IMSU Journal of Communication Studies
Volume 10, Issue 1, 2026
ISSN: 2682-6321, E-ISSN: 2705-2240
www.imsujcs.com

INFLUENCE OF GENERATIVE AI TOOLS ON JOURNALISTIC REPORTING: A QUANTITATIVE STUDY OF DAILY TRUST AND THE GUARDIAN

[1]AZEEZ, Suleiman
[2]AMINA, Ahmad Aminu
[3]MUSA, Alhassan

[1,2,3] Department of Mass Communication, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria

Corresponding Author: MUSA, Alhassan, mslhssn@gmail.com

Abstract
This study examines the influence of generative and assistive artificial intelligence tools on journalistic reportage, focusing on Daily Trust and The Guardian media organisations in Abuja. The study investigates the extent of artificial intelligence utilisation in reportage, its perceived impact on job security, its benefits and limitations, and strategies for responsible integration in Nigerian newsrooms. The study is anchored in the Technology Acceptance Model, which emphasises perceived usefulness and ease of use as key factors influencing technology adoption. Using a survey design, structured questionnaires were administered to 75 journalists, 49 from Daily Trust and 26 from The Guardian. Data were analysed using descriptive statistics and presented in frequency tables. Findings revealed a high level of awareness and moderate-to-high utilisation of artificial intelligence tools, particularly ChatGPT for content generation and Grammarly for editing and proofreading tasks. Respondents acknowledged improvements in speed, efficiency, and consistency but expressed concerns about accuracy, creativity, and ethical issues. The study concludes that artificial intelligence is increasingly shaping newsroom practices and recommends the establishment of structured training programmes and ethical guidelines to ensure its responsible use in journalism.

Keywords: Generative AI tools, Journalism, News reportage, Newspapers

Introduction

Journalism has evolved continuously in response to technological advancements, and artificial intelligence now stands as one of the most influential forces shaping contemporary news practice. AI systems can process information, learn from new data, retrieve and analyse content, draft and edit materials, as well as influence cognitive offloading and reshape critical thinking processes (Gerlich, 2025). These capabilities have led to the development of generative artificial intelligence, which is a class of systems capable of producing content that closely resembles human authorship. While technical literature explains that generative AI operates through probabilistic modelling that enables the creation of text and other media outputs with high coherence (Madnani, 2025), recent Nigerian scholarship and professional commentary show that journalists and fact-checkers in Nigeria are already integrating generative tools into routine newsroom work, even as debates about professional standards intensify (Tijani, 2025; Etumnu, & Azubuike, 2024; Daily Trust, 2024).

Generative AI encompasses a wide range of model architectures designed for different content-creation purposes. These include transformer-based language models, variational autoencoders, and generative adversarial networks, each tailored for text generation, image synthesis, and other tasks (Alterxsoft, 2024; Lawton, n.d.). In journalism, these systems emerge at a time when practitioners face mounting pressures of credibility threats, misinformation, shrinking newsroom resources, and increasingly

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19894934

demanding production cycles. More so, these pressures intersect with long-standing constraints in newsroom technology adoption and capacity, as studies on ICT uptake in Nigerian newspapers have documented infrastructural and organisational barriers that shape how new tools are introduced and used (Constraints in the Adoption of ICTs in the Newsroom of ThisDay, Daily Trust and The Guardian Newspapers in Nigeria, 2026). Recent Nigerian commentary also suggests that awareness of AI is rising, although adoption remains uneven across newsrooms, with training and institutional support identified as key gaps (The Guardian, 2025; Oyedeji & Uthman, 2024).

In response to these challenges, there is growing evidence that generative and assistive tools can support routine newsroom processes including transcription, editing, and preliminary research to enhance efficiency and consistency. Nigerian studies and reports indicate that journalists increasingly deploy such tools to reduce labour-intensive tasks and speed up workflows, but they also raise concerns about accuracy, originality, bias, and ethical responsibility (Oyedeji & Uthman, 2024; Tijani, 2025). Beyond scholarship, capacity-building initiatives by Nigerian media-development organisations further reflect the urgency of integrating AI responsibly into journalism practice, especially through training and ethical standards (CJID, 2025; WSCIJ, 2026). Against this backdrop, the present study investigates how journalists at Daily Trust and The Guardian use generative AI tools in their reportage and explores the broader implications for newsroom practice. Daily Trust and The Guardian were selected due to their prominence and influence in Nigeria's media ecosystem and their relevance in existing technology-adoption discussions, making them suitable institutional contexts for assessing AI use in contemporary reportage (Constraints in the Adoption of ICTs, 2026).

