

Algorithmic Visibility and Public Opinion: Transparency, Accountability, and the Future of Digital News Consumption

Opeyemi Alawode^{1*}, Naomi Oboyi², Chukwunonyelum Rosalyn Ezeako³

¹Western Illinois University, Macomb, Illinois, USA

²Independent Researcher, Abuja, Nigeria

³University of Central Missouri, Warrensburg, Missouri, USA

*Corresponding Author: Opeyemi Alawode, alawodeopeyemi22@gmail.com

Abstract

This study examines how algorithmic systems increasingly shape digital news visibility, audience exposure, and public opinion, while interrogating the transparency, accountability, and governance challenges arising from platform-mediated information environments. Using a structured interdisciplinary review of scholarship spanning journalism studies, communication research, platform governance, artificial intelligence ethics, and digital media policy, the study synthesizes evidence on algorithmic gatekeeping, personalization, selective exposure, visibility inequalities, explainability, and emerging AI-enabled news consumption.

The findings show that platforms have become consequential information intermediaries whose ranking, recommendation, and engagement systems influence which stories, sources, and perspectives gain prominence. Personalization can improve relevance and convenience, yet it may also intensify selective exposure, reinforce existing preferences, and narrow encounters with diverse viewpoints when optimized primarily for engagement. The review further identifies unequal digital access, algorithmic literacy, infrastructural disparities, and differential optimization capacity as important sources of informational inequality. Transparency was found to be meaningful only when disclosures are understandable, actionable, and accompanied by mechanisms for scrutiny, redress, and independent oversight. The rapid emergence of generative artificial intelligence, conversational interfaces, automated summaries, and multi-agent systems is also reshaping how audiences discover and interpret news.

The study concludes that responsible digital news ecosystems require stronger human oversight, explainable recommendation practices, auditable algorithms, and governance frameworks that protect pluralism and user autonomy. It recommends independent algorithmic audits, accessible appeal mechanisms, improved algorithmic literacy, clearer disclosure of ranking principles, and sustained comparative research, particularly across underrepresented regions. These measures are essential for ensuring that technological innovation supports informed participation,

institutional accountability, and resilient democratic communication across rapidly evolving and increasingly automated environments.

Keywords: Algorithmic visibility; Digital news; Public opinion; News personalization; Platform governance; Generative artificial intelligence

1. Introduction

1.1 Algorithmic Mediation of Digital News

Algorithmic mediation has become a defining structural condition of digital news, altering how journalistic information is selected, ordered, distributed, and encountered. Rather than functioning merely as neutral technical filters, algorithms participate in the institutional organization of media by translating editorial priorities, behavioral data and platform objectives into computational rules that determine exposure. This shift extends automation beyond news production into the circulation and consumption of information, making algorithmic systems consequential actors within contemporary media institutions (Napoli, 2014). In this environment, visibility is increasingly produced through interactions among editorial judgment, platform architecture, data infrastructures and machine-learning models.

The transformation is especially significant because traditional gatekeeping no longer rests exclusively with journalists and editors. Digital platforms introduce additional gates through ranking, recommendation, search, trending functions and user interaction signals, producing a distributed system in which individuals, algorithms and platform operators jointly influence what reaches public attention (Wallace, 2018). Automation also reconfigures newsroom practice itself: machines can aggregate, prioritize and distribute information at speeds and scales unavailable to human workers, although professional journalists continue to exercise authority over interpretation, verification and final editorial judgment (Wu, Tandoc & Salmon, 2019). Algorithmic mediation should therefore be understood as a hybrid socio-technical process rather than the wholesale displacement of journalism by computation.

Personalization intensifies this transformation by tailoring news exposure to inferred preferences, prior behaviour, contextual information and engagement histories. European news organizations have adopted recommender systems not only to maximize short-term clicks but also to cultivate audience loyalty while attempting to preserve editorial missions, illustrating the tension between commercial optimization and journalistic responsibility (Bodó, 2019). The architecture of recommender systems is consequently normative as well as technical: design decisions determine which journalistic values become operationalized through ranking criteria, relevance

measures and recommendation objectives (Møller, 2024). What becomes visible to an individual user is thus partly shaped before any conscious act of news selection occurs.

Research on news recommender systems further demonstrates that these technologies operate across both the supply and demand sides of political communication, influencing distribution practices while reorganizing how audiences navigate abundant information environments (Mitova et al., 2023). Their evaluation cannot consequently be reduced to predictive accuracy or click-through performance. Values such as diversity, fairness, transparency, serendipity and editorial responsibility are increasingly recognized as legitimate design objectives because recommender systems perform functions formerly associated with editorial selection (Bauer et al., 2024). Algorithmic visibility therefore involves choices about which public values are encoded, measured and privileged within computational infrastructures.

