases like "AI Adoption" AND (fears OR anxieties OR concerns OR resistance); "Artificial Intelligence" AND (challenges OR uncertainties OR disruption OR displacement); "AI Fears" AND "Media Industry" AND (barriers OR concerns); "AI Resistance" AND (adoption OR transformation) AND (media OR publishing OR broadcasting); "AI Displacement" AND (enterprise OR media) AND (risks OR challenges OR fears); "AI Transformation" AND "U.S. media" AND (workforce OR strategy OR concerns); and "AI in Media" AND (resistance OR uncertainty OR displacement). These were applied across all platforms to maximize recall and relevance.

Total Articles Reviewed: This research paper draws on a broad, rigorous source base encompassing more than 120 channels and source types. The review prioritized sources published between 2020 and 2026, reflecting the pivotal shift from experimental AI deployment to large-scale enterprise AI solutions following the introduction of ChatGPT in November 2022. All sources were evaluated for methodological rigor, relevance to AI adoption concerns in U.S. media, and the credibility of the publishing institution or author. Eligible sources included peer-reviewed academic articles, dissertations, and published research studies directly relevant to AI adoption, AI fears, and organizational transformation in media, as well as sources from reputable academic databases, including ProQuest, EBSCO, ERIC, and Google Scholar. Industry research reports from major consulting and advisory firms such as McKinsey, Gallup, Pew Research Center, CSIS, Deloitte, PwC, Grant Thornton, Reuters Institute, IAB, Gartner, Palo Alto Networks, and IDC were also eligible. Research from leading academic institutions, including Stanford HAI, Harvard Business Review, MIT, Pepperdine University, University of Florida, Student Press Law Center, Brookings Institution, Thomson Reuters Foundation, Frontiers in Communication, and Columbia Journalism Review; investment and economic research reports from Goldman Sachs and the World Economic Forum; and reports and data from major news and prominent media organizations, including The Wall Street Journal, The Washington Post, TIME, BBC, CBS News, PBS News, The Atlantic, and NPR, were also eligible, as were government and public sector data from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and the FBI.

Literature Review

Defining Fears in U.S. Media Organizations’ Context

Understanding fears in the media industry involves recognizing their roots in a long history of technological change. Innovations like the printing press, radio, TV, and the internet have historically triggered similar fears and resistance before becoming integrated into society (Anderson, 2021). Defining AI universally is challenging because its development is constantly evolving, and different fields interpret "intelligence" uniquely. While no single definition exists, in this context, AI fears refer to the concerns and stress people experience regarding AI's increasing influence (Boyd, 2025). These fears, often called AI anxiety (Li & Huang, 2020), relate to societal impacts such as job automation and privacy issues. The uncertain effects of AI generate widespread unease (Boyd, 2025). This ambiguity demonstrates that AI fears are complex and multidimensional. Most studies treat AI fear as a single concept, which limits comprehension. Molina and Sundar (2022) see it as a trust issue, measured by statements like "I don't know why, but AI scares me." Gornemann and Spiekermann (2022) used "fear" as an umbrella term for emotional responses to AI. However, viewing AI fear as one-dimensional overlooks individual differences: a journalist might fear losing their job, while a reader may be concerned about ethical issues (Zhan et al., 2024). AI fear likely encompasses multiple sub-dimensions influenced by type and context, necessitating a more nuanced approach.

AI-related fears include job loss, threats from superintelligent AI, privacy breaches, bias, lack of transparency, and "FOMO-AI." These worries stem from rapid technological

change, cultural narratives, and uncertainty, forming a complex web of personal, societal, and philosophical issues (Fengyi et al., 2025; World Economic Forum, 2025; Stadelmann, 2025). Unlike earlier technology fears, concerns about AI center on the potential to replace human cognition, existential risks, and societal integration (Veras, 2025; Stadelmann, 2025). Rapid development, the blurring of human-machine boundaries, and transhumanist ideas have added existential dimensions, broadening AI fears into philosophical territory. In U.S. media, fears focus on job displacement, ethical lapses, and organizational effects. Chin-Rothmann (2023) highlights concern not only about replacing journalists but also about decisions that could cause the industry to collapse, since AI cannot replicate human expertise. CSIS (2025) reports suggest AI could affect up to 80% of U.S. jobs, mainly in media, heightening fears of losing livelihoods. Additionally, synthetic media like deepfakes threaten the trustworthiness of journalism, complicating fact-checking (Pindrop, 2024). These concerns challenge journalism's integrity, raising doubts about its credibility in the era of synthetic content.

Historical Fears in U.S. Media Organizations

Throughout history, major technological revolutions have elicited both excitement and fear, reflecting common human responses to disruptive change. From the advent of writing to the Industrial Revolution, innovations prompted societies to reconsider roles, identities, and ways of living and working (Veras, 2025). While these developments brought opportunities, they also sparked concerns about job loss, loss of traditions, and independence, despite their advantages. This recurring pattern illustrates the ambivalence toward progress (Veras, 2025). Understanding this context helps us grasp current anxieties about AI, which echo past upheavals but also possess distinctive qualities.

AI has evolved from a science-fiction concept into an integral part of daily life, transforming how we engage with information, commerce, and one another (Veras et al., 2024). It personalizes content, targets advertising, and shapes news coverage and product recommendations through behavioral monitoring, subtly guiding our choices. AI marks a new stage in human technological advancement, comparable to writing, the Industrial Revolution, and social media. Like these milestones, AI excites with its potential but also raises concerns about human autonomy. Its rapid development raises important questions: should we fully adopt AI or proceed cautiously? Reflecting on past technological responses helps explain why AI elicits complex, emotional reactions from individuals, industries, and institutions.

The Printing Press and the Scribe's Dilemma

The emergence of movable-type printing in 15th-century Europe parallels today's AI disruptions. Skilled scribes who crafted manuscripts by hand faced obsolescence as printing technology enabled mass production, threatening their profession and cultural significance (Eisenstein, 1979). This shift not only revolutionized book manufacturing but also challenged the identity and livelihoods of an entire class. Similarly, modern writers and journalists fear that automation could render their skills redundant, much as the scribes' skills were devalued by machinery. History shows that fears of technological displacement recur during such transitions (Mokyr, 1990; Frey, 2019). The most direct record of resistance comes from German abbot Johannes Trithemius, whose 1492 treatise *De Laude Scriptorum* ("In Praise of Scribes") defended manuscript copying against print, emphasizing the spiritual, cultural, and qualitative importance of the scribal tradition (Trithemius, 1492/1974). Later scholars note that the shift from manuscript to print was neither swift nor uncontested, accompanied by genuine anxieties about accuracy, authority, and the human element (Johns, 1998). Essentially, scribes and their supporters feared that machines enabling faster, cheaper production would make their roles obsolete, raising concerns about quality, precision, cultural connection, and employment, issues central to resistance during technological change.

Despite initial fears, the invention of the printing press exemplifies a recurring cycle in which resistance is followed by widespread societal progress. Although people at the time

worried about disrupting traditional practices, printing eventually made information more accessible, fueling major movements such as the Renaissance, Reformation, and Scientific Revolution (Eisenstein, 1979; Pettegree, 2010). This pattern, where disruption sparks concern but ultimately yields benefits, repeats throughout history (Eisenstein, 1979; Mokyr, 1990) and shapes modern fears about automation and creative work (Frey, 2019; Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014). Understanding this pattern helps put current AI concerns into perspective: while such fears are valid and understandable, the long-term effects depend on how society responds to these technologies.

Telegraph, Telephone, and the Speed of News

In the 1840s, the invention of the telegraph, followed by the telephone in the 1870s, transformed journalism by allowing news to be transmitted more quickly. This change affected how news was gathered, shared, and consumed (Blondheim, 1994; Czitrom, 1982). Although these innovations brought many benefits, many reporters initially hesitated, voicing concerns similar to today's doubts about artificial intelligence. Their worries focused not on understanding the new technology but on how it might affect journalism's quality, depth, and integrity. These fears show that even technological progress with obvious advantages often faces resistance when it challenges traditional methods, a pattern still seen today in debates about AI in U.S. media (Carey, 1989; Schudson, 1978).

Reporters voiced specific concerns about how telegraph and telephone technologies were reshaping their profession. They feared that an emphasis on rapid publication could compromise verification and accuracy. The high cost of telegraphic transmission, which favored conciseness, also threatened to reduce detailed, contextual storytelling in favor of simpler, more condensed language (Blondheim, 1994; Carey, 1989). They also worried that community-centered local insights might be undervalued as priorities shifted toward speed and standardization (Czitrom, 1982). These concerns reveal that their resistance was driven by a desire to uphold essential professional values, accuracy, depth, local relevance, and storytelling that they believed these technological developments threatened.