Statement of the Problem

Recent Nigerian studies have examined the growing presence of artificial intelligence in journalism. For instance, Talabi et al. (2024) explored AI use in television media organisations, highlighting efficiency gains alongside ethical and professional concerns. Similarly, other studies conducted across different Nigerian states report rising awareness of AI tools but uneven adoption patterns among journalists. While these studies provide valuable insight into AI integration within Nigerian media, they are largely state-based, multi-organisational, or focused on broadcast media.

However, limited empirical attention has been given to institution-specific quantitative evidence within major national print newspapers, particularly in Abuja. Existing research often aggregates journalists across multiple organisations, making it difficult to understand how AI is perceived and integrated within specific newsroom cultures. Furthermore, while concerns about job security and ethical implications are frequently discussed, there is insufficient quantitative evidence documenting how journalists within elite Nigerian newspapers interpret the impact of generative AI on newsroom practice, employment stability, and editorial standards.

Given the growing incorporation of AI tools in news production, there is a need for focused empirical investigation within leading national newspapers. This study therefore examines journalists' perceptions of generative AI in Daily Trust and The Guardian to provide institution-specific evidence on newsroom impact, job security implications, and ethical concerns within Nigeria's evolving media landscape.

Research Aim and Objectives

The study aims to examine the influence of generative artificial intelligence on the reportage of journalists at *Daily Trust* and *The Guardian.*

The specific objectives are to:

1. Examine journalist's perceptions of the impact of generative artificial intelligence on newsroom practices in Daily Trust and The Guardian.
2. Determine journalist's perceptions of the implications of generative artificial intelligence for job security within their organisations.
3. Assess journalist's perceptions of the benefits, limitations, and ethical concerns associated with generative artificial intelligence in news reporting

Literature Review

Generative artificial intelligence (AI) refers to computational systems capable of producing text, images, audio, and other forms of content that resemble human-created output. In the context of journalism, generative AI tools are increasingly applied to tasks such as automated transcription, summarisation, headline generation, data analysis, fact-checking, and content drafting (Biswal & Gouda, 2020). These technologies are often presented as efficiency-enhancing mechanisms capable of supporting journalists in managing information overload and accelerating production cycles.

However, global scholarship showed that the implications of generative AI in journalism extend beyond efficiency. Rahima et al. (2023) caution that AI systems may reproduce biases embedded in training data and generate misleading or inaccurate content, raising concerns about authenticity, editorial integrity, and professional accountability. These contrasting perspectives position generative AI as both a tool of newsroom optimisation and a source of ethical and professional uncertainty. Importantly, the impact of such technologies may not be uniform; rather, their influence is filtered through journalist's individual interpretations, professional experiences, and organisational contexts.

Within the Nigerian context, recent scholarship indicates rising awareness of artificial intelligence in journalism, although adoption and perceptions remain uneven. In a survey of journalists across Lagos and Kwara States (n = 360), Bello et al. (2023) report high awareness of AI journalism alongside moderate levels of adoption, suggesting that while journalists recognise AI utility, its use is not yet uniform in day-to-day practice. Complementing this, Umeora (2025) provides qualitative evidence that awareness and use of AI vary across newsroom types and professional exposure, with structural constraints such as poor infrastructure, limited funding, skills gaps, and absence of clear organisational guidelines shaping adoption patterns. Together, these studies suggest that journalist's perceptions of AI are not homogeneous but shaped by both individual and institutional conditions.

