University Curricula in Media and Communication between Traditional Heritage and Artificial Intelligence Challenges: Towards an Innovative Vision for University Media Education

Faten BEN LAGHA[*],

1 - **Department of Media, Sultan Qaboos, University (OMAN),** yolmech@squ.edu.om

Received: 08/05/2026; **Revised:** 27/06/2026; **Accepted:** 30/06/2026؛

Abstract:

University-level media and communication education stands at a genuine turning point. It carries the weight of a pedagogical tradition built around twentieth-century broadcasting norms, print journalism values, and a discipline-focused organization of knowledge, while simultaneously confronting the disruption of generative artificial intelligence algorithmic newsrooms, data-driven storytelling, and platform-based media economies that have substantially altered what employers expect of graduates.

This paper argues that the friction between inherited curricula and these technological realities is not simply a matter of updating course content; it constitutes an epistemological challenge that requires reconsidering the purpose of university media education itself. Drawing on curriculum theory, critical media studies, and evidence from professional practice, the paper maps the structural assumptions underlying conventional media programmes and examines how artificial intelligence particularly large language models, synthetic media tools, and automated content systems challenges those assumptions at the level of skills, ethics, and disciplinary identity.

Rather than advocating uncritical technological adoption or a defensive return to tradition, the paper proposes a framework for curriculum renewal that holds both concerns in balance. Particular attention is given to Arab universities, where institutional conservatism, limited research infrastructure, Arabic-language technology gaps, and geopolitical constraints compound an already difficult situation. The paper concludes with practical recommendations and a call for a regionally coordinated research agenda on AI-informed media education.

Keywords: *media education, journalism curricula, artificial intelligence, Arab universities, curriculum reform, media literacy, generative AI, higher education.*

[*] **Faten BEN LAGHA**

1. Introduction

The history of media education is, in a meaningful sense, a history of continual reinvention. Each major communication technology the rotary press, the telegraph, broadcasting, the internet has reshaped not only the industry but the question of what universities should be training students to do (Barnhurst & Nerone, 2001; Franklin, 2014). Journalism departments, communication faculties, and later media studies programmes were each constituted around the technologies prevailing at their founding, and each has subsequently had to adapt to technologies that emerged afterward.

The rise of artificial intelligence particularly generative AI capable of writing news articles, synthesising audio and video, analysing large datasets, and personalising content at scale follows the same pattern and is not, in that sense, unprecedented. What distinguishes this moment is its pace. The shift from print to broadcasting unfolded over decades, giving institutions time to adapt gradually; the generative AI transformation is compressing what might otherwise have been a generation's worth of professional change into a few years. A student who began a media degree in 2020 now graduates into a professional environment that scarcely existed at enrolment.

This paper treats that compression as a substantive educational problem rather than a pretext for either wholesale displacement of established practice or defence of the status quo. It argues instead for deliberate, principled curriculum reform one that is candid about the capabilities and limitations of AI, about what journalism and media practice actually require of human practitioners, and about what is realistic given the specific institutional conditions of Arab universities. Section 2 examines how traditional media curricula are structured and the assumptions on which they rest. Section 3 considers how AI challenges those assumptions. Section 4 addresses the Arab university context specifically. Section 5 proposes a framework for curriculum renewal. Section 6 presents recommendations and concludes the paper.

2. How Traditional Media Curricula Are Built

2.1 Historical Origins

University journalism education in its recognisable form originated in the United States during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The Pulitzer School at Columbia and the Missouri School of Journalism became the models subsequently exported worldwide (Boylan, 2003). The founding objective was professionalisation: to establish journalism as more than a trade, equipped with an ethical framework and a set of teachable standards encompassing news writing, editing, reporting, objectivity, and public service.

This model was exported first to Western Europe, then, through colonial and post-colonial educational networks, to Africa, Asia, and the Arab world (Deuze, 2006). The result was a global landscape of media faculties that, despite surface variation, shared

a common underlying structure. Curricula were organised around skills tracks print journalism, broadcast journalism, public relations, advertising supported by theory drawn from mass communication research, media sociology, and, from the 1980s onward, cultural studies. Practical skills courses carried the greatest institutional prestige and were modelled on professional practice as it existed at the moment of curriculum design (Waisbord, 2013).

2.2 The Assumptions Behind the Curriculum

Beneath the structure of most conventional media programmes lies a set of assumptions rarely made explicit. They warrant identification here precisely because they are the assumptions on which AI now exerts pressure.