This disruption shows that journalism did not just passively accept technological change; it actively adapted by setting new standards that redefined the profession (Schudson, 1978; Stephens, 2007). A key development was the rise of the "inverted pyramid" style, which places the most important facts at the beginning and remains a core element of journalism. Its evolution is linked to the limitations and opportunities of telegraphic news delivery (Mindich, 1998). Worries that faster news might impact accuracy led to the creation of new editorial policies and verification methods (Blondheim, 1994). This history highlights that transformative technologies often force industries to reaffirm and formalize their fundamental values. For U.S. media facing AI, this pattern acts as both a warning about potential threats to journalistic integrity and a reminder that strategic adaptation can help maintain lasting professional standards (Carey, 1989).

Fears and Concerns in Adopting AI Across U.S. Media Businesses

Business Model Disruptions and Revenue Cannibalizations

Media organizations are increasingly concerned that AI answer engines may threaten their main revenue streams by delivering answers directly to users, potentially reducing traffic to publisher websites. Newman (2024) from the Reuters Institute underscores this worry, noting that search traffic might decrease as AI results provide answers within the interface instead of directing users to news sites. This concern is supported by data showing nearly 50% of publishers in 2023 reported significant declines in website traffic (Digiday, 2024). The rise of generative AI like ChatGPT introduces a new challenge, as users can receive direct answers from AI models, jeopardizing subscription and ad revenue. This risk was evidenced when ChatGPT Plus users found that the Browse with Bing feature could bypass publisher paywalls, leading OpenAI to temporarily disable it "to do right by content owners" and exercise caution (Columbia Journalism

Review, 2023). Although later restored with adjustments, this incident highlights the genuine threat posed by AI systems bypassing content creators.

The pressures are particularly intense for the subscription business model, which publishers started developing after The New York Times introduced its content meter in 2011. Studies show that 57% of publishers now anticipate their subscription revenue will grow only slightly, remain flat, or decline. This has led to a strategic shift from chasing growth at all costs to reducing customer churn and boosting average revenue per user (ARPU). AI complicates this issue by lowering the perceived value of premium content: if AI systems can compile information from multiple sources and offer comprehensive answers, consumers may question why they should pay for individual premium publications. This challenge is especially critical for specialized and niche outlets, whose unique expertise and analysis can be mimicked by advanced AI models (Digiday, 2024). Advertising revenue, a vital part of media business models despite diversification efforts, faces similar risks. While global advertising spend was projected to surpass \$1 trillion in 2024, most media firms haven't benefited from this growth (Digital Content Next, 2024). AI platforms can now serve targeted ads based on user queries without relying on traditional media channels, capturing value that used to go to publishers. The IAB State of Data 2025 report reveals that nearly twice as many agencies and publishers have fully scaled AI compared to brands, emphasizing a focus on improving advertising efficiency, often at the expense of the traditional entities that provide the context and audience for ads (IAB, 2025).

AI threatens to intensify existing inequalities in the media sector, extending beyond just impacting individual revenue streams. Issues around copyright and licensing could worsen power imbalances between large and small news outlets, as well as between news organizations and technology providers (Kuai, 2024). Major publishers with extensive archives and strong brand recognition usually negotiate better AI licensing agreements, while smaller outlets often lack the influence. The absence of clear AI governance policies could lead to further media concentration (Bannerman, 2024). The media and entertainment AI market is projected to grow from \$19.5 billion in 2024 to nearly \$99.48 billion by 2034, with an average annual growth rate of 25.22% (Polaris Market Research, 2025; Grand View Research, 2024). This rapid expansion is expected to primarily benefit tech companies and large media conglomerates, potentially marginalizing small, independent, and local outlets even more.

In response to rising threats, major publishers have entered into licensing agreements with AI companies, creating a divide in industry reactions. In 2024, OpenAI secured content licensing deals with outlets such as News Corp, the Financial Times, The Atlantic, The Associated Press, Axel Springer, DotDash Meredith, and Vox Media (Digiday, 2024). Meanwhile, Perplexity AI launched its own revenue-sharing initiative, enabling publishers like Time, Der Spiegel, Fortune, and The Texas Tribune to earn from ads on its platform. By November 2024, 14 publishers had joined this program (Digiday, 2024). Some industry leaders see these deals positively; for instance, Le Monde's CEO Louis Dreyfus called them "consolidating our business model by providing a significant source of additional, multi-year revenue" (Digiday, 2024). However, doubt persists: Reuters Institute research indicates nearly 48% of news executives believe publishers will receive little revenue from AI licensing agreements, while 35% think most earnings will favor large publishers (Newman, 2024). This situation risks creating a gap, with well-resourced media firms securing favorable terms and smaller publishers facing increased AI-driven competition.

Psychological Fears and Economic Uncertainties

Many media companies now view AI adoption as crucial to staying competitive, posing a unique challenge for leaders. They must safeguard institutional knowledge while ensuring smooth operations in a rapidly changing environment where market timing and pricing strategies can shift quickly, sometimes within weeks rather than months or years. Media executives, especially CEOs,

face intense pressure to implement AI, driven by the belief that it can enhance customer engagement, increase revenue, and lower costs, alongside a widespread fear of missing out. As more competitors adopt an "AI-First" stance, pressure from investors, shareholders, and boards grows, creating a strong sense of urgency. This explains why many CEOs are rushing to "Hurry up and AI the everything" (Inc., 2025). Despite AI's potential and significant investments by major firms, the industry still faces a tough innovation dilemma. Moving too fast risks reputational damage, legal issues, job cuts, and ethical problems; moving too slowly could lead to the loss of market share, revenue, efficiency, and relevance. This dilemma is especially challenging because the right approach is unclear, technology evolves quickly, regulations are changing, and best practices are still developing (West, 2023; Mayanga, 2026).

These strategic challenges are intensified by the high capital costs of competitive AI infrastructure, which create significant barriers for new entrants and concentrate AI capabilities in a few well-funded organizations. This situation hampers innovation among smaller media firms (Crawford, 2021). Training cutting-edge AI models can cost approximately \$100 billion, with ongoing inference and retraining expenses that grow as usage increases (Deloitte, 2025). Media companies often avoid building models from the ground up, but customizing and integrating AI still demand substantial investments. Moreover, attracting high-cost technical talent skilled in developing and maintaining AI systems is challenging, as many prefer roles with hyperscalers that offer higher pay (Deloitte, 2025). The rapid pace of AI development means investments can become outdated within six months, raising concerns about inefficiency and wasted funds (Deloitte, 2025). Additionally, organizations often struggle to fully utilize their AI infrastructure due to mismatches between peak demand and average usage, demand fluctuations, and rapid hardware obsolescence (Schwartz et al., 2020).

These investment pressures are heightened by deep uncertainty about return on investment. As AI adoption speeds up, executives expect their teams to focus not only on implementation but also on generating clear enterprise value, a particularly tough challenge for media companies already affected by two decades of digital disruption. The uncertain financial results of AI are worsened by rapid technological changes, which make long-term planning difficult and increase the risk of investing in soon-to-be-obsolete technology. Assessing AI's value is especially hard because it impacts content creation, audience analysis, advertising, and operations, areas that are hard to quantify directly, while the high deployment and expertise costs prevent smaller firms from competing with larger, tech-focused companies (Deloitte, 2024). Although many U.S. media companies are investing heavily, it's still uncertain if these investments will produce financial returns, as current funding strategies face notable challenges related to economic viability, efficiency, and societal effects (Mayanga, 2026). The absence of clear timelines for returns and profitability leads to ongoing tension between executives' strategic investments and their responsibilities to shareholders and investors (Mayanga, 2026).

Empirical data on AI returns present mixed signals. IDC (2025) suggests that companies adopting AI can reduce costs by up to 30%, underscoring the need for leaders to align substantial AI investments with tangible outcomes such as cost savings, improved quality, and greater efficiency. Conversely, a 2024 McKinsey report shows that although 72% of organizations use AI in some form, fewer than 30% can clearly demonstrate financial benefits (McKinsey, 2024). Gartner (2024) echoes this, indicating that generative AI is nearing the "trough of disillusionment," where initial enthusiasm wanes as limitations become evident, causing concern among media firms that invested early, who question whether expected benefits will be achieved. Similarly, a Reuters Institute (2024) study finds that while news organizations show interest in AI, most executives cite unclear ROI and a lack of proven financial gains as key barriers, exposing a gap between AI's promise and its actual value. For media companies, a lack of demonstrable ROI can lead to reduced internal investment, eroded

stakeholder and investor trust, and increased hesitation in AI adoption, putting them at a competitive disadvantage (PwC, 2024). To address this, media organizations need improved AI evaluation methods, clearer ways to measure value across content, sales, and operations, and the ability to learn and adapt continuously, rather than waiting for definitive ROI proofs that may not materialize soon.