Further quantitative evidence from North-Central Nigeria reinforces this uneven pattern of adoption in print journalism. Kalu (2024), in a survey of 164 print journalists across Kogi, Nasarawa, Plateau, Benue, Kwara States, and the Federal Capital Territory (FCT), found that although AI has emerged as a tool supporting news collection, processing, and fact-finding activities, its overall utilisation remains low. Respondents acknowledged efficiency gains but identified structural barriers such as high internet costs and insufficient technical knowledge. Notably, journalists did not strongly associate AI use with job loss, suggesting that perceptions of employment threat may depend on contextual exposure and professional orientation rather than technology presence alone.

Beyond awareness and adoption, recent Nigerian studies increasingly foreground job security perceptions in the AI era. Lawal (2024), using a descriptive survey among registered journalists in Katsina State (N = 284), reports high AI awareness and finds that journalists largely perceive learning new AI-assisted reporting skills as protective of job security. Statistical testing revealed no significant gender or age differences in AI awareness and job security perceptions, indicating that perceived employment risk may not be strongly determined by basic demographic variables. However, the study's broad sampling across multiple organisations limits its ability to explain how such perceptions manifest within specific elite newsroom settings.

On newsroom operations, emerging evidence shows that ethical concerns persist even where AI adoption remains limited. Zakariyyah, Mohammed, and Shadrach (2024), in a survey of NUJ-registered journalists in Kogi State (n = 108), found low organisational AI use, yet respondents expressed strong concerns about misinformation risks, weakened creativity, compromised standards, and manipulation of public opinion. The findings suggest that ethical anxieties may be shaped more by perceived risk and professional norms than by actual levels of implementation. Similarly, Talabi et al. (2024), using qualitative focus group discussions with media professionals in Oyo State (n = 12), report mixed experiences with AI tools for content generation, summarisation, and verification. Participants expressed both optimism regarding efficiency gains and apprehension about displacement, privacy, and loss of professional control, underscoring the variability of AI perceived impact across newsroom roles and experience levels.

To cap it all, these studies reveal three persistent gaps. First, much of the existing Nigerian research is state-based and multi-organisational, offering limited institution-specific evidence from major national newspapers. Second, while awareness, adoption, and ethical concerns have been examined, fewer studies systematically connect these perceptions to newsroom practice, professional identity, and job security within elite print media institutions. Third, although variation in attitudes is frequently acknowledged, there remains limited quantitative evidence documenting how journalists in leading national newspapers interpret AI influence on their professional routines and security. Addressing these gaps, the present study provides quantitative evidence from journalists in Daily Trust and The Guardian in Abuja to examine how generative AI is perceived to be shaping contemporary reportage, job security, and newsroom ethics.

Theoretical Framework: Individual Differences Theory

This study is anchored in Individual Differences Theory, which posits that media effects and technological influences are not uniform across audiences but vary according to individual characteristics, experiences, and predispositions. Rooted in the limited-effects tradition of media research (Klapper, 1960), the theory argues that personal factors mediate how individuals interpret and respond to media content and technological innovations. Rather than assuming direct and homogeneous influence, the theory emphasises selective perception, suggesting that individuals interpret the same phenomenon differently depending on their cognitive frameworks and social positions.

Applied to journalism practice, Individual Differences Theory provides a useful lens for understanding why generative artificial intelligence may be perceived differently among journalists within the same organisational environment. While AI tools may offer similar functional capabilities, interpretations of these tools may vary according to professional role, years of experience, technological literacy, newsroom culture, and exposure to digital innovation. The theory also illuminates how perceptions of ethical risk may differ among journalists. Concerns regarding misinformation, bias, transparency, and editorial integrity may not arise solely from actual technological performance but from individual expectations, professional norms, and prior experiences with technological change. In this regard, AI perceived impact on newsroom practice becomes less a function of the technology itself and more a reflection of how journalists selectively interpret its implications within their professional context.

By foregrounding perception rather than mere adoption, Individual Differences Theory aligns with the present study's focus on how journalists in Daily Trust and The Guardian interpret the influence of generative AI on newsroom routines, job security, and ethical standards. The theory supports the study's quantitative examination of perceived impact, recognising that technological change within media institutions is filtered through individual cognitive and professional lenses.