The first assumption holds that media competence is fundamentally a human skill: the journalist writes, the producer directs, the editor decides. These functions are understood as cognitive and linguistic performances requiring human sensibility, training, and ethical agency, and the curriculum exists to cultivate precisely those capacities.

The second is the gatekeeping assumption. Traditional media education functioned, among other things, as training in the exercise of editorial power determining who speaks, in what format, to which audience (Singer, 2010). This gatekeeping function justified the ethical emphasis of journalism education, including verification, source protection, and editorial independence: those who hold gatekeeping power bear corresponding responsibility for its exercise (Cushion, 2012).

The third assumption is disciplinary: the premise that journalism, mass communication, or media studies constitutes a coherent field that can be bounded, sequenced, and assessed (Zelizer, 2004). This assumption underwrites the entire degree structure, the course catalogue, and the accreditation frameworks governing media schools globally.

Each of these assumptions is now under substantial pressure. Generative AI demonstrates that many routine communication tasks news summaries, financial reports, sports results, weather reports can be performed at professional quality without a human author, which directly unsettles the first assumption. It undermines the gatekeeping assumption by enabling content production at a scale and speed no editorial structure was designed to accommodate. And it renders skills obsolete faster than curriculum review cycles can manage, while blurring the boundaries between journalism, technology, data science, and communication design in ways that resist straightforward disciplinary mapping.

2.3 The Problem of Reform Velocity

Curriculum reform in universities is slow by design. Committee structures, accreditation requirements, faculty expertise, and resource constraints together

generate substantial institutional friction. In media education, where professional practice itself changes rapidly, this slowness has consistently produced some lag between what is taught and what the field requires. For an extended period, that lag remained manageable.

That lag is no longer manageable. The issue is not merely that specific software packages become outdated that has always been true, and is ordinarily addressed by updating practical course content. The issue is that the foundational competency model of traditional media education, its core theory of what a trained media professional should know and be able to do, requires structural reconsideration at a pace universities are not well equipped to sustain.

3. The Implications of Artificial Intelligence for Media Education

3.1 Current Applications of AI in Media Practice

Before addressing curriculum design, it is necessary to establish, with some precision, what contemporary AI systems actually accomplish in media and communication contexts, independent of the rhetoric surrounding either their promise or their threat. Since approximately 2022, large language models capable of producing fluent, contextually appropriate text have been deployed extensively across media-adjacent tasks (Cools & Diakopoulos, 2024): automated report generation from structured data, summarisation and translation, headline and social copy generation, first-draft article composition from briefing notes, and audience engagement chatbots.

AI systems for audio and video synthesis voice cloning, facial animation, full video generation from text have simultaneously reached a quality threshold at which synthetic media becomes genuinely difficult to distinguish from authentic recorded footage without specialised detection tools. This development carries serious implications for the verification practices central to journalism ethics.

Recommendation and personalisation systems have, meanwhile, substantially reshaped content distribution (Loosen & Schmidt, 2012). Editorial decisions about what audiences encounter are increasingly determined not by human editors but by optimisation algorithms trained on engagement metrics (Diakopoulos, 2019). Understanding how these systems function their logic, their incentive structures, their social effects now constitutes a core literacy requirement for anyone working in or studying media.

3.2 Differential Effects on Professional Skills

The skills implications of AI in media are not uniform, and the distinctions warrant precise treatment. Certain tasks to which traditional media curricula have devoted considerable time are genuinely automatable at professional quality: transcription, basic data reporting, content translation, image captioning, routine copy editing (Gynnild, 2014). Programmes built around these skills must confront the

uncomfortable possibility that they are training students for work AI will increasingly perform during those students' careers.

Other skills increase in value rather than diminish. Complex investigative work requiring source cultivation, contextual judgement, ethical deliberation, and creative narrative construction remains substantially resistant to automation, at least at present (Hamilton, 2016). The same holds for skills involved in communicating nuance, ambiguity, and uncertainty the kind of editorial intelligence that requires not merely factual accuracy but a sense of what matters, and why, within a particular social and political moment (Beckett & Deuze, 2016).