Perhaps the most immediate and visceral concern is fear of job displacement and layoffs, affecting media workers at all levels. Goldman Sachs research (2025) predicts that widespread AI adoption could displace 6% to 7% of the U.S. workforce, with some scenarios estimating up to 50% by 2027 (AI Multiple, 2024). The media industry is especially vulnerable because AI increasingly performs content creation tasks. The International Monetary Fund estimates that 300 million full-time jobs worldwide could be impacted by AI-driven automation, though most will involve task-level changes rather than complete job loss (AI Multiple, 2024). This offers little reassurance to media professionals, as core activities like writing, editing, fact-checking, copywriting, and design are precisely what generative AI targets. This concern is supported by a clear trend: newsroom employment has fallen by 26% since 2008, a decline that predates but has been worsened by AI adoption (The Amsterdammer, 2023). Additionally, reduced search and social referral traffic, partly due to AI-powered answer engines, has further strained already fragile news outlets (Digital Content Next, 2024). Major tech firms supporting media have also announced significant layoffs, with Meta, Amazon, and Microsoft dismissing hundreds of employees. Some affected staff have expressed worries on social media about AI's role in layoffs. One Amazon worker stated, "I have worked for Amazon for 8 years and have received numerous promotions, including two last year, and I received an excellent review just a month ago" (The Amsterdammer, 2023).

Copyright Infringement and Intellectual Property Theft Concerns

Copyright concerns are arguably the most contentious and legally complex issues facing media companies in the AI era. Central to this problem is a key question: does training AI on copyrighted materials without permission or payment constitute copyright infringement? This debate has led to numerous lawsuits, Congressional hearings, and international policy discussions (Coffey, 2024; Trapova & Mezei, 2024). The December 2023 lawsuit by The New York Times against OpenAI and Microsoft was a significant milestone, accusing the companies of "widescale copying" of millions of articles to develop ChatGPT and other large language models (Khelif, 2024). The newspaper is asking the court to delete all models trained on its content and to award damages for alleged copyright violations. The case underscores the legal importance of copyright registration, with the lead counsel emphasizing that, to claim statutory damages, works must have been registered with the copyright office before or shortly after the infringement (Editor and Publisher, 2024).

At the heart of this dispute is the contested application of the "fair use" doctrine. AI companies often defend their training methods by arguing that using copyrighted materials to develop large language models is a transformative use that doesn't replace the original works (Borek, 2024). In contrast, media organizations strongly oppose this view, with Danielle Coffey, President and CEO of the News/Media Alliance, arguing that copyright registration signifies ownership and grants the right to enforce copyright protections (Editor and Publisher, 2024). The fair use defense faces multiple challenges in AI, as copyright law considers four factors: the purpose and character of the use, the nature of the copyrighted work, the amount and significance of the portion used, and the impact on the work's market value (Reilly, 2024). Because courts often look unfavorably on commercial use, and because AI platforms like ChatGPT, Midjourney, Gemini, DALL-E, and Claude operate on commercial subscription models that generate substantial revenue, OpenAI, for instance, earned approximately \$1.6 billion in 2023, the argument for transformative use is scrutinized closely (Reilly, 2024).

Media organizations are increasingly concerned about Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG), which allows AI systems to access and scrape live content via search engines. Coffey noted that this enables large language models to replicate breaking news and real-time updates verbatim, making AI direct competitors to the stories publishers cover as events unfold (Editor and Publisher, 2024). This poses a serious threat to media business models by enabling AI to provide answers without driving traffic to publishers' websites, thereby harming subscription and ad revenues (Columbia Journalism Review, 2023). In response, leading publishers such as The New York Times, News Corp, and AIC are reportedly considering forming a coalition to counter these shared risks (Columbia Journalism Review, 2023). An often-overlooked concern is the removal of Copyright Management Information (CMI), which includes copyright notices, titles, identifying details, and usage terms (Tech Policy Press, 2025). When AI systems strip this metadata during training or content creation, they remove vital attribution information that safeguards creators' rights and supports compensation. Additionally, the Student Press Law Center warned that using copyrighted material with AI raises significant issues regarding creator rights and user liability, emphasizing that anyone who republishes or rebroadcasts someone else's work is responsible (Student Press Law Center, 2025). This situation poses legal risks for journalists and media organizations that rely on AI-generated content without clear knowledge of its origin.

Ethics, Bias Concerns, and Compliance Considerations

The ethical aspects of AI in media extend beyond job concerns to include content quality, bias, transparency, accountability, and societal impacts (Diakopoulos, 2019; Jobin et al., 2019). Media organizations face serious ethical dilemmas regarding AI-generated content that challenge core journalistic values such as accuracy, responsibility, and openness, especially as AI becomes more involved in content creation (Student Press Law Center, 2025). This raises important questions: should AI-created content be labeled, and if so, how prominently? When AI helps produce content, how should authorship and accountability be assigned? What human oversight is needed to ensure AI outputs meet journalistic standards, and how can bias, stereotypes, or misinformation be prevented? Additional concerns include when AI-driven content personalization becomes manipulation and how issues surrounding authorship, creativity, and intellectual property complicate AI use in creative fields (Belam, 2023; Brittain & Dastin, 2023). The Reuters Institute reports that publishers view AI-assisted content creation as their biggest reputational risk, even as they plan to increase AI use a clear sign of the challenge in balancing efficiency with ethical responsibilities.

Questions of accountability and attribution become especially complex when AI systems create or heavily influence content. Traditional journalism relies on clear chains of responsibility, where reporters gather information, editors verify facts, and publishers are accountable for their publications. AI disrupts this clarity by using automated decision-making processes that can be opaque. When trained on large amounts of human-created work, AI raises issues of labor exploitation, content ownership, and attribution of creative input (Perrigo, 2023). The 2023 Hollywood writers' strike highlighted these concerns, with writers protesting AI replacing their work or using their creations for training without pay (Writers Guild of America, 2023). The Student Press Law Center emphasized that anyone who republishes or rebroadcasts content is responsible, a rule that applies to AI-generated content as well. However, assigning responsibility is complicated when content results from human prompts, AI processing, and automated editing (Student Press Law Center, 2025).

These accountability issues are closely tied to growing demands for transparency and disclosure. Regulations increasingly require disclosure of AI use in content creation, including the European Union's AI Act, which mandates transparency for specific applications (Trapova & Helberger, 2024), and various U.S. states that are passing bills to require disclosure of AI-generated political ads and deepfakes. Transparency and explainability pose unique challenges in media, where audiences need to understand how

content is produced and how decisions are made (Diakopoulos, 2015, 2019). Because journalistic credibility partly depends on transparency about methods and sources, the "black box" nature of complex machine learning algorithms, whose decision processes are hard to explain even to experts, is a significant concern (Burrell, 2016). As a result, media professionals may worry that using AI could undermine their ability to uphold ethical standards and clearly communicate their work. Organizations also face conflicting pressures: regulatory mandates to disclose AI use, audience expectations for transparency, fears that excessive disclosure might harm content credibility, and competitive pressures to hide AI use if rivals do not. Finding the right balance remains challenging as norms and rules continue to develop.

Bias and fairness issues pose significant ethical risks because AI systems can reinforce and magnify biases found in their training data. Studies have identified different types of AI bias, such as racial bias in facial recognition, gender bias in language models, and socioeconomic bias in content recommendations (World Economic Forum, 2025). In journalism, algorithmic bias is particularly concerning, as AI can strengthen stereotypes and discrimination in media content (Noble, 2018; O'Neal, 2016). When news outlets use automated writing tools trained on historical data, they risk perpetuating biases in sourcing, framing, and representation (Carlson, 2015). Grant Thornton highlighted the importance for organizations to consider bias, ethics, and employment practices when adopting AI, though the key difficulty is turning these considerations into effective policies and practices that reduce bias (Grant Thornton, 2024). Media professionals often worry that AI implementation may focus more on efficiency and profit than on ethical standards, which are vital to their professional identity and social responsibilities (Christians et al., 2009). If economic pressures lead organizations to replace human judgment with algorithms, the resulting content might serve commercial interests at the expense of public service, investigative depth, and artistic integrity that professionals cherish (Beckett, 2019; Carlson, 2015).

Data Quality and Governance Concerns

Data quality is a major obstacle to AI adoption in media organizations. The IAB State of Data 2025 report identified it as a key challenge, with nearly two-thirds of respondents expressing concerns about the quality of data used and generated (IAB, 2025). This concern is justified because AI systems depend on data quality; poor inputs lead to unreliable results. For media organizations, these issues manifest in various ways. AI trained on biased or incomplete data can spread inaccuracies, stereotypes, and misinformation. Additionally, the "hallucination" problem where AI confidently produces false information poses significant reputational risks, especially for media brands that have built trust over years. Finally, the secretive nature of training data makes it hard for media outlets to determine whether AI outputs are trustworthy (IAB, 2025).