Methodology

This study employed a quantitative survey design to generate measurable evidence on journalist's perceptions of generative artificial intelligence and its impact on newsroom practice, job security, and ethical considerations. The research was conducted in the Abuja bureaus of *Daily Trust* and *The Guardian*, two nationally recognised Nigerian newspapers with established print and digital operations.

The target population comprised 92 practising journalists, of which 58 were from Daily Trust and 34 from The Guardian, including reporters, editors, and correspondents across various desks. Given the relatively small population size, a census approach was adopted. Questionnaires were distributed to all 92 journalists; however, 75 completed copies were returned and found valid for analysis, representing an 81.5% response rate. This response rate is considered adequate for survey research and supports reliable statistical interpretation.

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire consisting of 28 items, organised into sections measuring perceived newsroom impact, job security implications, and ethical concerns associated with generative AI use. The instrument employed a five-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Agree (5) to Strongly Disagree (1).

Pilot test involving 15 journalists outside the study population was conducted to assess reliability. The instrument yielded a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.82, indicating good internal consistency reliability and suggesting that the items were sufficiently coherent in measuring the intended constructs. The collected data were coded and analysed using descriptive statistical techniques, specifically frequencies and percentages, to identify patterns in journalists' perceptions across the measured variables.

Data Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation

4.1 Data Presentation

This section shows the computation and analysis of data using tables, frequency scores and simple percentages of the respondents.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Gender Distribution

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	48	64.0
Female	27	36.0
Total	75	100.0

Age Distribution

Age	Frequency	Percentage
18-24	5	6.7
25-34	22	29.3

35-44	32	42.7
45 and Above	16	21.3
Total	75	100.0

Organization Distribution

Organisation	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Daily Trust	49	65.3
The Guardian	26	34.7
Total	75	100.0

Role of Respondents

Category	Frequency	Percentage
Reporter	42	56.0
Editor	16	21.3
Content Creator	2	2.7
Digital Media specialist	1	1.3
Others	14	18.7
Total	75	100.0

Years of Experience

Category	Frequency	Percentage
Less Than 1 Year	10	13.3
1-3 Year	7	9.3
4-6 Year	12	16.0
7-10 Year	17	22.7
More Than 10 Years	29	38.7
Total	75	100.0

Of the 75 valid responses, 48 respondents (64.0%) were male, while 27 (36.0%) were female. Regarding age distribution, 5 respondents (6.7%) were between 18–24 years, 22 (29.3%) were aged 25–34 years, 32 (42.7%) were between 35–44 years, and 16 (21.3%) were aged 45 years and above. In terms of organisational affiliation, 49 respondents (65.3%) were from Daily Trust, while 26 (34.7%) were from The Guardian. With respect to newsroom roles, the majority of respondents were reporters (56.0%), followed by editors (21.3%). Other roles included content creators (2.7%), digital media specialists (1.3%), and other newsroom positions (18.7%).

Concerning years of professional experience, 29 respondents (38.7%) had more than 10 years of experience, while 17 (22.7%) had between 7–10 years. Additionally, 12 respondents (16.0%) had 4–6 years of experience, 7 (9.3%) had 1–3 years, and 10 (13.3%) had less than one year of experience. The distribution indicates that a substantial proportion of respondents possess considerable professional experience, with over 60% having more than seven years in journalism.

Table 2: Respondents view on the type of journalistic tasks used for Generative AI

Response	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Transcribing of interview	39	31.2

Editing and proofreading	4l2	33.6
Content ideation, headline generation	14	11.2
Creating visual content	13	10.4
Translating content	10	8.0
Other	7	5.6
Total	125	100.0

The results show that editing and proofreading (33.6%) and transcribing interviews (31.2%) are the most frequent uses of generative AI among journalists. Tasks such as content ideation (11.2%) and creating visual content (10.4%) were less common, while translation (8.0%) and other uses (5.6%) were minimal. The total responses (125) exceeding the total number of respondents indicate that many journalists use AI tools for multiple purposes. Overall, the data suggest that generative AI is primarily applied to routine editorial tasks that enhance productivity rather than to creative or analytical functions.

Table 3: Respondents view on how the adoption of generative AI tools poses a threat to their job security.