A third category of skills is genuinely new: working with AI systems productively, critically, and ethically. This encompasses prompt engineering, evaluating and fact-checking AI output, understanding the training data and algorithmic architecture of these systems well enough to recognise their characteristic failure modes, and applying AI tools to data-driven investigative analysis (Stray, 2019; Lewis & Westlund, 2015). None of these constituted curriculum categories five years ago.

3.3 The Verification Crisis

Arguably the sharpest pedagogical challenge AI poses to media education concerns verification the foundational journalistic practice of establishing accuracy prior to publication. Verification has historically been taught as a set of practical procedures: cross-referencing sources, checking primary documents, contacting those involved, applying editorial judgement (Graves, 2016; Hermida, 2012). These procedures presupposed a world in which producing a convincing fabrication required significant effort and skill.

Generative AI overturns that presupposition entirely. Plausible text, realistic images, convincing audio, and increasingly realistic video can now be produced quickly, cheaply, and at scale. A photograph of a public figure engaged in newsworthy activity can no longer be treated as presumptive evidence that the depicted event occurred. A fluent news report cannot be assumed to have a human author who stands behind its claims. An audio recording no longer constitutes evidence of what someone actually said.

Media education must respond on two levels. The first concerns new pedagogical content: the epistemology of AI-generated media, technical methods for detecting synthetic content, and the institutional procedures news

organisations are developing to authenticate what they publish (Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017). The second is more fundamental, requiring that students develop a more sophisticated understanding of evidence and epistemic responsibility in an environment saturated with synthetic content.

3.4 The Ethical Dimensions of AI in Media

The ethical challenges AI poses to media practice are substantial and pedagogically underexplored. They include questions of responsibility for AI-assisted or AI-generated content; the use of AI systems trained on copyrighted material; the amplification of biases present in training data; the use of synthetic media to misrepresent reality (Tandoc et al., 2018; Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017); the opacity of algorithmic recommendation systems (Napoli, 2019); and the labour consequences of AI-enabled automation for media workers (Carlson, 2015; Örnebring, 2010).

Conventional media ethics curricula, organised around truth-telling, harm minimisation, editorial independence, and source protection (Christians et al., 2016), are not well designed to address these questions. They presuppose a human author who makes choices and bears accountability for them. When authorship is distributed across a human-AI system, or when the relevant choices were made at the level of training data curation or algorithmic design rather than individual editorial judgement, existing frameworks simply fail to cover the relevant ground.

This is not a merely theoretical concern. News organisations are currently working through questions about how to govern AI use in their newsrooms, what disclosure standards to adopt, and how to maintain public trust amid the proliferation of synthetic content (Cools & Diakopoulos, 2024). Graduates unprepared to engage seriously with these questions will face a professional disadvantage.

4. Compounding Constraints in the Arab University Context

4.1 Institutional Conservatism and Structural Constraints

Arab universities confront all of the challenges described above, but within an institutional context that renders them considerably more difficult to address. University governance across much of the Arab world is highly centralised, and curriculum changes frequently require approval at ministerial or national accreditation levels operating on multi-year timescales. This is not merely bureaucratic inertia; it reflects genuine political, cultural, and institutional commitments. It does, however, mean that the curriculum review processes needed to respond meaningfully to AI are structurally slower than those available to universities in many other regions.

Faculty capacity presents a related issue. Media and communication departments in many Arab universities were established and staffed during periods when the dominant professional models were broadcast television, state-affiliated print media, and advertising. Academic staff who developed their expertise in those contexts, and who have advanced through institutional hierarchies shaped by that expertise, may possess neither the technical knowledge nor the professional incentive to lead a curriculum shift toward AI-integrated media education. This is not a criticism of individuals but a structural observation that any reform effort must navigate.

4.2 The Language-Technology Gap

One of the most consequential and least-discussed challenges facing Arab media education in the AI era is the language-technology gap. The most capable AI language systems currently available have been trained predominantly on English-language data, with substantially smaller proportions of Arabic-language data (Al-Khalifa et al., 2025). The practical consequence is that these systems perform less reliably in Arabic, producing more frequent factual and grammatical errors and failing to capture the significant dialectal variation across Arabic-speaking societies.

This bears on Arab media education in several ways. Students learning to work with AI tools encounter systems that are measurably less capable when applied to Arabic-language tasks, which complicates the development of accurate intuitions about AI's capabilities and limitations. Fact-checking and verification tools built primarily for English-language media may perform less effectively on Arabic content. The rapid development of Arabic-language AI models by Gulf state institutions and regional technology companies (Al-Khalifa et al., 2025) further creates a fast-moving landscape that curricula must track in the absence of an established pedagogical framework to guide that process.

