

Artificial Intelligence's Application in Journalistic Practice in Terms of Digital Transformation*

Vladyslav Teremetskyi¹, Oleksandr Ryzhenko², Liudmila Ryzhenko³,
Viktoriia Klymiuk⁴, Andrii Smus⁵

¹ Mamutov Institute of Economic and Legal Research of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, ² Academy of Labour, Social Relations and Tourism, Ukraine, ³

National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine,

⁴ Academician Stepan Demianchuk International University of Economics and Humanities, Ukraine, ⁵ Academician Stepan Demianchuk International University of Economics and Humanities, Rivne, Ukraine.



[10.15408/jch.v13i3.46852](https://doi.org/10.15408/jch.v13i3.46852)

Abstract

The article examines the problems of regulatory and legal support for the use of artificial intelligence technologies in journalism in Ukraine in the context of modern digital transformations. Utilising interdisciplinary and comparative legal analysis, the legal nature of AI as an object of regulation is examined, the state of national legislation in the media sphere is characterised, and gaps in the regulatory framework for the use of AI in journalism are identified. This study places particular emphasis on the analysis of two significant documents: the EU Regulation No. 2024/1689, also known as the "Artificial Intelligence Act", and the European Parliament Resolution on AI in the audiovisual sector. These documents are of particular significance as they serve to enshrine the principles of transparency, non-discrimination, ethical use of algorithms, and protection of freedom of expression. The implementation of the relevant provisions of the Acquis Communautaire into Ukrainian national legislation is justified by the aim of ensuring information security, freedom of speech, and European integration. The analysis yielded a proposed model of regulatory harmonisation, which entails the incorporation of specific AI regulations within the Ukrainian legislation entitled "On Media" and "On Information". The results of the study are of practical importance for updating the legal framework in the context of digital challenges and contribute to the formation of a theoretical and methodological basis for further research on the interaction between AI and freedom of speech.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence; Information Law; Digital Ethics; Acquis Communautaire

* Received: June 17, 2025, revised: July 22, 2025, accepted: July 19, 2025, published: December 30, 2025.

¹ **Vladyslav Teremetskyi.** Doctor of Law, Professor, head of the Sector of problems of implementation of economic legislation of the Department of modernizing commercial law and law, State organization "V. Mamutov Institute of Economic and Legal Research of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine", Kyiv, Ukraine. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2667-5167>. e-mail: vladvokat333@ukr.net

² **Oleksandr Ryzhenko.** PhD in Law, Associate professor, associate professor of the department of the Academy of Labour, Social Relations and Tourism, Academy of Labour, Social Relations and Tourism, Kyiv, Ukraine. ORCID: orcid.org/0009-0002-6771-4094 e-mail: rygenkosasha@ukr.net

³ **Liudmila Ryzhenko.** PhD in Social Communications, Associate Professor at the Department of Journalism and Language Communication, National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1800-3907> e-mail: l_ryzhenko@nubip.edu.ua

⁴ **Viktoriia Klymiuk.** Candidate of Sciences in Social Communications, Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Department of Social Communications, Academician Stepan Demianchuk International University of Economics and Humanities, Rivne, Ukraine. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5969-9758> e-mail: zolyak@ukr.net

⁵ **Andrii Smus.** Candidate of Sciences in Social Communications, Associate Professor of the Department of Social Communications, Academician Stepan Demianchuk International University of Economics and Humanities, Rivne, Ukraine. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6046-6924> e-mail: smus_andriy@ukr.net

**Corresponding Author: vladvokat333@ukr.net

A. INTRODUCTION

The rapid development of information technology has necessitated the integration of innovative solutions into professional activities in various fields, including journalism. One of the key technologies that is shaping contemporary transformations in the media environment is artificial intelligence (henceforth referred to as AI). The objective of its implementation is to enhance the efficiency of journalistic activities, automate routine processes, and improve data analytics. However, it must be noted that this initiative is accompanied by a number of legal, ethical, and social challenges that directly impact the institutional foundations of freedom of expression, accuracy of information, and editorial independence.