These concerns about quality are accompanied by notable shortfalls in transparency and accountability. Half of media brands worry they lack visibility into how agency and publishing partners deploy AI, while an equal share of agencies are concerned about brands integrating AI internally and reducing their dependence on external partners (IAB, 2025). This mutual mistrust underscores broader fears about accountability in AI systems. The "black box" nature of many AI algorithms complicates understanding of decision-making processes, data influences, and error correction, which is particularly problematic for media outlets that rely on their ability to explain and justify editorial decisions.

Privacy concerns further increase hesitancy towards AI adoption. Since AI systems rely heavily on large data sets, they raise critical issues about consent, data collection, and security (World Economic Forum, 2025). Media organizations handling sensitive personal information (PII) about their audiences must ensure compliance with data privacy laws, such as the GDPR in Europe and state laws like the CCPA in the U.S. The legal risks go beyond privacy; the Student Press Law Center warned that reposting AI-generated content with libelous statements can make an organization directly liable (Student Press Law Center, 2025). This

liability encompasses copyright, privacy, and other legal concerns, posing significant risks for media outlets using AI content without proper safeguards.

Adding to these governance issues is the growing threat to data security and cybersecurity. As AI tools have become highly skilled at coding, they have also gained the ability to carry out cyberattacks; since malware is software, this change has greatly increased the scale, speed, and complexity of such attacks. Palo Alto Networks noted a fourfold rise in daily attacks on its thousands of clients from 2024 to 2025, as cybercriminals develop AI-driven viruses that can adapt immediately to evade detection, automate cyber-espionage against foreign governments, and exfiltrate data within minutes instead of hours (Palo Alto Networks, 2025). In this context, media organizations worry that proprietary data used to train custom AI models might be compromised, leaked, or misused, especially since many have adopted ChatGPT and similar generative AI tools with proprietary corporate data to boost productivity without fully understanding the security risks (Grant Thornton, 2024). The problem becomes more urgent because deploying generative AI often requires sharing private internal information with external platforms, raising critical questions about data storage, protection, access, and whether data might be used to train models accessible to competitors. To mitigate these risks, Grant Thornton (2024) recommends organizations clearly define their use cases, start with small proof-of-concept projects, conduct thorough risk assessments, know where their data is stored, implement strong data management practices, and involve legal and security teams early in the process.

Technical Implementation and Integration Challenges

A key obstacle to adopting AI in media organizations is the widespread lack of strategic planning and change management. The IAB State of Data 2025 report shows that 50% of the media and advertising sector lacks a defined strategic plan for AI deployment (Eng, 2025). This gap highlights several core issues, including uncertainty about which AI solutions will be truly valuable, challenges in identifying suitable use cases that align with organizational capabilities, limited expertise to assess different AI options, and concerns about investing in the wrong technologies. Without clear strategies, organizations risk implementing AI in disconnected, haphazard ways that may not deliver expected benefits and could add operational complexity. Additionally, the lack of direction hampers efforts to secure executive support and allocate resources effectively.

These strategic deficiencies are compounded by notable gaps in technical expertise. Traditionally, media organizations have prioritized creative and editorial skills over technical capabilities, leaving many unprepared for AI integration. The World Economic Forum's white paper highlighted that AI progress offers both opportunities and challenges for media, requiring more than software purchases; it demands fundamental capability development (World Economic Forum, 2025). Similarly, Deloitte's report noted that capturing, enhancing, and maximizing the unique value chains, workflows, and expertise in media and entertainment pose considerable challenges (Deloitte, 2025). To bridge these gaps, media companies need to develop or acquire skills in data science, machine learning, prompt engineering, and AI ethics capabilities many currently lack and find difficult to build internally.

Media organizations face significant challenges beyond their core expertise, particularly in scalability, performance, and integration with existing systems. Key concerns include whether AI can maintain accuracy when processing large volumes of content, handle peak loads during breaking news, and deliver real-time responses for digital journalism. These issues are especially critical for organizations producing vast amounts of content across multiple platforms, where an AI system that works in a small pilot might struggle at an enterprise level, posing operational risks. The problem is compounded by legacy infrastructure that predates modern AI. Integrating AI with content management, editorial workflows, distribution channels, and analytics tools involves complex technical hurdles,

particularly for organizations with limited IT staff. Additionally, maintaining business continuity throughout implementation is vital, as media outlets cannot halt operations; they must gradually adopt new systems without disrupting news publishing, content creation, or audience services.

Misinformation, Deepfakes, and Content Authenticity

Media organizations are concerned that AI-produced misinformation could erode public trust in journalism and legitimate news outlets, while flooding the information landscape with synthetic content that's becoming harder to differentiate from real reporting. Public concern is significant; the Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation Review found that 80% of Americans worry about AI and election misinformation (Yan et al., 2025). Evidence supports these fears: NewsGuard reported a tenfold increase in AI-driven fake news sites in 2023, many with minimal or no human oversight (University of Florida, 2024), and Google research noted a sharp rise in AI-generated image misinformation since early 2023 (CBC News, 2024). The Washington Post called this situation a "misinformation nightmare," highlighting how AI automates fake news production and drives a surge in websites spreading false information (The Washington Post, 2023).

The rise of synthetic content threatens already declining public trust in news media. A global survey found that 60% of respondents believe news outlets often report false stories, and 82% of Argentinians frequently encounter deliberately false stories. Additionally, 66% of U.S. consumers believe that at least 76% of news on social media is biased (Redline Digital, 2024). Notably, those who rely on television for AI news tend to have greater concerns about AI spreading election misinformation. This concern was particularly strong among people aged 65 and older, according to a Harvard Kennedy School study (Yan et al., 2025).

Deepfake technology, which uses AI to produce convincing but fake audio and video, poses a significant threat to media credibility. In 2023, Deep Media reported that the number of video deepfakes tripled and voice deepfakes increased eightfold compared with earlier years (Redline Digital, 2024). That year, an estimated 500,000 deepfakes circulated on social media (Redline Digital, 2024). Notable incidents highlight their disruptive potential: in May 2023, a fake AI-generated image of an explosion near the Pentagon temporarily affected the stock market (PBS News, 2023). Additionally, fabricated images of Donald Trump's arrest and of Pope Francis in a puffer jacket went viral, demonstrating how easily synthetic media can mislead audiences (BBC, 2023; CBS News, 2023). These trends have caused considerable concern among journalists; the Reuters Institute found that reporters feel "ambivalent about using AI for content creation" and worry about its impact on jobs and public trust. Over 33% of respondents view AI-driven newsgathering as risky because of concerns about accuracy and authenticity (Newman, 2024).

These issues are especially serious during elections and in the spread of political disinformation. With the 2024 elections affecting about 2 billion people across 50 countries, concerns over AI-driven political falsehoods have reached a peak (Virginia Tech News, 2024). Advanced generative AI can now replicate voices and generate hyper-realistic images, videos, and audio quickly and cheaply, making it possible for anyone to produce convincing content that could mislead voters and influence election results (PBS News, 2023). The potential threats include automated robocalls in a candidate's voice instructing voters to vote on the wrong day, fake audio recordings of candidates admitting to crimes or holding racist views, videos of speeches or interviews that never happened, and fake images that mimic local news reports claiming a candidate has dropped out (PBS News, 2023). These threats have already appeared: before the 2024 U.S. election, an AI-generated deepfake audio robocall featuring Senator Ted Cruz (R-TX) surfaced, and in 2025, a deepfake voice impersonation of U.S. Secretary of State Marco Rubio and other officials was used to contact foreign ministers. The FBI warns that these deepfake scams will grow more sophisticated as criminals develop new AI and deepfake tools (FBI, 2025).

Legislative and Regulatory Frameworks Uncertainty

The absence of clear regulatory frameworks raises significant concerns for media organizations adopting AI. The EU's AI Act is a step toward regulation, but its full effects remain uncertain (Trapova & Helberger, 2024). In the U.S., regulations vary widely by state and issue, creating a complex compliance landscape. Senator Hawley's proposed "No Section 230 Immunity for AI Act" reflects ongoing discussions about AI liability (Digital Content Next, 2024). Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act has traditionally shielded platforms from liability for user content, but its applicability to AI-generated output remains unclear. If AI companies lose this protection, they could face greater liability for harmful content, though the impact on media organizations using these tools remains uncertain.