Equity implications follow from this as well. Media markets in the Arab world serve populations whose primary language is Arabic, populations for whom the productivity gains of AI-assisted media production are accordingly less immediately available. Students training to compete in those markets require a realistic understanding of these asymmetries rather than a curriculum premised on the assumption that AI tools perform equally well across languages.

4.3 Press Freedom, Political Context, and Media Ethics

Media education does not occur in a political vacuum, and in the Arab context, questions concerning press freedom, editorial independence, and the relationship between media institutions and state power are particularly complex (Alterman, 2011; Hanitzsch et al., 2019). These complexities affect what can actually be taught and how it is received.

AI systems have, for instance, been deployed for content moderation and, in some documented instances, for the suppression of political speech (Gorwa et al., 2020). Teaching students to think critically about AI in media necessarily entails engaging with these uses, which requires a degree of political openness not available in every institutional context. Similarly, AI's role in disinformation campaigns including those with geopolitical dimensions relevant to Arab states (Abouzied et al., 2025; Scheufele & Krause, 2019) requires pedagogical treatment that some institutional environments will not readily permit.

This is not an argument that Arab media educators should avoid these topics. It is an argument that curriculum designers must be realistic about the constraints within

which they operate, and must develop pedagogical strategies capable of functioning within those constraints while still equipping students with genuine critical capacity.

4.4 Research Infrastructure and the Missing Evidence Base

Sound curriculum reform should be grounded in solid empirical evidence: surveys of professional practice, employer needs analyses, graduate outcome studies, and comparative assessments of pedagogical approaches. Across much of the Arab university world, that evidence base is largely absent. Research on media education in the region remains sparse, is often published in limited-circulation Arabic-language journals with restricted international indexing, and rarely involves the systematic comparison of programme models that would support evidence-based curriculum design.

The consequence is that Arab media educators attempting to reform their curricula rely largely on research from North American and Western European contexts that may not translate directly to their circumstances (Reese, 2001). The language-technology gap, the political contexts, the institutional structures, the professional media markets, and the student preparation profiles differ sufficiently that uncritical importation of recommendations from elsewhere is genuinely problematic.

This is a call for a regional research agenda, not a justification for inaction. The reforms proposed in this paper rest on principled reasoning and on documented evidence about AI capabilities and professional media practice. They nonetheless require accompaniment by systematic empirical work that tests their effectiveness specifically within Arab university contexts.

5. A Framework for Curriculum Renewal

5.1 Starting Principles

Before specifying the content of a reformed curriculum, it is necessary to make explicit the principles that should shape the reform process. These principles follow from the preceding analysis and are intended as a check against both uncritical technological enthusiasm and defensive traditionalism.

The first principle holds that curriculum reform should be driven by a theory of media practice rather than a theory of technology. The relevant question is not what AI can do but what journalism and media communication require of human practitioners in an AI-mediated environment. AI capabilities change rapidly and unpredictably, whereas the underlying human values that media practice should serve accuracy, fairness, contextual intelligence, ethical responsibility, democratic accountability change far more slowly and should accordingly provide the stable normative foundation for curriculum design.

The second principle is critical integration, positioned against both uncritical adoption and reactive rejection. Students should learn to work with AI tools competently while evaluating them critically understanding their limitations, embedded biases, ethical implications, and social consequences. The objective is graduates who are neither AI-illiterate nor uncritically dependent on AI.

The third principle is intellectual honesty about uncertainty. Any curriculum designed today in response to current AI capabilities will be partly outdated by the time its first graduates enter the workforce. What matters more than an encyclopaedic inventory of current tools is the development of an adaptive capacity in students the ability to evaluate new tools as they emerge, to update professional competencies accordingly, and to engage with new ethical challenges as they arise.

The fourth principle is contextual specificity. Reforms that succeed in well-resourced universities with strong technology infrastructure and substantial institutional autonomy may not transfer directly to universities operating under language-technology gaps, limited resources, and constrained institutional autonomy. The framework proposed here is designed to be adapted rather than simply adopted.

5.2 Five Core Curriculum Domains

A reformed curriculum for AI-era media education should be organised around five interconnected domains, each combining technical, critical, and ethical dimensions.