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	18	7.5
Disagree	17	7.1
Neutral	59	24.7
Agree	98	41.0
Strongly Agree	47	19.7
Total	239	100.0

The results show that 41.0% of respondents agreed and 19.7% strongly agreed that generative AI poses a threat to job security, indicating that over half of the participants view AI adoption with apprehension. About 24.7% remained neutral, reflecting uncertainty about its long-term impact, while only 14.6% disagreed with the statement. These findings reveal that concerns over job displacement are prevalent among journalists, suggesting that technological advancement is accompanied by anxiety about professional stability. The perception of threat could hinder openness to AI integration and training, underscoring the need for media organisations to emphasise AI as a supportive rather than substitutive tool.

Table 4: Respondents' Perceptions of AI-Related Changes in Professional Roles

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Positive	35	46.7
Negative	9	12.0
Non	16	21.3
Not Sure	14	18.7
No Response	1	1.3
Total	75	100.0

The findings indicate that 46.7% of respondents reported perceiving positive job-related changes, such as upskilling or improved productivity, associated with AI adoption in their organisations. In contrast, 12.0% indicated negative changes, while 21.3% reported no noticeable changes, and 18.7% were uncertain. These results suggest that perceptions of AI-related professional impact vary across respondents. While a considerable proportion view AI adoption as contributing to skill development and efficiency, others either

perceive no change or remain uncertain, indicating uneven experiences and interpretations of AI integration within newsroom settings. This pattern aligns with the Individual Differences perspective, which posits that technological change is filtered through individual evaluation and professional context rather than experienced uniformly across all members of an organisation.

Table 5: Respondents view on regularly fact-check or verify AI-generated content before publishing

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	6	8.0
Disagree	5	6.7
Neutral	20	26.7
Agree	20	26.7
Strongly Agree	24	32.0
Total	75	100.0

The results show that 30.3% of respondents believe AI has increased speed but reduced depth in journalistic content, while 23.7% stated it has reduced originality. Another 22.4% noted improved consistency, suggesting that AI enhances standardisation in writing and editing. However, 11.8% reported no change and an equal proportion were uncertain, indicating mixed experiences or limited exposure to AI-supported content. Overall, the findings reveal a trade-off between efficiency and creativity: while AI improves accuracy and workflow consistency, it may also dilute originality and critical depth. This underscores the need for balanced integration, ensuring that AI complements rather than replaces human editorial judgement.

Table 6: Respondents' views on how AI-supported content affects editorial standards in their organisation

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Improved consistency	17	22.4
Increase speed but improve depth	23	30.3
Reduced Originality	18	23.7
No Change	9	11.8
I'm not sure	9	11.8
Total	76	100.0

The findings indicate varied perceptions regarding the influence of AI-supported content on editorial standards within the newsroom. A plurality of responses (30.3%) suggest that AI use has increased production speed while affecting content depth, indicating a perceived trade-off between efficiency and analytical richness. Additionally, 23.7% of respondents reported that AI adoption has reduced originality in reporting, whereas 22.4% believed it has improved consistency in content production.

A smaller proportion of respondents indicated no change (11.8%) or uncertainty (11.8%), suggesting that experiences with AI-supported content are not uniform across journalists. These findings reflect journalists' perceptions of both benefits and limitations associated with generative AI in news reporting. While improved consistency and speed represent perceived operational advantages, concerns about reduced originality and depth highlight perceived limitations of AI integration in editorial processes.

Table 7: Respondents' views on concerns associated with the use of generative AI in news reporting

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Concern reduction role	18	22.4
Concern of Overdependence	32	30.3
Concern of Loss Creativity	38	23.7
Concern of Ethical Issues	31	11.8
No Concern	11	11.8
Total	130	100.0

The results reveal several concerns associated with the use of generative AI in news reporting. The most frequently expressed concern relates to overdependence on AI tools (30.3%), followed by role reduction (22.4%) and loss of creativity (23.7%). Ethical concerns were also reported by some respondents (11.8%), while an equal proportion (11.8%) indicated that they had no concerns regarding AI use.