Numerous examples of the use of AI in journalism can be found around the world. In particular, Reuters has developed the Tracer system, which automatically generates news based on data from social networks, ensuring a rapid response to events (Liu et al., 2017). Automated Insights has a collaborative relationship with the Associated Press, with the objective of automatically generating financial reports. This process has been shown to reduce the time needed to prepare materials (The Associated Press, 2014). In the domain of video journalism, the Chinese agency Xinhua pioneered the introduction of the world's first AI news anchor, capable of sustained broadcasting of information (Xinhua News Agency, 2018). In the United States, Caledo has developed AI anchors for local news, although their use has given rise to debate about the quality and accuracy of the information presented (Scrimgeour, 2024).

Despite the active use of certain AI tools in the Ukrainian information space, the legal regulation in this area remains fragmented and doctrinally undeveloped. At present, there are no specific provisions in national legislation regulating the use of AI technologies in the professional activities of journalists. This creates a regulatory gap in the context of the digital transformation of the media sphere.

In contrast, in recent years, the European Union (henceforth – EU) has been actively developing a system of regulatory control in the field of AI, in particular through the adoption of EU Regulation No. 2024/1689 (the “Artificial Intelligence Act”) (EU, 2024) and the European Parliament Resolution on the use of AI in the audiovisual sector (EP, 2020). These documents establish the legal foundation that combines technological innovation with adherence to democratic values, in particular the principles of transparency, ethics and accountability of algorithmic systems used for automated data processing and decision-making.

In consideration of Ukraine's strategic emphasis on European integration, the implementation of the provisions of the Association Agreement between Ukraine and the European Union (European Union, European Atomic Energy Community & Ukraine, 2014), and the commitment to gradually align national legislation with the *Acquis Communautaire*, the study of European experience in the legal regulation of AI use in journalism becomes particularly relevant. The media sector, being sensitive to social transformations and threats of digital disinformation, needs to implement regulatory approaches that simultaneously respond to the challenges of the digital age and European legal values.

Literature Review

The utilisation of artificial intelligence in journalism, along with the legal framework governing this domain, is a subject of active research in Ukraine and on the global stage. However, the extant scientific literature demonstrates a largely fragmentary or general nature of analysis, which does not take into account the specifics of journalistic activity as particularly sensitive to ethical, social and regulatory challenges associated with the digital transformation of society.

In Ukraine, the legal aspects of AI regulation are considered in the works of S. Kornieieva, who emphasises the need to adapt Ukrainian legislation to European norms and standardised terminological approaches (2021). In 2023, O. Baranov published a study that focused on clarifying the definition of the concept of "artificial intelligence" in the context of digital transformations. In 2024, O. Kozhukhar explored the prerequisites and prospects for the legal regulation of AI systems in the EU, pointing to a cautious risk-oriented approach. However, none of these works analyse the application of AI in the context of journalism, which significantly reduces their practical value in the media sphere.

As indicated in the relevant literature, the issues addressed in this article are associated with publications by T. Prystupenko and I. Yevdokymenko (2025). These publications analyse the processes of forming the EU legislative framework for regulating AI technologies and outline the challenges associated with its implementation in Ukrainian legislation. These researchers pay particular attention to the development and improvement of regulatory framework for the use of AI in Ukraine, particularly in the context of the media space.

Simultaneously, the majority of these works are restricted to a general analysis of the status quo of the legal regulation of AI application, and do not comprise substantive proposals for the updating of Ukrainian legislation in accordance with EU legal standards. Conversely, the international academic

community has directed its attention to the issue of AI application in journalism. Accordingly, Goyanes et al. (2025) categorised the primary domains of scientific investigation in a systematic review, encompassing issues of ethical bias in algorithms and the risks associated with the reliability of content creation. The researchers emphasise the necessity to develop a balanced AI implementation strategy that combines technological efficiency with adherence to the principles of social responsibility. This scientific approach is further explored by M. Rahman (2024), who examines the economic and ethical implications of AI's integration into the media sphere. Specifically, Rahman focuses on the prediction of changes in the professional role of journalists and the evolution of editorial structures under the influence of algorithmisation processes.

The research conducted as part of the "From Trust to Truth" project (Solopova, 2025), covering Ukraine and Germany, is of particular value. The present study analyses the impact of AI on fact-checking and the quality of journalistic standards, and proposes policy recommendations to prevent manipulation and maintain trust in information. Despite the substantial accumulation of analytical and conceptual materials, research lacks a focused analysis of the legal regulation of AI use specifically in journalism from the perspective of the compliance of Ukrainian legislation with European law. In particular, the categories of AI risk in the context of freedom of speech, ethical balancing of editorial independence, consumer rights to information, and algorithmic transparency remain overlooked. Consequently, there is an urgent need for research that combines legal analysis, a comparative legal approach and a focus on the *Acquis Communautaire* as a source of the imperative values of the European legal system. The objective of this study is thus defined: to formulate scientifically substantiated recommendations for the modernisation of Ukrainian legislation in the domain of AI technology application in journalism, with consideration for European legal standards, ethical principles and the safeguarding of freedom of expression.