These developments also complicate audience agency. Personalized recommendation may improve relevance and reduce information overload, yet meaningful user control depends on whether people can understand, contest or modify the logic shaping their news environment. Democratic approaches to recommendation consequently emphasize mechanisms through which users can exercise voice over algorithmic curation rather than remaining passive recipients of invisible personalization processes (Harambam, Helberger & van Hoboken, 2018). Ethical analysis of journalistic personalization similarly identifies autonomy, opacity, privacy, selective exposure and discrimination as central concerns, showing that personalized news delivery can unsettle established assumptions about universal access to common informational agendas (Rydenfelt et al., 2024).

The implications are equally important beyond highly resourced Western media systems. Evidence from Nigeria indicates that AI-driven news personalization is emerging within local media organizations, alongside concerns about infrastructure, algorithmic bias, content diversity and the continued necessity of human editorial oversight (Umeora, Duru & Nnabuike, 2025). South African newsroom research likewise shows that AI adoption is uneven and shaped by organizational capacities, professional routines and task-specific forms of technological appropriation (Munoriyarwa, Chiumbu & Motsaathebe, 2023). These patterns reinforce the broader importance of institutional preparedness when advanced technologies are introduced, because adoption depends on the readiness of organizations and their personnel to incorporate new systems into existing practices (Akhigbe, Falemi & Akin-Oluyomi, 2024). Algorithmic mediation of news is therefore best understood as a geographically uneven but increasingly global restructuring of visibility, editorial authority and audience access. Its significance lies not simply in technological efficiency, but in the redistribution of communicative power over which issues, sources and perspectives acquire prominence in everyday public knowledge formation.

1.2 Visibility, Influence, and Public Opinion

Digital news visibility is not merely a question of whether information exists online; it concerns which issues and interpretations enter public attention. Algorithmic ranking systems intervene in this process by determining content prominence within personalized feeds, thereby making visibility a distributive resource with implications for opinion formation. Evidence from Facebook demonstrates that algorithmic ranking can reduce exposure to ideologically cross-cutting material, although users' own selective choices may exert an even stronger effect on what they ultimately consume (Bakshy, Messing & Adamic, 2015). Visibility therefore emerges from an interaction between platform design and audience agency rather than from either force independently.

Personalized recommendation can further reorganize political attention by privileging information predicted to match users' interests. Experimental research shows that recommender-system design can affect selective exposure, information processing, and political knowledge, indicating that technical design choices can shape the informational conditions under which judgments are formed (Beam, 2014). At the consumption level, search engines and social networks may increase ideological separation while exposing users to counter-attitudinal material, complicating deterministic claims that digital news inevitably produces sealed echo chambers (Flaxman, Goel & Rao, 2016). Comparative evidence from Australia, Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States shows that incidental social-media exposure can broaden news sources encountered, particularly among younger and less news-interested users (Fletcher & Nielsen, 2018).

The influence of digital visibility becomes consequential when repeated exposure alters the composition of citizens' news diets. A field experiment found that encouraging users to follow ideologically opposing news sources increased exposure to cross-cutting information but could also produce attitudinal effects that varied by political orientation, demonstrating that exposure diversity does not automatically generate convergence (Levy, 2021). In Nigeria, the circulation of political disinformation across social media and conventional media illustrates how digitally amplified narratives can migrate between communication environments, intensify cleavages and potentially distort public deliberation (Hassan, 2023). Comparable dynamics are visible in Ghana, where political actors employ platform-specific framing, hashtags and visually salient content to structure issue presentation and voter engagement across social platforms (Tawiah, 2025). Algorithmic visibility must therefore be understood as a consequential layer of public communication: it conditions which messages acquire reach, repetition and perceived salience, while its effects remain mediated by user preferences, social networks, political context and the strategic behaviour of communicative actors.

1.3 Transparency and Accountability Concerns

Algorithmic transparency has become a central concern in digital news because audiences increasingly encounter information through computational systems whose ranking criteria, data inputs and optimization objectives are rarely visible. This opacity complicates understanding of why particular stories, sources or viewpoints receive prominence. Algorithmic accountability reporting therefore interrogates the power embedded in computational systems by identifying their assumptions, consequences and institutional beneficiaries, extending journalism's watchdog function into infrastructures shaping information visibility (Diakopoulos, 2015).

Transparency, however, should not be equated with accountability. Disclosing source code, model documentation, or platform policies may reveal fragments of a system without enabling scrutiny of how decisions are produced or contested. Effective accountability requires mechanisms through which responsible actors can be identified, questioned and subjected to consequences when algorithmic practices create foreseeable harms (Ananny & Crawford, 2018). Scholarship similarly emphasizes that accountability depends on specifying the actor, forum, evaluation standards, justification process and sanctions, rather than treating openness as an end in itself (Wieringa, 2020).

For digital news organizations, these concerns are intensified by artificial intelligence in editorial workflows and distribution systems. South African journalists have expressed concerns regarding embedded bias, reliability and the possibility that automated systems may reproduce social inequalities while failing to amplify marginalized voices (Solomons & Ndlovu, 2024). Responsible AI journalism consequently requires ethical principles to be translated into newsroom routines, governance arrangements and professional judgments capable of preserving accuracy, fairness, autonomy and public trust (Shin, Zhou & Rasul, 2025).