This uncertainty is worsened by concerns that AI deployment might unintentionally breach regulations that organizations do not yet fully grasp. Grant Thornton's analysis identified issues related to bias, ethics, and employment practices, noting that New York City is the first area to explicitly regulate AI use in employee screening (Grant Thornton, 2024). The fast-moving development of AI technologies often surpasses regulatory efforts, leaving media groups unsure about their compliance responsibilities. In Europe, the AI Act is the first broad attempt to regulate AI, but its impact on media firms remains unclear (Trapova & Helberger, 2024), while in the U.S., legislative proposals around AI and Section 230 immunity add further uncertainty to future liabilities (Digital Content Next, 2024).

For organizations operating globally, these challenges are compounded by differences in international regulations. The European Union's human-centered approach to copyright stands in stark contrast to China's separation of authorship and ownership (Kuai, 2024), and data protection and content moderation rules also vary widely across countries. This fragmentation makes it difficult to develop unified AI strategies that work across markets, as solutions compliant in one jurisdiction might violate regulations in another. Consequently, media organizations often have to run multiple systems in parallel or accept the limitations of the most restrictive legal regime. In response to growing concerns, legislative efforts have increased. The Senate Judiciary Committee's January 2024 hearing, titled "Oversight of AI: The Future of Journalism," questioned whether current copyright laws sufficiently protect journalists from AI-related infringements (Digital Content Next, 2024). Senator Richard Blumenthal (D-CT) stressed the importance of providing remedies that are both effective and enforceable (Digital Content Next, 2024). Several witnesses proposed licensing agreements as a solution, pointing out that such practices are common in the music, radio, and local TV sectors (Digital Content Next, 2024). Moreover, Senator Josh Hawley (R-MO) introduced the "No Section 230 Immunity for AI Act" along with a comprehensive AI legislative framework covering licensing, transparency, and trustworthiness issues (Digital Content Next, 2024).

Theoretical Frameworks that inform U.S. media professionals' views on AI adoption

This paper integrates multiple theoretical frameworks to provide a comprehensive understanding of media professionals' fears regarding AI adoption. The theoretical framework draws from technology acceptance theory, diffusion of innovations, professional identity theory, organizational change theory, and critical technology studies.

Professional Identity Theory

Professional identity theory (Pratt et al., 2006; Ibarra, 1999) holds that individuals derive significant aspects of self-concept from their occupations, particularly in fields requiring specialized expertise and offering intrinsic rewards. Media professionals' identities are constructed around values such as creativity, autonomy, public service, and craft excellence (Deuze, 2005; Hanitzsch & Vos, 2017). An identity threat arises when external forces challenge individuals' sense of professional self (Petriglieri, 2011). This research paper examines how AI capabilities that replicate or replace human creative and cognitive functions threaten media professionals' identities and how this threat manifests as fear, anxiety, and resistance. It also explores which aspects of

professional identity feel most threatened by AI and how professionals engage in identity work to preserve valued self-concepts.

The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)

The Technology Acceptance Model (Davis, 1989) offers a foundation for understanding technology adoption, proposing that perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use shape attitudes toward technology, which in turn influence behavioral intentions and actual use. However, this conceptual research paper extends TAM by foregrounding emotional responses, particularly fear and anxiety that may override rational assessments of usefulness when technologies threaten professional survival (Venkatesh & Bala, 2008). The paper examines how fear about job security, creative control, and professional identity interact with perceptions of AI usefulness and usability to shape adoption behaviors and resistance patterns.

Diffusion of Innovations Theory

Rogers' (2003) diffusion of innovations theory offers insights into how new technologies spread through social systems and the factors that influence adoption rates. The theory identifies innovation characteristics (relative advantage, compatibility, complexity, trialability, observability) and adopter categories that shape diffusion patterns. This research paper applies diffusion theory by examining how AI technologies' characteristics and professionals' individual differences shape adoption or resistance. However, the paper also critically interrogates assumptions in diffusion theory that treat resistance as problematic rather than potentially rational, and examines when and why resistance to AI adoption may be justified (Selwyn, 2003).

Organizational Change Theory

Organizational change literature emphasizes that successful change requires addressing the human dimensions of transformation, including emotional responses, communication, participation, and consideration for employee welfare (Kotter, 2012; Armenakis & Harris, 2009). Change-related anxiety arises when employees perceive threats to their security, status, or values (Bordia et al., 2004). This paper applies organizational change theory to examine how AI implementation processes either exacerbate or mitigate professionals' fears. The research investigates which change management approaches professionals believe would address their concerns while enabling beneficial innovation.

Critical Technology Studies (CTS)

Critical technology studies challenge technological determinism and examine how technologies embody social values, power relations, and economic interests (Feenberg, 2002; Winner, 1980). Scholars in this tradition argue that technology is not neutral but is shaped by and shapes social relations, often benefiting some groups while harming others (Noble, 2018; Hare, 2022). This research paper applies critical perspectives to examine how AI adoption in media organizations serves particular economic interests, such as cost reduction and efficiency gains, while potentially harming workers and compromising the social functions of media. The paper treats professional resistance not as irrational but as potentially rational responses to technologies that threaten legitimate interests and values (Selwyn, 2003).

Strategic Recommendations for Navigating Fear of AI Adoption in U.S. Media Organizations Section

Fears about adopting artificial intelligence across U.S. media organizations, including business model disruption, economic uncertainty, misinformation, copyright infringement, data governance, ethics, regulatory ambiguity, and technical integration, are neither irrational nor insurmountable. They reflect a sector facing genuine existential pressures while also risking competitive irrelevance if it fails to adapt. The following five strategic recommendations offer a coordinated framework for

media organizations to address these concerns constructively, transforming defensive anxiety into deliberate, sustainable action.

Establish a Formal AI Governance Framework and Strategic Roadmap Before Scaling Adoption

Media organizations should resist the pressure to "hurry up and AI the everything" (Inc., 2025) and instead develop a formal, board-approved AI governance framework and strategic roadmap before committing significant resources. This can be accomplished by establishing the AI Review Board, an internal committee comprising representatives from various business units. The Board's role is to evaluate and oversee AI risk and governance across the organization before adopting AI, machine learning, and automation. This approach aims to increase efficiency, improve decision-making, and reduce manual effort in critical areas such as business process automation, IT operations, and cybersecurity. Additionally, it strengthens governance and compliance by continuously developing and reviewing company-wide AI guidelines and tools.

This directly addresses the finding that half of the media and advertising industry lacks a clear strategic roadmap for AI implementation, leading to fragmented, ad hoc deployments that fail to deliver promised benefits (Eng, 2025). A structured roadmap should define approved use cases, set risk thresholds, and align AI investments with measurable business outcomes, including cost savings, quality improvements, and time efficiency (IDC, 2025). Crucially, this framework must acknowledge the "innovator's dilemma," recognizing that moving too quickly risks reputational damage, legal liability, and ethical compromise, while moving too slowly risks competitive disadvantage and market irrelevance, a tension that demands deliberate navigation rather than reactive decision-making (West, 2023; Mayanga, 2026). Organizations are advised to "start small, get a proof of concept going, do a risk analysis, understand where your data is, have really good data management, and work with your legal counsel and information security teams first" (Grant Thornton, 2024).

Diversify Revenue Through Strategic Licensing While Protecting Core Business Models

To address risks like traffic diversion, search displacement, and revenue loss, media groups should establish strategic content licensing deals with AI firms and also defend against unauthorized content extraction. The pattern is clear: in 2024, OpenAI secured licensing agreements with News Corp, the Financial Times, The Atlantic, The Associated Press, Axel Springer, DotDash Meredith, and Vox Media, while Perplexity AI introduced a revenue-sharing partnership with Time, Der Spiegel, Fortune, and The Texas Tribune (Digiday, 2024). Le Monde's CEO Louis Dreyfus described these agreements as "strengthening our business model by creating a substantial, multi-year revenue stream" (Digiday, 2024). However, organizations must approach these agreements with clear-eyed realism, given that nearly 48% of news executives believe there will be very little money for publishers in AI licensing deals and 35% believe most revenue will flow to large publishers (Newman, 2024). Smaller and independent outlets, which lack negotiating leverage, should therefore explore collective bargaining coalitions, following the model of major publishers who considered forming an alliance to address these threats (Columbia Journalism Review, 2023), to avoid further marginalization in a market projected to grow from \$19.5 billion in 2024 to \$99.48 billion by 2034 (Polaris Market Research, 2025).