B. METHODS

The research employs an interdisciplinary approach, integrating legal, philosophical-legal, socio-communicative and comparative-legal analysis to provide a comprehensive study of the application of artificial intelligence (AI) in journalism in the context of digital transformation. The research toolkit is grounded in a qualitative methodology with a focus on the analytical processing of normative data, scientific literature, practical cases of AI implementation in the media, and European policies in the field of artificial intelligence.

The authors of this article employed the following scientific methods in its composition: The first method is the formal legal approach, which is employed for the analysis of EU regulatory acts. This includes, in particular, Regulation (EU) 2024/1689, also known as the Artificial Intelligence Act, European Parliament Resolutions, and the provisions of the Association Agreement between Ukraine and the EU with regard to approximation to the *acquis communautaire*. Secondly, the comparative legal method will be employed to facilitate a detailed investigation into the regulatory approaches of European and Ukrainian journalism with regard to artificial intelligence. This will entail the identification of any conceptual differences and potential points of harmonisation of legislation. The third element to consider is that of discursive analysis, the purpose of which is to identify social, ethical and professional dilemmas arising from the algorithmisation of media production. The fourth method is the systemic-structural method, which is employed to ascertain the relationship between technological innovations in the media and the necessity for regulatory support with regard to freedom of expression, information reliability, and copyright protection. The fifth point pertains to the analogy and modelling method, the purpose of which is to develop proposals for the implementation of a matrix of legal constructs adapted to the challenges of the digital age.

The study places particular emphasis on the analysis of European legal discourse as a source of value-oriented norms that should form the basis for the development of an updated model of legal regulation of AI use in the Ukrainian media sphere. The present study is not empirical in the traditional sense, as the lack of systematic statistical data on the use of AI in Ukrainian journalism limits the possibilities for a full-fledged empirical analysis. Concurrently, the authors analysed exemplifications of the practical implementation of AI in journalism in other countries, which enabled them to formulate normatively sound conclusions and proposals.

C. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. This Paper Sets Out to Explore the Concept and Legal Nature of AI in the Media

The concept of artificial intelligence (AI) in the legal sphere is characterised by its openness and dynamism. In the majority of regulatory acts, both Ukrainian and European, a single fixed definition is absent. Instead, it is the subject of ongoing development within the interdisciplinary space between law, information technology and ethics.

In Ukraine, the definition of AI was first established in the Concept for the Development of Artificial Intelligence, which was approved by the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine on 2 December 2020 (No. 1556-r). The document defines AI as “an organised set of information technologies, the application of which makes it possible to perform complex tasks using a system of scientific research methods and algorithms for processing information obtained or created during operation” (CMU, 2020).

In the scientific literature, S. Kornieieva (2021) differentiates between two approaches to understanding AI: etymological (as robotics and machine thinking) and technological (focusing on risk-oriented regulation of specific tools). In the contemporary discourse on artificial intelligence, O. Baranov (2023) offers a definition of AI as a set of technologies that mimic human cognitive functions. This definition underscores the necessity to take anthropomorphic features into account in legal classification.

At the EU level, the most systematic definition is provided in EU Regulation No. 2024/1689 (the “Artificial Intelligence Act”), adopted on 13 June 2024. According to the European Union (EU), the term “AI” is understood to signify a system that possesses the capacity to exert an influence on the environment, to discern patterns within data, to arrive at automated decisions and to engage with both people and objects, typically without the necessity for human intervention (EU, 2024). The categorisation of AI in the media according to risk level is of particular importance. The document differentiates between the following categories: Firstly, general-purpose systems can be employed in any industry, including the media. Secondly, high-risk systems have the potential to have a significant impact on human rights, the competitive environment, and media ethics (EU, 2024, arts. 6–8).