The first domain is foundational media practice, and it is not optional. Students still require genuine competence in investigative reporting, source cultivation, interview technique, narrative construction, and multimedia storytelling. These capacities do not diminish in importance with the introduction of AI; if anything, their importance increases, since they form the basis for the human judgement required to work effectively and responsibly alongside AI systems. Curriculum reform should protect and deepen this domain rather than trading it away for technical AI training.

The second domain is AI literacy and critical evaluation. Students need to understand at a level supporting genuine critical engagement rather than superficial familiarity how large language models function, what image generation systems do, how algorithmic recommendation shapes audience exposure, and how synthetic media is detected and authenticated. This is not computer science education; it is applied critical literacy for media practitioners.

The third domain is data journalism and computational methods. AI tools in professional media practice are increasingly applied to processing large datasets social media corpora, financial documents, government databases, sensor networks (Flew et al., 2012). Graduates who can use these tools, and who understand enough about data analysis to evaluate AI-generated insights critically, will be substantially better equipped for contemporary practice than those who cannot (Coddington, 2015).

This domain should encompass data literacy, basic statistical reasoning, and hands-on experience with data-driven storytelling.

The fourth domain is media ethics in the AI era. This requires a genuine renewal of media ethics education rather than the addition of a few AI-specific cases to an existing course. It entails philosophical engagement with questions of authorship, responsibility, and transparency in human-AI systems; empirical engagement with documented cases of AI-enabled manipulation, disinformation, and bias; and institutional engagement with the governance frameworks and editorial policies that news organisations and regulators are actively developing. The objective is graduates capable of thinking clearly and acting decisively in ethical situations that existing professional codes do not fully address.

The fifth domain is media systems and political economy. Understanding the structural conditions under which AI is deployed in media ownership structures, incentive systems, regulatory frameworks, labour relations is essential for any meaningful critical engagement with AI's role in media. This domain builds on existing traditions in media studies and political economy but requires updating to address platform capitalism, AI investment dynamics, and the geopolitics of AI infrastructure.

5.3 Pedagogical Approaches

These five domains cannot be taught effectively through traditional lecture-based instruction alone. An AI-integrated media curriculum requires pedagogical approaches that build the adaptive, critical, and practical capacities graduates actually need.

Problem-based and project-based learning serve this purpose better than the conventional skills-course model. A student who produces a data-driven investigative report using AI-assisted analysis, then subjects it to peer critique on its factual accuracy, ethical choices, and use of AI tools, develops competencies in a more integrated and transferable manner than one who completes separate courses in reporting, data journalism, and ethics without ever connecting them.

Collaboration with professional media organisations brings curriculum content into contact with the rapidly changing realities of professional practice. Working journalists, editors, and technologists can provide access to genuine editorial challenges, actual AI tool deployments, and real ethical dilemmas in ways classroom simulations cannot replicate. This is not a substitute for academic rigour but a complement to it.

Critical AI practice labs, in which students systematically test AI tools, document their capabilities and failures, and produce written evaluations, build both practical familiarity and analytical habits. Students who have deliberately stress-tested a large language model feeding it misleading prompts, probing its factual accuracy,

exploring how it handles sensitive content develop a considerably more sophisticated and usable understanding of these systems than those who have only read about them.

Finally, cross-disciplinary engagement with computer science, philosophy, sociology, law, and political science is not a luxury. The questions raised by AI in media practice cannot be answered within the disciplinary boundaries of mass communication alone. Curricula need to establish genuine points of contact with other disciplines, whether through shared courses, joint projects, or interdisciplinary seminars.

5.4 A Staged Implementation Sequence

A complete curriculum redesign undertaken from scratch is rarely feasible within established institutions possessing existing faculty expertise, student expectations, and accreditation requirements. For most Arab universities, a more realistic path is staged reform: progressively introducing new content while gradually adapting the foundational degree structure.

In the first stage, AI literacy content is integrated horizontally across existing courses rather than introduced as standalone modules. Ethics courses incorporate AI ethics content; reporting courses address AI verification challenges; media theory courses include analysis of algorithmic media systems. This stage requires faculty development but not structural reorganisation.

In the second stage, dedicated courses in data journalism, AI-assisted reporting, and digital media ethics are introduced as required core courses or structured elective streams. This stage requires targeted faculty hiring or retraining, alongside engagement with professional partners who can bring practitioner expertise into the classroom.