Implement Rigorous Data Governance, Provenance Tracking, and Cybersecurity Controls

Given that data quality ranks among the top barriers to AI adoption, with nearly two-thirds of respondents citing concerns about the quality of data used and produced (IAB, 2025), media organizations must invest in rigorous data governance, provenance tracking, and cybersecurity infrastructure. Poor-quality inputs inevitably produce unreliable outputs, and the "hallucination" problem, in which AI confidently generates false information, poses severe reputational risks for brands that have spent decades building credibility (IAB, 2025). Organizations must also confront escalating security threats, as AI tools proficient at coding now excel at executing cyberattacks;

Palo Alto Networks observed a fourfold increase in daily attacks across its client base from 2024 to 2025 (The Atlantic, 2026). Media organizations should establish clear protocols governing what proprietary data is shared with AI platforms, where it is stored, who has access, and whether it may be used to train competitor-accessible models (Grant Thornton, 2024). Compliance with data privacy regulations, including GDPR and the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA), must be embedded in every AI application handling personally identifiable information, particularly given the third-party liability risk that reposting AI-generated material containing libelous or infringing content can create direct legal exposure (Student Press Law Center, 2025).

Adopt Transparent, Ethically Grounded Content Standards with Human Oversight

Media organizations should codify transparent, ethically grounded standards for AI-generated content that preserve journalistic integrity and public trust. This recommendation responds to the finding that publishers view AI-assisted content creation as their single biggest reputational risk, even among those planning to expand AI use (Newman, 2024). Clear editorial policies must specify whether and how AI-generated content is labeled, how authorship and accountability are attributed, and the level of human oversight required to meet journalistic standards (Student Press Law Center, 2025). These standards are essential given the documented erosion of public trust; four out of five Americans expressed concern about AI's role in election misinformation (Yan et al., 2025), while AI-enabled fake news sites increased tenfold in 2023 (University of Florida, 2024). Organizations must also implement bias-mitigation practices, recognizing that AI systems trained on historical archives risk reproducing biases in sourcing, framing, and representation (Noble, 2018; Carlson, 2015). By maintaining clear chains of editorial responsibility and prioritizing accuracy, accountability, and transparency in line with established journalistic codes of ethics, media organizations can distinguish authentic reporting from the synthetic content flooding the information ecosystem, turning trust itself into a competitive advantage (Diakopoulos, 2019).

Build Internal Capability and Establish Continuous ROI Evaluation Mechanisms

Media organizations must invest in building internal technical capability while establishing continuous, multidimensional ROI evaluation mechanisms rather than waiting for definitive proof of financial return. This approach addresses the persistent challenge that, while 72% of organizations use AI in some form, fewer than 30% can demonstrate clear financial gains (McKinsey, 2024), and that most news executives view unclear ROI as a major obstacle to adoption (Reuters Institute, 2024). Because media organizations traditionally prioritized creative and editorial expertise over technical capabilities, they must now develop or acquire competencies in data science, machine learning, prompt engineering, and AI ethics (World Economic Forum, 2025), while contending with the difficulty of attracting technical talent that prefers hyper-scalers able to pay premium salaries (Deloitte, 2025). Given that generative AI is approaching the "trough of disillusionment" (Gartner, 2024) and that early investments may require updates within six months due to rapid model obsolescence (Deloitte, 2025), media organizations should develop robust evaluation methods that measure value across content, sales, and operations, and cultivate the capacity to learn and adjust continuously rather than awaiting perfect ROI proof, which is unlikely to materialize soon (PwC, 2024). This adaptive posture allows media organizations to capture efficiency gains, with AI implementation potentially cutting costs by as much as 30% (IDC, 2025), while managing the financial risk inherent in a rapidly evolving technology landscape.

Conclusion

This research paper explores the diverse fears and concerns surrounding artificial intelligence adoption in U.S. media organizations, situating current anxieties within a broader historical, theoretical, and strategic framework. It shows that AI fears are not uniform or irrational but complex and multidimensional, encompassing job loss, disruption of business models, copyright violations, ethical concerns, data management, misinformation, and regulatory challenges (Boyd,

2025; Li & Huang, 2020; Zhan et al., 2024). Viewing these fears as a single, undifferentiated entity, as most existing research does, overlooks their varied and often logical origins. For example, a journalist's worry about automated news differs significantly from an executive's concern over investment returns or a reader's apprehension about synthetic media. Effective responses must be tailored to these specific concerns.

The historical record offers valuable insights into current issues. From scribes being replaced by the printing press to journalists resisting the telegraph, and from the Press-Radio War of the 1930s to the profound impacts of television, the internet, and social media, technological upheavals have consistently sparked initial resistance, followed by adaptation and eventual change (Eisenstein, 2005; Mindich, 1998; Veras, 2025). However, this analysis indicates that AI represents more than another cycle. Unlike previous innovations that threatened manual labor or distribution, AI directly affects human cognition in central media industry tasks such as writing, editing, analysis, and creative judgment. Moreover, AI arrives at a time when the industry is already fragile: newsroom employment has decreased by 26% since 2008, and digital disruptions over two decades have significantly weakened the sector's resilience to new shocks (The Amsterdammer, 2023). The convergence of existential, economic, ethical, and informational challenges within a single, pervasive technology is unprecedented in history and demands thoughtful, deliberate, and comprehensive responses.

The evidence shows that media professionals' worries stem from real trends, not just technophobia. AI answer engines threaten to reduce search traffic and subscription revenue (Newman, 2024; Digiday, 2024). Copyright disputes, such as The New York Times' lawsuit against OpenAI, highlight ongoing concerns about unpaid journalism (Khelif, 2024). Additionally, AI-generated fake news sites increased tenfold in a year (University of Florida, 2024). Fewer than 30% of organizations using AI demonstrate clear financial gains (McKinsey & Company, 2024). This review integrates theories such as professional identity, the Technology Acceptance Model, diffusion of innovations, organizational change, and critical technology studies. These frameworks clarify why fears often turn into resistance, which may be a rational response to technological threats to core interests and values rather than mere opposition (Petriglieri, 2011; Selwyn, 2003; Rogers, 2003).

This research paper's strategic recommendations aim to balance the risks of rushing into AI adoption with the dangers of being overly cautious. By implementing formal AI governance before expansion, diversifying revenue streams through strategic licensing while safeguarding core business models, enforcing strict data governance and cybersecurity protocols, establishing clear, ethical content standards with human oversight, and building internal expertise through continuous ROI evaluation, media organizations can transform reactive fears into deliberate, sustainable strategies. These recommendations recognize the 'innovator's dilemma' faced by media leaders, in which moving too fast could damage reputation and ethics, while moving too slowly risks losing the competitive edge. They also highlight that solutions should be based on a structured, values-driven approach rather than reactive measures (West, 2023; Mayanga, 2026; Grant Thornton, 2024).

The future of AI in U.S. media hinges more on how media organizations decide to respond than on the technology itself. History indicates that industries thriving amid technological shifts are those that actively shape the integration according to their core values, instead of resisting or surrendering. For journalism, fundamental values such as accuracy, accountability, transparency, independence, and public service differentiate authentic reporting from the rising tide of synthetic content. As AI-generated content inundates the information landscape, trust becomes journalism's most vital competitive advantage (Diakopoulos, 2019). While these concerns are valid and require serious institutional measures, they should not lead to inaction. Media organizations that confront these challenges directly through governance, strategy, ethics, and staff investment will be best equipped to navigate the AI era and define responsible, trustworthy journalism.