In the domain of journalism, this entails that any AI tools employed for content generation, information moderation, or algorithmic sorting of information should be subject to legal regulation. Such regulation should ensure the transparency of algorithms, prevent discrimination, respect copyright, and maintain ethical standards. Researchers Goyanes et al. (2025) emphasise that journalism, in contrast to automated financial or logistics sectors, is sensitive to the risks of algorithmic bias, privacy violations and the devaluation of professional standards. In consideration of the principles of the *Acquis Communautaire*, particularly the tenets of the rule of law, respect for fundamental rights, and transparency, it is recommended that AI in the media be governed by a distinct legal paradigm. In this paradigm, AI is regarded not solely

as a technological apparatus, but also as a potential agent of influence on democratic institutions.

2. This paper sets out to explore the potential and gaps in Ukrainian national legislation on journalism in the context of AI implementation

Ukraine's regulatory framework in the media sector is not yet sufficiently adapted to the new technological challenges associated with the use of AI. The fundamental premise of this approach is rooted in conventional tenets of journalism, wherein human ingenuity remains paramount. This methodology does not incorporate the utilisation of algorithmic systems in the conception or dissemination of media content. The primary regulatory acts governing journalistic activity are the Laws of Ukraine: "On Media" (Law of Ukraine, No. 2849-IX 2022), "On Information" (Law of Ukraine, No. 2657-XII 1992), "On State Support for the Media, Guarantees of Professional Activity and Social Protection of Journalists" (Law of Ukraine, No. 540/97-VR 1997).

The Law of Ukraine "On Media" is the first piece of Ukrainian legislation to systematically define the categories of online media, audiovisual content, media service licensing, and the regulatory powers of the National Council. Concurrently, the principles delineated in Article 1 of the aforementioned legislation do not encompass digital technologies, machine learning, automation, or AI (Law of Ukraine, No. 2849-IX 2022). The provisions of this law do not reflect the necessity to regulate algorithmic content, even in cases where it is created, moderated, or adapted for an audience. The Law on Information (Law of Ukraine, No. 2657-XII, 1992, Articles 22–26) establishes guarantees of freedom of information, the concepts of mass media, information services and sources. However, the law contains no provisions that would allow AI to be interpreted as a tool for creating information products or regulate its use. This engenders a substantial lacuna in law enforcement practice, particularly in the context of the accelerated automation of news gathering, text or video generation, comment moderation, and so forth.

The Law of Ukraine "On State Support for Media, Guarantees of Professional Activity and Social Protection of Journalists" establishes the status of journalists, their rights, guarantees, pension provisions and social protection. The definition of journalists as creative professionals engaged in the professional processing of information is provided in the Law of Ukraine No. 540/97-VR (1997). However, there are no provisions in place that define the interaction between journalists and intelligent systems, nor is there an obligation to inform them about algorithms that influence content.

Accordingly, the prevailing Ukrainian legislation stipulates: The first point to consider is the failure to identify AI as a subject or object of legal regulation in journalism; Secondly, the text does not provide any guarantees with regard to the transparency of AI use in the production of news; Thirdly, the issue of responsibility for the distortion of facts generated by algorithms is not addressed; The fourth point to consider is that media organisations are not obliged to include a declaration in their editorial policy regarding the use of AI systems.

A comparison of the Ukrainian legislation with the relevant European legislation, in particular EU Regulation No. 2024/1689 (EU, 2024), reveals a complete absence of provisions on the following matters: The first, Employees must be provided with prior notification regarding algorithms; Secondly, it is imperative to consider the potential for AI models to produce discriminatory outcomes, necessitating measures to safeguard against such occurrences; Thirdly, consideration must be given to the ethical use of large language models in journalism; The fourth point pertains to the necessity of transparency and accountability in decision-making systems. Moreover, the absence of provisions for mandatory labelling of AI-generated content in Ukrainian legislation directly contradicts European standards of digital transparency. Insufficient regulatory coverage of digital transformation issues in the media sphere in general and journalism in particular is a serious obstacle to the harmonisation of Ukrainian legislation with the *Acquis Communautaire* and the creation of a secure information environment in the context of hybrid threats, the growth of disinformation and fake content, including that created by AI.

3. The European Model for Regulating the use of AI in Journalism: Principles, Standards and Compliance with the *Acquis Communautaire*

The European Union is a global leader in shaping the regulatory and value system for AI technologies. In this context, particular attention is paid to the protection of human rights, ethical requirements for algorithms, and the implementation of the principles of transparency and accountability, which are the main tenets of the *Acquis Communautaire*. This approach is directly relevant to the field of journalism, which is included in the list of sectors that are sensitive to the democratic system.