In the third stage, the programme undertakes a full structural review of its core competency model, aiming to produce a curriculum map that explicitly articulates how foundational media skills, critical AI literacies, and professional adaptive capacity fit together. This review should involve faculty, students, and professional partners, together with in the Arab context engagement with accreditation bodies and, where appropriate, national regulatory frameworks.

6. Recommendations

6.1 For University Administrations

The most urgent recommendation is that AI integration in media curricula be treated as a strategic institutional priority rather than a departmental matter. The scale of reform required demands substantive resource allocation for faculty development, technology infrastructure, professional partnerships, and the research agenda that

should accompany reform. Universities that leave this to individual faculty initiative without institutional backing will produce fragmented and inadequate responses.

Accreditation bodies in the Arab world should initiate a regional dialogue concerning the competency frameworks governing media and communication programmes in the AI era. Current frameworks were designed for a substantially different professional environment. A regionally coordinated revision drawing on the best available international models while attending to the specific conditions of Arab media markets and educational contexts would provide the institutional structure curriculum reforms require.

Universities should invest in faculty development that provides existing media faculty with both conceptual understanding of AI systems and hands-on experience with AI tools in journalistic contexts. This cannot rely on individual initiative; it requires structured, supported, and institutionally recognised learning opportunities. Partnerships with regional technology companies, international journalism schools, and AI research institutions can supply the external expertise that most Arab media faculties cannot develop entirely in-house.

6.2 For Curriculum Design

Media programmes should audit their existing curricula specifically for AI relevance, identifying what already addresses AI-related competencies, what teaches skills currently undergoing substantial automation, and which AI-related competency areas remain absent. This audit should serve as the starting point for reform planning.

Every programme should develop, at minimum, a required module ideally a full course in media ethics for the AI era. The content should address authorship and responsibility in human-AI systems; synthetic media and the verification crisis; algorithmic bias and its consequences for media representation; disclosure standards and editorial transparency; and AI's use in authoritarian control and disinformation.

Practical AI literacy should be embedded within reporting and production courses rather than confined to a separate technical elective. When a student submits an AI-assisted draft, the instructor should engage directly with how the AI was used, how its output was evaluated and fact-checked, and what its limitations were in that specific context. This normalises critical AI practice rather than treating AI as either a special topic or a forbidden shortcut.

6.3 A Regional Research Agenda

The arguments advanced in this paper rest on documented evidence and principled reasoning, but they would be considerably strengthened by a more robust Arab-specific evidence base. Several questions warrant systematic investigation: What AI tools are Arab media organisations actually deploying, for what purposes, and under what governance arrangements? How do major AI language systems perform on

Arabic-language media tasks specifically? What competency profiles are Arab media employers seeking in graduates, and how are those profiles changing? What curriculum models for AI-integrated media education are currently being trialled in Arab universities, and with what results? And what specific ethical challenges does AI pose within the political contexts of Arab media systems?

These questions require collaborative, multi-institutional research involving media educators, working journalists, AI researchers, and policymakers. The infrastructure for such collaboration remains underdeveloped in the region, and building it is a prerequisite for evidence-based curriculum reform at any meaningful scale.

7. Conclusion

The crisis facing university media education in the age of AI is substantial, though not structurally unprecedented. Universities have always had to negotiate between inherited disciplinary knowledge and the changing demands of professional and social life. What is new is the pace of change and the depth of the challenge to the foundational competency model on which media education has rested for over a century.

The appropriate response is neither uncritical technological adoption nor a defensive retreat to existing curricula, but principled, critically engaged integration one that keeps the values of media practice central while honestly reckoning with what AI changes. In Arab universities, that integration must navigate genuine institutional constraints, language-technology asymmetries, and political complexities, and it must be accompanied by the regional research agenda and institutional coordination that serious reform requires.

The graduates who will sustain credible, trustworthy, and socially valuable media practice in an AI-saturated environment will not be those maximally proficient with the latest tools, nor those who have successfully avoided them. They will be the graduates who have developed critical intelligence, ethical seriousness, foundational journalistic craft, and the adaptive capacity to use powerful tools responsibly, in the service of truthful, contextually intelligent, and publicly accountable communication. Preparing those graduates is the task that AI-era media education must rise to meet.