References

- AI Multiple. (2024). *Jobs at risk from AI: Analyzing millions of job listings*. <https://research.aimultiple.com/jobs-at-risk-from-ai/>
- The Amsterdammer. (2023, December 7). *AI and journalism: Job losses and industry transformation*. <https://theamsterdammer.com>
- Anderson, C.W. (2021). Fake news is not a virus: On Platforms and their effects. *Communication Theory*, 31(1), 42-61. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ct/qtaa008>
- Armenakis, A.A. & Harris, S.G. (2009). Reflections: Our Journey in organizational change research and practice. *Journal of Change Management*, 9(2), 127-142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14697010902879079>
- Artificial Intelligence and Journalism (2025): A systematic bibliometric and thematic analysis of global research. *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/html/2507.10891v1>
- Bannerman, S. (2024). AI governance in Canada: Policy silence and the concentration of media power. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 49(2).
- BBC. (2023, March 24). *Fake Trump arrest photos: How to spot an AI-generated image*. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-65069316>
- Beckett, C. (2019). *New powers, new responsibilities: A global survey of journalism and artificial intelligence*. London School of Economics and Political Science.
- Beckett, C. (2020). *News powers, new responsibilities: A global survey of journalism and artificial intelligence*. London School of Economics Polis/Google News Initiative.
- Belam, M. (2023, July 26). The machines will not replace us: Hollywood strike highlights threat of AI. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/film/2023/jul/26/Hollywood-strike-ai-artificial-intelligence>
- Blondheim, M. (1994). *News over the wires: The telegraph and the flow of public information in America, 1844-1897*. Harvard University Press.
- Bordia, P., Hobman, E., Jones, E., Gallois, C., & Callan, V. J. (2004). Uncertainty during organizational change: Types, consequences, and management strategies. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 18(4), 507-532. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JOB.0000028449.99127.f7>
- Borek, J. (2024). *Fair use and the training of large language models: A transformative approach*. Harvard Journal of Law & Technology Digest.
- Boyd, K. (2025). *AI anxiety: Calm in the face of change*. https://www.sas.com/en_gb/insights/articles/analytics/ai-anxiety-calm-in-the-face-of-change.html
- Brennen, J. S., Howard, P. N., & Nielsen, R. K. (2020). *An industry-led debate: How U.K. media cover artificial intelligence*. Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.
- Brittain, B., & Dastin, J. (2023, January 17). Artists sue AI art generator over copyright infringement. *Reuters*. <https://www.reuters.com/legal/artists-sue-ai-art-generator-midjourney-copyright-infringement-2023-01-16/>
- Brookings Institution. (2024, March 25). *Can journalism survive AI?* <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/can-journalism-survive-ai/>
- Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Burrell, J. (2016). How the machine 'thinks': Understanding opacity in machine learning algorithms. *Big Data & Society*, 3(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951715622512>
- Carey, J. W. (1989). *Communication as culture: Essays on media and society*. Unwin Hyman.
- Carlson, M. (2015). The robotic reporter: Automated journalism and the redefinition of labor, compositional forms, and journalistic authority. *Digital Journalism*, 3(3), 416-431.
- CBC News. (2024, November 19). *Google launches new measures to detect AI-generated images used in misinformation*. <https://www.cbc.ca>
- CBS News. (2023, March 27). *Pope Francis in a puffer jacket: How a viral AI-generated image fooled millions*. <https://www.cbsnews.com>
- Chan-Olmsted, S. (2019). *Media industry challenges and AI integration*.
- Chin-Rothmann, C. (2023). *Navigating the risks of artificial intelligence on the digital news landscape*. Center for Strategic & International Studies (CSIS). <https://www.csis.org/analysis/navigating-risks-artificial-intelligence-digital-news-landscape>
- Christians, C. G., Glasser, T. L., McQuail, D., Nordenstreng, K., & White, R. A. (2009). *Normative theories of the media: Journalism in democratic societies*. University of Illinois Press.
- Coffey, D. (2024). *Testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee. Oversight of AI: The future of journalism*. News/Media Alliance.
- Columbia Journalism Review. (2023, October 23). *Major publishers are reportedly considering a coalition to negotiate with AI companies*. <https://www.cjr.org>
- Crawford, K. (2021). *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary costs of artificial intelligence*. Yale University Press.
- CSIS. (2025, February 28). *Navigating the risks of artificial intelligence on the digital news landscape*. <https://www.csis.org/analysis/navigating-risks-artificial-intelligence-digital-news-landscape>

- Czitrom, D. J. (1982). *Media and the American mind: From Morse to McLuhan*. University of North Carolina Press.
- Davis, F.D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319-340. <https://doi.org/10.2307/249008>
- Deloitte. (2024). *State of generative AI in the enterprise: Navigating from potential to performance*. Deloitte Insights. <https://www.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/topics/emerging-technologies/generative-ai-roi-enterprise.html>
- Deloitte. (2025). 2025 media and entertainment industry outlook. Deloitte Insights. <https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/industry/technology/technology-media-and-telecom-predictions.html>
- Deuze, M. (2005). What is journalism? Professional identity and ideology of journalists reconsidered. *Journalism*, 6(4), 442-464. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884905056815>
- Diakopoulos, N. (2015). Algorithmic accountability: Journalistic investigation of computational power structures. *Digital Journalism*, 3(3), 398-415. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2014.976411>
- Diakopoulos, N. (2019). *Automating the news: How algorithms are rewriting the media*. Harvard University Press.
- Digiday. (2024). *AI deals roundup: How publishers are partnering with OpenAI, Perplexity and others*. <https://digiday.com>
- Digital Content Next. (2024). *Senate Judiciary hearing examines AI's impact on journalism*. <https://digitalcontentnext.org>
- Dorr, K.N. (2016). Mapping the field of Algorithmic Journalism. *Digital Journalism*, 4(6), 700-722. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2015.1096748>
- Editor and Publisher. (2024). *Copyright registration gives publishers powerful weapon against AI*. <https://www.editorandpublisher.com>
- Eisenstein, E. L. (1979). *The printing press as an agent of change: Communications and cultural transformations in early modern Europe (Vol. 1-2)*. Cambridge University Press.
- Eisenstein, E. L. (2005). *The printing revolution in early modern Europe* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Eng, D. (2025). IAB releases State of Data 2025 report. Interactive Advertising Bureau. <https://www.iab.com>
- FBI. (2025). *FBI Warns of Account Takeover Scams Targeting Various Sectors*. <https://www.ic3.gov/PSA/2025/PSA251125>
- Feenberg, A. (2002). *Transforming technology: A critical theory revisited*. Oxford University Press.
- Fengyi, D., Zichen, Z., Yajun, L., Xiaoping, M., & Yue, Z. (2025). *When everyone is talking about AI: The development of fear of missing out on AI scale*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2025.102283>
- Frey, C. B. (2019). *The technology trap: Capital, labor, and power in the age of automation*. Princeton University Press.
- Frontiers in Communication. (2025, April 9). *The use and ethical implications of artificial intelligence, collaboration, and participation in local Ibero-American newsrooms*. <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/communication/articles/10.3389/fcomm.2025.1539844/full>
- Fullview. (2025). *200+ AI statistics & trends for 2025: The ultimate roundup*. <https://www.fullview.io/blog/ai-statistics>
- Füssel, S. (2005). *Gutenberg and the impact of printing* (D. Martin, Trans.). Ashgate.
- Gartner. (2024). *Hype cycle for emerging technologies, 2024*. Gartner Research. <https://www.gartner.com/en/research/methodologies/gartner-hype-cycle>
- Goldman Sachs Research. (2025). *AI could displace as many as 300 million jobs. Here's how to navigate it*. <https://www.goldmansachs.com/insights/articles/ai-could-displace-as-many-as-300-million-jobs>
- Görnemann, E., & Spiekermann, S. (2022). Emotional responses to human values in technology: The case of conversational agents. *Human-Computer Interaction*, 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07370024.2022.2136094>
- Grand View Research. (2024). *Artificial intelligence in media & entertainment market size report, 2030*. <https://www.grandviewresearch.com>
- Grant Thornton. (2024). *Generative AI in media and entertainment: Opportunities and challenges*. <https://www.grantthornton.com>
- Hanitzsch, T., & Vos, T.P. (2017). Journalistic roles and the struggle over institutional identity: The discursive constitution of journalism. *Communication Theory*, 27(2), 115-135. <https://doi.org/10.1111/comt.12112>
- Hare, S. (2022). *Technology is Not Neutral: A Short Guide to Technology Ethics*. London Publishing Partnership.
- The Harvard Gazette. (2025, October 20). *AI presents challenges to journalism - but also opportunities*. <https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2025/10/ai-presents-challenges-to-journalism-but-also-opportunities/>
- IAB. (2025). *State of Data 2025*. <https://www.iab.com/insights/state-of-data-2025/>
- Ibarra, H. (1999). Provisional selves: Experimenting with image and identity in professional adaptation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(4), 764-791. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2667055>
- IDC Research. (2025). *IDC FutureScape: Worldwide IT Industry 2025 Predictions*. <https://my.idc.com/research/viewtoc.jsp?containerId=US51736824>
- Inc. (2025, December 31). *How FOMO Is Turning AI Into a Cybersecurity Nightmare*. <https://www.inc.com/nick-selby/how-fomo-is-turning-ai-into-a-cybersecurity-nightmare/91261473>
- Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The Global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(9), 389-399. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2>
- Johns, A. (1998). *The nature of the book: Print and knowledge in the making*. University of Chicago Press.
- Khelif, A. (2024). *The New York Times v. OpenAI: Examining copyright in the age of AI*. Technology Policy Review.