On 13 June 2024, Regulation No. 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of the EU, known as the Artificial Intelligence Act, was adopted. This document established a hierarchy of AI systems based on risk level and introduced mandatory requirements for developers and users of high-risk technologies, particularly in the media sector (EU, 2024).

The following provisions are of particular significance in the context of journalism: The first, It is an imperative that AI systems guarantee human control at each stage of the algorithm's life cycle (EU, 2024, Art. 14); Secondly, it is essential that journalists and media professionals are apprised in a timely manner of the utilisation of AI in the content creation process (EU, 2024, Art. 29); Thirdly, it is imperative that the utilisation of artificial intelligence does not transgress copyright and intellectual property rights (EU, 2024, Art. 53). It is imperative that suppliers of general-purpose AI models adhere to the stipulated codes of practice (EU, 2024, Art. 58). Consequently, European law has established not only technical but also ethical and social criteria for the admissibility of AI use in sensitive areas.

An additional regulatory framework for the media sector is provided by the European Parliament Resolution of 19 May 2021 on AI in education, culture and the audiovisual sector (EP, 2021). The document under scrutiny places particular emphasis on the following points: The first, the following point is made in paragraph 4 of the European Parliament's 2021 report: "The inadmissibility of biased and discriminatory algorithms"; Secondly, there is the danger of utilising substandard or obsolete data, which can result in erroneous predictions and manipulation (EP, 2021, paragraph 5); Thirdly, engineers are under an obligation to cooperate with media professionals when developing algorithms (EP, 2021, paragraph 14); The fourth point pertains to the obligation to apprise editorial offices of the parameters of AI systems (EP, 2021, paragraph 19); The fifth point pertains to the necessity of ethical labelling of AI-generated content (EP, 2021, paragraph 22, 82).

The Resolution also focuses on combating fake news and disinformation, which can be exacerbated by the use of generative models, particularly on social media and news aggregators (EP, 2021, paragraph 83). It is evident that the provisions of the aforementioned documents are consistent with the principles of the *Acquis Communautaire*, which include the following: The First, the fundamental principles that must be upheld under any circumstances include the respect for human dignity and the freedom of expression; Secondly, the principle of the rule of law necessitates two things: firstly, that algorithms should be predictable, and secondly, that there should be accountability for them; Thirdly, the ethical responsibility of digital actors is addressed; The fourth issue pertains to the necessity of maintaining a harmonious equilibrium between the pursuit of innovation and the assurance of user safety. As demonstrated by EU Regulation No. 2024/1689 (EU, 2024) and the 2021 European Parliament Resolution (EP, 2020), these values have been incorporated into specific regulatory mechanisms.

It is posited that for the Ukrainian legislative framework, the aforementioned acts can serve as: The first point to consider is that of a model of multi-level regulation; Secondly, this source provides a basis for the formulation of a legal framework for AI in the media; The third point is to establish a foundation for the creation of an ethical code for the utilisation of AI in journalism. This will enable Ukraine to adapt to European standards and to integrate into the single EU political and legal space in the field of media and digital technologies.

4. Comparative Legal Analysis and Recommendations for the Harmonization of Ukrainian Legislation with the *Acquis Communautaire*

An analysis of Ukrainian media and journalism legislation in the context of challenges related to the implementation of AI technologies reveals a significant mismatch between these legal norms and the modern regulatory approach developed in the EU. In contrast to the European approach, which is predicated on the principles of accountability, transparency, non-discrimination, and the protection of fundamental rights, Ukrainian legal norms remain largely neutral towards the challenges posed by the use of algorithmic systems in journalistic activities.

To a considerable extent, Ukrainian legislation is deficient in its lack of a systematic vision regarding the manner in which journalists or editorial teams can (and should) interact with AI technologies. The prevailing legal framework does not encompass procedural stipulations for the identification of AI-generated or AI-modified content, nor does it impose obligations on media institutions to apprise their employees of the utilisation of such technologies. In this context, there is a critical need to develop a systemic approach based on coherent legal constructs that would clearly define the scope of rights, safeguards, and obligations of journalism actors in relation to the implementation of AI.