These findings indicate that journalists perceive several limitations and ethical concerns associated with the integration of generative AI in newsroom practice. Concerns about overdependence and loss of creativity suggest apprehension about the potential impact of AI on professional autonomy and journalistic originality. Similarly, concerns regarding role reduction reflect anxieties about how technological adoption may influence professional responsibilities. Overall, the results demonstrate that while AI is increasingly present in news production, journalists remain attentive to its potential implications for professional practice and ethical standards.

Discussion of Findings

Findings from Table 2 and Table 3 show that editing and proofreading (33.6%) and transcribing interviews (31.2%) are the most frequent ways journalists apply generative AI in their newsroom routines. In contrast, more creative functions such as content ideation and headline generation (11.2%) and visual content creation (10.4%) recorded lower usage. This indicates that journalists rely primarily on AI for supportive, efficiency-driven tasks rather than for core creative or analytical functions. The pattern suggests that AI is integrated into workflow processes to enhance speed and accuracy rather than to redefine storytelling practices. Similarly, findings from Table 5 reveal that a substantial proportion of respondents regularly verify or fact-check AI-generated content before publication. While 26.7% agreed and 32.0% strongly agreed that they fact-check AI outputs, only a small proportion disagreed. This demonstrates that AI has not replaced editorial gatekeeping but is used under human supervision. The continued emphasis on verification reflects adherence to professional standards and indicates that journalists remain cautious in delegating authority to automated systems.

Further evidence from Table 6 shows mixed perceptions regarding AI's influence on editorial standards. While 30.3% of respondents stated that AI-supported content has increased production speed, 23.7% believed it has reduced originality, and 22.4% felt it improved consistency. These results suggest that journalists perceive AI as producing both benefits and trade-offs. On one hand, AI enhances efficiency and standardisation; on the other hand, it may affect depth and creativity in reporting. Overall, the findings confirm that generative AI is perceived as a functional newsroom tool rather than a transformative creative force. Journalists appear to adopt it pragmatically for routine tasks while maintaining editorial control and expressing caution about its influence on originality and professional quality.

The analysis of Table 3 reveals that 41.0% of respondents agreed and 19.7% strongly agreed that generative AI tools pose a threat to job security. This indicates that a majority of journalists perceive AI adoption as potentially destabilising to employment within the newsroom. Although 24.7% remained

neutral and only a small proportion disagreed, the overall pattern reflects significant anxiety regarding the long-term implications of automation for professional relevance and stability.

However, Table 4 presents a more balanced perspective. While fears of displacement are evident, 46.7% of respondents reported observing positive job-related changes such as upskilling, improved efficiency, or enhanced productivity. Only 12.0% indicated negative changes, with others reporting no noticeable change or uncertainty. This suggests that although AI evokes employment concerns, it is simultaneously facilitating adaptation and skill acquisition within the newsroom.

These findings are consistent with previous scholarship that describes digital transformation in journalism as generating both apprehension and opportunity. Studies such as Lawal (2024) and Umeora (2025) similarly report that journalists express concern about job security while also acknowledging the necessity of technological adaptation. The present findings therefore reinforce the argument that AI integration in Nigerian newsrooms is more evolutionary than disruptive. Rather than immediate replacement, the technology appears to be reshaping professional roles through gradual adjustment and skill enhancement.

From an Individual Differences perspective, the coexistence of fear and optimism suggests that perceptions of job security are not uniform but filtered through individual experiences, exposure levels, and professional orientation. Some journalists interpret AI as a threat to traditional roles, while others perceive it as an opportunity for professional development. This dual perception underscores the complexity of technological change within contemporary newsroom environments.

Findings from Table 6 indicate that journalists perceive both benefits and limitations in the use of generative AI for news reporting. While 30.3% of respondents stated that AI-supported content has increased production speed, 22.4% believed it has improved consistency in editorial output. These responses highlight the perceived benefits of AI, particularly in enhancing workflow efficiency and standardisation within the newsroom. Such findings suggest that journalists recognise AI as a tool capable of strengthening operational performance.