- Kotter, J.P. (2012). *Leading change*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- Kuai, L. (2024). Copyright, authorship and AI-generated journalism: Comparative perspectives from the EU and China. *Digital Journalism*, 12(3), 412-429.
- Li, J., & Huang, J. S. (2020). Dimensions of artificial intelligence anxiety based on the integrated fear acquisition theory. *Technology in Society*, 63, Article 101410. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2020.101410>
- Love, H. (1993). *Scribal publication in seventeenth-century England*. Oxford University Press.
- Mayanga, K. (2026). Big Tech Companies' Massive Capex Spending on AI Investment Plans Doesn't Add Up, And the Math Could Break the Entire Tech Industry. *Scientia Moralitas Journal*, 11(1), 23-42.
- McKinsey & Company. (2024). *The state of AI in 2024: GenAI adoption spikes and starts to generate value*. McKinsey Global Institute. <https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/quantumblack/our-insights/the-state-of-ai>
- McKinsey. (2025, March). The State of AI. https://www.mckinsey.com/~media/mckinsey/business%20functions/quantumblack/our%20insights/the%20state%20of%20ai/2025/the-state-of-ai-how-organizations-are-rewiring-to-capture-value_final.pdf
- McKitterick, D. (2003). *Print, manuscript and the search for order, 1450-1830*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mindich, D. T. Z. (1998). *Just the facts: How "objectivity" came to define American journalism*. New York University Press.
- Mokyr, J. (1990). *The lever of riches: Technological creativity and economic progress*. Oxford University Press.
- Molina, M. D., & Sundar, S. S. (2022). Does distrust in humans predict greater trust in AI? Role of individual differences in user responses to content moderation. *New Media & Society*, 1461444822110353. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444822110353>
- Newman, N. (2024). Journalism, media and technology trends and predictions 2024. *Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism*. <https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/journalism-media-and-technology-trends-and-predictions-2024>
- Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. NYU Press.
- O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown.
- Ouchy, L., et al. (2020). AI in the headlines: The portrayal of the ethical issues of artificial intelligence in the media. *AI & Society*, 35(4), 927-936. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-020-00965-5>
- Palo Alto Networks. (2025, December 16). *State of Cloud Security Report 2025*. <https://www.paloaltonetworks.com/state-of-cloud-native-security>
- PBS News. (2023, October 17). *How AI deepfakes could change the 2024 election*. <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/politics/how-ai-deepfakes-could-change-the-2024-election>
- Pepperdine University. (2024). *Media and entertainment data in America 2024: An industry analysis*. Graziadio Business School Digital Commons. <https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1034&context=graziadiowps>
- Perrigo, B. (2023, February 9). The AI arms race is changing everything. *TIME*. <https://time.com/6255952/ai-impact-chatgpt-microsoft-google/>
- Petriglieri, J.L. (2011). Under threat: Responses to and consequences of threats to individuals' identities. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(4), 641-662. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2009.0087>
- Pettegree, A. (2010). *The book in the Renaissance*. Yale University Press.
- Pew Research Center. (2025, February 25). *U.S. Workers Are More Worried Than Hopeful About Future AI Use in the Workplace*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2025/02/25/u-s-workers-are-more-worried-than-hopeful-about-future-ai-use-in-the-workplace/>
- Pindrop. (2024). The impact of deepfakes on journalism. *Pindrop Security Research*. <https://www.pindrop.com/article/deepfakes-impacting-trust-media/>
- Polaris Market Research. (2025). *AI in media and entertainment market share, size, trends, industry analysis report*. <https://www.polarismarketresearch.com>
- Pratt, M. G., Rockmann, K. W., & Kaufmann, J. B. (2006). Constructing professional identity: The role of work and identity learning cycles in the customization of identity among medical residents. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(2), 235-262. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2006.2078706>
- PwC. (2024a). *2024 AI business predictions: Turning promise into performance*. PricewaterhouseCoopers. <https://www.pwc.com/us/en/tech-effect/ai-analytics/ai-predictions.html>
- PwC. (2024b). *U.S. edition: Global entertainment & media outlook 2025-2029*. <https://www.pwc.com/us/en/industries/tmt/library/global-entertainment-media-outlook.html>
- Redline Digital. (2024). *The state of misinformation: AI-generated fake news and deepfakes in 2024*. <https://www.redlinedigital.com>
- Reilly, E. (2024). Generative AI and copyright law: Legal challenges and fair use considerations. *Stanford Technology Law Review*, 27(1).
- Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism. (2024a). *AI and elections: What publishers need to know*. University of Oxford. <https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk>
- Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism. (2024b). *Journalism, media, and technology trends and predictions 2024*. Reuters Institute, University of Oxford. <https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/journalism-media-and-technology-trends-and-predictions-2024>

- Rogers, E.M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.
- Schudson, M. (1978). *Discovering the news: A social history of American newspapers*. Basic Books.
- Schwartz, R., et al. (2020). Green AI. *Communications of the ACM*, 63(12), 54-63. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3381831>
- Selwyn, N. (2003). Apart from technology: Understanding people's non-use of information and communication technologies in everyday life. *Technology in Society*, 25(1), 99-116. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-791X\(02\)00062-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-791X(02)00062-3)
- SEO.AI. (2024, December 2). *AI Replacing Jobs Statistics Report: The Impact on Employment in 2025*. <https://seo.ai/blog/ai-replacing-jobs-statistics>
- Stadelmann, T. (2025). *How Not to Fear AI [TEDxZHAW]*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=deVbPhViMQ&t=524s>
- Standage, T. (1998). *The Victorian internet: The remarkable story of the telegraph and the nineteenth century's on-line pioneers*. Walker.
- Stanford HAI. (2025). *The AI Index 2025 Annual Report*. *AI Index Steering Committee*, Institute for Human-Centered AI, Stanford University. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2504.07139>
- Statista. (2023). *Concern about AI replacing human jobs in the United States in 2023, by occupation*. <https://www.statista.com>
- Stephens, M. (2007). *A history of news* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Student Press Law Center. (2025). *AI in student media: Legal and ethical considerations*. <https://splc.org/2025/01/ai-in-student-media/>
- Tech Policy Press. (2025). *Copyright management information and AI: Protecting creator rights*. <https://techpolicy.press>
- Thompson Reuters Foundation. (2025, January). *Journalism in the AI era: Opportunities and challenges in the Global South and Emerging Economies*. <https://www.trust.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/TRF-Insights-Journalism-in-the-AI-Era.pdf>
- TIME. (2024, January 18). *A New Nonprofit Is Seeking to Solve the AI Copyright Problem*. <https://time.com/6564041/ai-copyright-fairly-trained/>
- Trapova, A., & Helberger, N. (2024). The AI Act and its implications for media and journalism. *European Journal of Law and Technology*, 15(1).
- Trithemius, J. (1974). *In praise of scribes: De laude scriptorum* (K. Arnold, Ed.; R. Behrendt, Trans.). Coronado Press. (Original work published 1492)
- Túñez-López, J. M., et al. (2023). Automation, bots, and algorithms in news making: From artificial intelligence to automated journalism. *Journalism Practice*, 13(8), 1056-1074. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2019.16899395>
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2024). *Media and communication occupations*. Occupational Outlook Handbook. <https://www.bls.gov/ooh/media-and-communication/>
- Ufarte Ruiz, M. J., & Manfredi Sanchez, J. L. (2019). Algorithms and bots applied to journalism. *Doxa Comunicacion*, 29, 213-233. <https://doi.org/10.31921/doxacom.n29a11>
- University of Florida. (2024). *Combating AI-generated misinformation: Strategies for media organizations*. College of Journalism and Communications. <https://www.jou.ufl.edu>
- Venkatesh, V., & Bala, H. (2008). Technology Acceptance Model 3 and a research agenda on interventions. *Decision Sciences*, 39(2), 273-315.
- Ventionteams. (2024). *AI adoption statistics 2024: All figures & facts to know*. <https://ventionteams.com/solutions/ai/adoption-statistics>
- Veras, M. (2025, May 6). *How Humanity Has Always Feared Change: Are You Afraid of Artificial Intelligence?* Cureus. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.83602>
- Veras, M., Dyer, J.O., Shannon, H., et al. (2024). A mixed methods crossover randomized controlled trial exploring the experiences, perceptions, and usability of artificial intelligence (ChatGPT) in health sciences education. *Digital Health*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20552076241298485>
- Virginia Tech News. (2024). *Elections and AI-generated misinformation: What voters need to know*. <https://vt.edu/news>
- Washington Post. (2023, November 8). *AI's misinformation nightmare: Fake news sites proliferate*. <https://www.washingtonpost.com>
- West, D.M. (2023). *The Risks and Realities of Artificial Intelligence*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Winner, L. (1980). Do artifacts have politics? *Daedalus*, 109(1), 121-136. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20024652>
- World Economic Forum. (2025). *Why public uncertainty is a defining challenge of the AI era*. <https://www.weforum.org/stories/2025/11/why-public-uncertainty-is-a-defining-challenge-of-the-ai-era/>
- Writers Guild of America. (2023). *2023 MBA summary of changes*. <https://www.wga.org/>
- Yan, Y., et al. (2025). Public concern about AI in elections: A national survey analysis. *Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation Review*, 6(1).
- Zhan, E. S., Molina, M. D., Rheu, M., & Peng, W. (2024). What is there to fear? Understanding multi-dimensional fear of AI from a technological affordance perspective. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 40(22), 7127-7144. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2023.2261731>