First and foremost, Ukrainian legislation is deficient in its lack of a systematic vision regarding the interaction of journalists and editorial teams with AI technologies, both in terms of the potential and the recommended approach. The prevailing legal provisions do not stipulate procedural requirements for the identification of content generated or modified by AI. Furthermore, there is an absence of obligations imposed on media institutions to inform employees about the use of such technologies. In this context, the development of a coherent and comprehensive approach – grounded in consistent legal constructs – is essential

to clearly define the scope of rights, safeguards, and responsibilities of journalism actors in connection with the integration of AI. As previously mentioned, EU Regulation No. 2024/1689 establishes not only technical and functional requirements for AI systems but also introduces fundamentally new ethical and legal benchmarks, including algorithmic transparency, human oversight, and accountability for the consequences of AI-based decisions (EU, 2024). Moreover, the European Parliament Resolution on AI in education, culture, and the audiovisual sector delineates explicit requirements for editorial collaboration with algorithm developers whose tools may shape the informational landscape (EP, 2021).

In this regard, Ukraine's legal framework requires a conceptual renewal that aligns not only with current technological developments but also with its European integration trajectory. One of the primary steps should involve the inclusion of a dedicated section, or at least specific provisions within the Law of Ukraine "On Media" addressing the use of AI in journalism. Such amendments should include: The following definition is proposed for use in the media sector: It is imperative that journalists are apprised of the algorithms that exert a significant influence on their professional activities.

The following regulations have been established with regard to the labelling of AI-generated content: The utilisation of discriminatory algorithms is to be prohibited. It is imperative that AI developers and users observe the following ethical principles. Furthermore, the development of a Code of Ethical Use of AI in Journalism is recommended, initiated by co-regulatory bodies, journalists' trade unions, or civil society organisations advocating for freedom of expression. The ethical foundation of such a document should be based on the principles embedded in the *Acquis Communautaire*, namely respect for human rights, the prohibition of censorship, the prevention of discrimination, and transparency in decision-making processes.

The concept of "human-centric AI" merits particular emphasis in this context, as it is a term that is frequently employed in European legal documents. The notion of "human-centric AI" signifies the expectation that any system must be accountable, subject to human oversight, and allow for the possibility of human intervention to override or verify algorithmic outcomes. The implementation of these standards in Ukraine should be achieved not only through legislative provisions but also by developing a corresponding roadmap for legal reform, with clearly defined benchmarks, timelines, and implementation mechanisms. The harmonisation of national legislation with European approaches is of paramount importance in ensuring compliance with the

requirements of the Association Agreement between Ukraine and the EU. Furthermore, this harmonisation will provide an institutional foundation for the strengthening of information security, the increase of public trust in the media, and the establishment of a resilient framework for democratic journalism in the context of digital transformation.

D. CONCLUSIONS

The development and implementation of AI technologies in journalism not only create new opportunities for improving the effectiveness of information activities, but also give rise to a number of systemic challenges of a legal, ethical and institutional nature. The study demonstrated that, despite recent amendments, Ukraine's prevailing media legislation fails to encompass pivotal elements concerning the utilisation of AI in the creation, moderation and dissemination of information content. In contrast, the EU regulatory model, particularly within the framework of EU Regulation No. 2024/1689 and the 2020 European Parliament Resolution, demonstrates a systematic approach to regulating legal relations related to algorithmic intervention in media processes. The fundamental principles upon which it is based can be summarised as follows: ensuring the transparency of algorithms, preserving editorial control, preventing discrimination, and complying with copyright and pan-European ethical standards.

A comparative legal analysis has enabled the formulation of a number of recommendations for harmonising national legislation with the *Acquis Communautaire*. Firstly, it is imperative to expand the current Ukrainian legislation, namely the "On Media" and "On Information" laws, to incorporate a dedicated section on the utilisation of AI. This section should encompass definitions of pertinent terms, stipulations for the labelling of AI content, the education of media professionals, and guidelines for the ethical application of algorithms. It is also advisable to initiate the creation of a Code of Ethical Use of AI in Journalism as a form of soft regulation by the professional community. Concurrently, the implementation of a matrix of theoretical and legal constructs facilitates the construction of a regulatory model that is consistent with the values of European law, the rule of law, respect for human rights, freedom of expression and information security. The harmonisation of the relevant provisions will facilitate the adaptation of national legislation to the requirements of the Association Agreement, thereby engendering a new quality of digital democracy in Ukraine. Consequently, in response to the prevailing challenges confronting the Ukrainian media sphere, the study substantiates the imperative for legislative regulation of the utilisation of AI in journalism, predicated on

comprehensiveness, human-centredness, European values and principles of information responsibility. The conclusions obtained from the scientific and legal basis for further research are intended to inform the reform of Ukrainian legislation in the context of digital transformation and a new stage of European integration.