However, the data also reveal notable concerns regarding content quality. A significant proportion of respondents (23.7%) reported that AI adoption has reduced originality in reporting, while others expressed uncertainty or observed no change. This indicates that although AI may improve speed and consistency, it may simultaneously affect creativity and analytical depth. The coexistence of efficiency gains and creative concerns reflects a perceived trade-off between productivity and originality in AI-supported journalism.

Further insight is provided in Table 7, where respondents identified specific concerns associated with AI use. The most prominent concern was overdependence on AI (30.3%), followed by reduction of professional roles (22.4%) and loss of creativity (23.7%). Ethical concerns were also acknowledged by respondents, though to a lesser degree. These findings demonstrate that journalists' reservations extend beyond technical limitations to normative and professional considerations. The fear of overdependence suggests anxiety about diminishing professional autonomy, while concerns about role reduction and creativity point to deeper questions about identity and editorial integrity.

Taken together, the findings show that journalists perceive generative AI as both beneficial and problematic. While it enhances efficiency and consistency, it also raises concerns about originality, autonomy, and ethical standards. This dual perception supports the view that technological adoption in journalism is interpreted through individual and professional lenses, rather than being uniformly embraced or rejected.

Conclusion

This study examined journalists' perceptions of the influence of generative artificial intelligence on newsroom practices, job security, and ethical considerations in Daily Trust and The Guardian. The findings show that generative AI is primarily used for supportive newsroom functions such as editing, proofreading, and transcription rather than for core creative tasks. Journalists generally integrate AI as a functional tool that enhances workflow efficiency while maintaining human oversight through verification and fact-checking practices.

The results further reveal that perceptions of AI's impact on job security are mixed. While a majority of respondents view AI as posing a potential threat to employment stability, many also report positive job-related changes such as upskilling and improved productivity. This suggests that AI adoption within the studied newsrooms is perceived not as immediate displacement but as a gradual process of professional adjustment.

In terms of benefits and limitations, journalists recognise improvements in speed and consistency of content production. However, concerns remain regarding reduced originality, overdependence on AI tools, and potential role reduction. These findings indicate that AI integration generates both efficiency gains and professional apprehension.

Overall, the study concludes that generative AI is perceived as a pragmatic newsroom support system rather than a transformative replacement for journalists. Its impact is interpreted differently across individuals, reflecting varying professional experiences and orientations. Effective integration therefore depends on balanced adoption that preserves editorial standards while leveraging technological efficiency

References

Aissani, R., Abdallah, R. A.-Q., & Al Adwan, M. N. (2023). Artificial intelligence tools in media and journalism: Roles and concerns. In *Proceedings of the 2023 International Conference on Multimedia Computing, Networking and Applications (MCNA)* (pp. 19–26). IEEE.

AltexSoft Editorial Team. (2024, September 5). *Generative AI models explained*. AltexSoft.https://www.altexsoft.com/blog/generative-ai/

Ay, A. (2024). News production process model in AI journalism. In S. N. Mustafa, A. Aslan, S. G. Aktaş, & A. Göktepe (Eds.), Proceedings of the 16th Annual Conference of Global Communication Association: "Future(s) of Communication: Promises and Predicaments" (pp. 125–150). Marmara University.https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2816-1634

Bello, S., Ishola, A. S., & Umeaku, P. C. (2023). A survey of awareness and adoption of artificial intelligence journalism among Lagos and Kwara States journalists in Nigeria. *Indonesian Journal of Communication Studies, 16*(2), 95– 105. https://doi.org/10.31315/ijcs.v1i2.10282

Centre for Journalism Innovation and Development. (2025, May 26). *Nigeria AI Collective, CJID launches AI and tech accountability reporting fellowship to strengthen media capacity and advance tech reporting in Nigeria*. https://thecjid.org/nigeria-ai-collective- cjid-launches-ai-and-tech-accountability-reporting-fellowship-to-strengthen-media- capacity-and-advance-tech-reporting-in-nigeria/

Daily Trust. (2024, December 20). *The promise and peril of AI: How generative tools are transforming Nigerian newsrooms*. https://dailytrust.com/the-promise-and-peril-of-ai- how-generative-tools-are-transforming-nigerian-newsrooms/