References

- Abouzied, A., Alam, F., Ali, R., & Papotti, P. (2025). Combating misinformation in the Arab world: Challenges and opportunities. Communications of the ACM.
- Al-Khalifa, S., Durrani, N., Al-Khalifa, H., & Alam, F. (2025). The landscape of Arabic large language models. Communications of the ACM.
- Alterman, J. B. (2011). The revolution will not be tweeted. The Washington Quarterly, 34(4), 103–116.
- Barnhurst, K. G., & Nerone, J. (2001). The form of news: A history. Guilford Press.
- Beckett, C., & Deuze, M. (2016). On the role of emotion in the future of journalism. Social Media + Society, 2(3), 1–6.
- Boylan, J. (2003). Pulitzer's school: Columbia University's school of journalism, 1903–2003. Columbia University Press.
- Carlson, M. (2015). The robotic reporter: Automated journalism and the redefinition of labor, compositional forms, and journalistic authority. Digital Journalism, 3(3), 416–431.
- Christians, C. G., Fackler, M., Richardson, K., & Kreshel, P. (2016). Media ethics: Cases and moral reasoning (10th ed.). Routledge.
- Coddington, M. (2015). Clarifying journalism's quantitative turn. Digital Journalism, 3(3), 331–348.
- Cools, H., & Diakopoulos, N. (2024). Uses of generative AI in the newsroom: Mapping journalists' perceptions of perils and possibilities. Journalism Practice, 27, 1–19.
- Cushion, S. (2012). The democratic value of news: Why public service media matter. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Deuze, M. (2006). Global journalism education: A conceptual approach. Journalism Studies, 7(1), 19–34.
- Diakopoulos, N. (2019). Automating the news: How algorithms are rewriting the media. Harvard University Press.
- Flew, T., Spurgeon, C., Daniel, A., & Swift, A. (2012). The promise of computational journalism. Journalism Practice, 6(2), 157–171.
- Franklin, B. (Ed.). (2014). The future of journalism. Routledge.
- Gorwa, R., Binns, R., & Katzenbach, C. (2020). Algorithmic content moderation: Technical and political challenges in the automation of platform governance. Big Data & Society, 7(1), 1–15.
- Graves, L. (2016). Deciding what's true: The rise of political fact-checking in American journalism. Columbia University Press.
- Gynnild, A. (2014). Journalism innovation leads to innovation journalism. Journalism, 15(6), 713–730.
- Hamilton, J. T. (2016). Democracy's detectives: The economics of investigative journalism. Harvard University Press.
- Hanitzsch, T., Hanusch, F., Ramaprasad, J., & de Beer, A. S. (Eds.). (2019). Worlds of journalism: Journalistic cultures around the globe. Columbia University Press.
- Hermida, A. (2012). Tweets and truth: Journalism as a discipline of collaborative verification. Journalism Practice, 6(5–6), 659–668.
- Lewis, S. C., & Westlund, O. (2015). Actors, actants, audiences, and activities in cross-media news work. Digital Journalism, 3(1), 19–37.

- Loosen, W., & Schmidt, J. H. (2012). (Re-)discovering the audience. Information, Communication & Society, 15(6), 867–887.
- Napoli, P. M. (2019). Social media and the public interest: Media regulation in the disinformation age. Columbia University Press.
- Örnebring, H. (2010). Technology and journalism-as-labour: Historical perspectives. Journalism, 11(1), 57–74.
- Reese, S. D. (2001). Understanding the global journalist: A hierarchy-of-influences approach. Journalism Studies, 2(2), 173–187.
- Scheufele, D. A., & Krause, N. M. (2019). Science audiences, misinformation, and fake news. PNAS, 116(16), 7662–7669.
- Singer, J. B. (2010). Quality control: Perceived effects of user-generated content on newsroom norms, values and routines. Journalism Practice, 4(2), 127–142.
- Stray, J. (2019). Making artificial intelligence work for investigative journalism. Digital Journalism, 7(8), 1076–1097.
- Tandoc, E. C., Lim, Z. W., & Ling, R. (2018). Defining 'fake news': A typology of scholarly definitions. Digital Journalism, 6(2), 137–153.
- Wardle, C., & Derakhshan, H. (2017). Information disorder: Toward an interdisciplinary framework for research and policymaking. Council of Europe Report DGI(2017)09.
- Waisbord, S. (2013). Reinventing professionalism: Journalism and news in Global Perspective. Polity Press.
- Zelizer, B. (2004). Taking journalism seriously: News and the academy. Sage Publications.