REFERENCES

- Baranov, O. A. (2023). Vyznachennia terminiv štuchnoho intelektu ta perspektyvy yoho pravovoho statusu. *Informatsiia i pravo*, 1(44), 32–49. [https://doi.org/10.37750/2616-6798.2023.1\(44\).287537](https://doi.org/10.37750/2616-6798.2023.1(44).287537)
- Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine. (2020). *Concept for the development of artificial intelligence in Ukraine* (Order No. 1556-p). <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1556-2020-p>
- European Parliament. (2020). *European Parliament resolution of 20 October 2020 on artificial intelligence in the digital age (2020/2012(INL))* [P9_TA(2020)0275]. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-9-2020-0275_EN.html
- European Parliament. (2021, May 19). *Resolution of 19 May 2021 on artificial intelligence in education, culture and the audiovisual sector (2020/2017(INI))*. Official Journal of the European Union, C 15, 72–79. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:C:2022:015:FULL>
- European Union, European Atomic Energy Community, & Ukraine. (2014). *Association Agreement between the European Union and its Member States, of the one part, and Ukraine, of the other part*. Official Journal of the European Union, L161, 3–2137. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/agree_internation/2014/295/oj
- European Union. (2024). *Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 on laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act)*. Official Journal of the European Union. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj>
- Goyanes, M., Háló, G., & Lopezosa, C. (2025, January 7). Artificial Intelligence in journalism: A systematic literature review of global trends, regulatory challenges, and ethical concerns [Preprint]. SocArXiv. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/6sa9e>

- Kornieieva, S. R. (2021). Theoretical approaches to the definition and legal regulation of artificial intelligence. *Uzhhorod National University Herald. Series: Law*, 66, 50–55. <https://doi.org/10.24144/2307-3322.2021.66.9>
- Kozhukhar, O. (2024). Legal Regulation of Artificial Intelligence Systems in the EU: Prerequisites, Current State and Prospects. *NaUKMA Research Papers. Law*, 13, 65–73. <https://doi.org/10.18523/2617-2607.2024.13.65-73>
- Liu, X., Nourbakhsh, A., Li, Q., Shah, S., Martin, R., & Duprey, J. (2017). *Reuters Tracer: Toward automated news production using large scale social media data* [Preprint]. arXiv. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1711.04068>
- Prystupenko, T., & Yevdokymenko, I. (2025). Legal Regulation of the use of Artificial Intelligence in the Media: Ukrainian and Global Experience. *Scientific Notes of the Institute of Journalism*, 86(1), 9-20. <https://doi.org/10.17721/2522-1272.2025.86.1>
- Rahman, M. A. (2024). Artificial intelligence in journalism: A comprehensive review. *Journal of Scientific Reports*, 6(1), 56–65. <https://ijsab.com/wp-content/uploads/1035.pdf>
- Scrimgeour, G. (2024, September 11). *An AI bot named James has taken my old job*. WIRED. <https://www.wired.com/story/an-ai-bot-named-james-has-my-old-local-news-job/>
- Solopova, V. (2025). From Trust to Truth: Actionable Policies for the Use of AI in Fact-Checking in Germany and Ukraine [Preprint]. *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.18724>
- The Associated Press. (2014, July 1). *The AP is using robots to write earnings reports*. TechCrunch. <https://techcrunch.com/2014/07/01/the-ap-is-using-robots-to-write-earnings-reports/>
- Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (1992). *On Information: Law of Ukraine No. 2657-XII*. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2657-12#Text>
- Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (1997). *On State Support for Media, Guarantees of Professional Activity and Social Protection of Journalists: Law of Ukraine No. 540/97-VR*. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/540/97-bp>
- Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (2022). *On Media: Law of Ukraine No. 2849-IX*. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2849-20>
- Xinhua News Agency. (2018, November 8). *World's first AI news anchor makes "his" China debut*. XinhuaNet. https://www.xinhuanet.com/english/2018-11/08/c_137591813.htm