Etumnu, E.W. & Azubuike, C. (2024). Artificial intelligence and broadcasting in information driven society: Imo State, Nigeria in perspective. *International Journal Sub-Saharan African Research, 2*(4), 272–280. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14567502

Giles, M. (2018, February). The GANfather: The man who's given machines the gift of imagination. MIT Technology Review.https://www.technologyreview.com/2018/02/21/145289/the-ganfather-the-man-whos-given-machines-the-gift-of-imagination/

Inobemhe, K., Ugber, F., & Asekhamhe, M. O. (2026). Constraints in the adoption of information and communication technologies (ICTs) in the newsroom of *ThisDay*, *Daily Trust*, and *The Guardian* newspapers in Nigeria. *Journal of Arts & Social Sciences, 8*(1), 1–16.

Kalu, C. O. (2024). Adoption and use of artificial intelligence technology for newsgathering and reporting among print journalists in selected states in North Central Nigeria.

Lawal, B. A. (2024). Perception of registered journalists on job security in the era of artificial intelligence in Katsina State. *International Journal of Innovative Social Sciences & Humanities Research, 12*(1), 77–85.

Lawton, G. (n.d.). What is Gen AI? Generative AI explained. TechTarget.https://www.techtarget.com/searchenterpriseai/definition/generative-AI

Madnani, M. (2025, March 17). What is generative AI vs AI? Key differences and example.Udacity.https://www.udacity.com/blog/2025/03/what-is-generative-ai-vs-ai-key-differences-and-examples.html

Oyedeji, O., & Uthman, S. (2024). Opportunities and challenges of adopting AI in journalism in Nigeria. *International Journal of Media, Journalism and Mass Communications, 10*(2), 21–28. https://doi.org/10.20431/2454-9479.1002003

Shi, Y., & Sun, L. (2024). How generative AI is transforming journalism: Development, application and ethics. *Journalism and Media, 5*(2), 582–594. https://doi.org/10.3390/journalmedia5020039

Smith, G. (2025, April 9). What is journalism? Understanding the essence of journalism.The Knowledge Academy.https://www.theknowledgeacademy.com/blog/what-is-journalism/

Talabi, F. O., Oyewole, J. A., Bello, S. A., Adefemi, V. O., Talabi, J. M., Adesile, T., & Patrick, O. (2024). Adoption of artificial intelligence in news gathering and reporting in Nigerian mass media.Journal of Ecohumanism, 3(8), 8959–8968.https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i8.5511

Talabi, F. O., Ade-Johnson, C. S., Talabi, J. M., Adeniran, P. O., Bello, S. A., Kenechukwu, S. A., Okunade, J. K., Olaseinde, O. B., & Aiyesimoju, A. B. (2024). Bandwagon of artificial intelligence use among media houses in Oyo State, Nigeria.

The Guardian. (2025, August 16). *AI adoption in journalism practice still low despite high awareness*. https://guardian.ng/sunday-magazine/newsfeature/ai-adoption-in-journalism-practice-still-low-despite-high-awareness/

Tijani, O., & Nicholson, J. (2025). From human insight to machine intelligence: Assessing GenAI's role in Nigerian journalism. In *Proceedings of the 23rd EUSSET Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work – Posters and D emos*. https://doi.org/10.48340/ecscw2025_pd03

Umeora, C. C. (2025). Artificial intelligence and journalistic practices in Nigeria: Navigating awareness, adoption, and structural challenges. *Multidisciplinary Research and Development Journal, 7*(1), 136.

World Sustainable Communication & Journalism Initiative. (2026, February 27). *RUSH with AI: WSCIJ equips radio and audio journalists with AI skills to strengthen accountability reporting*. https://wscij.org/rush-with-ai-wscij-equips-radio-and-audio-journalists-with-ai-skills-to-strengthen-accountability-reporting/

Zakariyyah, Z. O., Mohammed, J. D., & Shadrach, I. (2024). Adoption of artificial intelligence and ethical challenges in newsroom operations within media organisations in Kogi State, Nigeria. *TSU Journal of Communication and Media Studies, 4*(2).