Institutional governance provides an accountability layer. Nigerian evidence on information-technology governance shows that structured frameworks such as COBIT and ITIL can strengthen auditability, risk oversight, compliance monitoring and allocated responsibility within digital operations (Fadero et al., 2018). Governance scholarship likewise emphasizes integrated architectures combining transparent information systems, audit trails, reporting pathways and enforceable accountability mechanisms as foundations for responsible strategic execution (Akhigbe, Falemi & Akin-Oluyomi, 2025). Applied to algorithmically mediated news, these principles imply that platforms and publishers require traceable decision processes, meaningful disclosure, independent auditing, accessible redress and identifiable human responsibility. Such safeguards matter where opaque recommendation systems influence public attention, because accountability must address how algorithms function, who authorizes their objectives, who

benefits, whose interests may be disadvantaged, and what remedies exist when visibility decisions undermine informational fairness or democratic participation.

1.4 Review Scope and Objectives

This review examines how algorithmic systems shape the visibility, circulation, and reception of digital news, with particular attention to their implications for public opinion, transparency, accountability, and future patterns of news consumption. Its scope encompasses the socio-technical processes through which platforms, search engines, recommender systems, and artificial intelligence increasingly influence what information becomes prominent, discoverable, or marginal within contemporary media environments. Rather than treating algorithms as neutral tools, the review considers them as institutional mechanisms embedded within commercial, editorial, technological, and regulatory structures.

The review has four principal objectives. First, it seeks to clarify the concept of algorithmic visibility and explain how automated ranking, personalization, recommendation, and distribution systems reshape traditional forms of news gatekeeping. Second, it evaluates how these mechanisms influence exposure, issue salience, selective attention, and the conditions under which public opinion is formed. Third, it investigates the transparency and accountability challenges created by opaque computational decision-making, including questions of explainability, bias, auditability, governance, and institutional responsibility. Fourth, it explores emerging trajectories in digital news consumption, particularly the growing role of generative artificial intelligence, conversational interfaces, automated summaries, and user-controlled recommendation systems.

The review is intentionally interdisciplinary, drawing together perspectives from journalism studies, communication research, platform governance, artificial intelligence ethics, and digital media policy. It also emphasizes comparative and geographically diverse perspectives to avoid framing algorithmic news systems solely through resourced Western contexts. By integrating technological, institutional, and audience-centered dimensions, the review aims to establish a coherent analytical foundation for assessing how algorithmic visibility is reshaping news access, public knowledge, and the democratic quality of digital communication.

2. Algorithmic Visibility in Digital News

2.1 Platforms as Algorithmic Gatekeepers

Platforms increasingly function as algorithmic gatekeepers because access to digital news is mediated not only by editorial selection but also by computational systems that rank,

recommend, suppress, and circulate content. Their influence arises from control over infrastructural visibility: publishers may produce news, but platforms frequently determine which items receive prominent placement within feeds, search results and recommendation streams. Facebook's early News Feed architecture demonstrated how algorithmic ordering could transform visibility itself into a form of power, making relevance dependent on software-defined signals rather than chronological publication alone (Bucher, 2012).

This transformation has redistributed gatekeeping authority across a layered media system. News organizations retain professional control over reporting and publication, yet platform companies establish the technical conditions through which stories encounter audiences. Research on Facebook news selection shows that algorithmic curation embeds particular values into ranking decisions, thereby shifting part of the traditional editorial function toward computational systems whose criteria are not fully observable to journalists or users (DeVito, 2017). The broader process of platformization deepens this dependency because publishers increasingly rely on infrastructures, data services and distribution channels governed by large technology companies, making news production and circulation contingent upon changing platform rules and business models (Nieborg& Poell, 2018).

Algorithmic gatekeeping is particularly consequential when platform logics determine which forms of journalism receive greater reach. Reverse-engineering research distinguishes among publishing, sharing, and algorithmic spreading, showing that platform algorithms can alter the overall composition of news encountered by audiences and, as dissemination expands, can become more influential than user preferences alone (Karlsson, Van Couvering& Lindell, 2022). In Nigeria, this dynamic is visible on Opera News Hub, where recommendation systems and audience metrics have encouraged journalists to adapt story selection toward content likely to attract engagement, with implications for professional autonomy and the relative visibility of hard and soft news (Umejei, 2022).

The gatekeeping process is also increasingly recursive. Audiences no longer occupy a purely receptive position because comments, shares, reactions and other engagement signals return to newsrooms and platforms as measurable indicators of attention. Evidence from Kenyan newsrooms shows that online audience comments can influence editorial evaluation and strategic decision-making, illustrating how audience feedback now participates in contemporary gatekeeping processes alongside journalists and digital infrastructures (Oywer et al., 2023). Such feedback can subsequently be incorporated into recommender systems, creating cycles in which past engagement helps determine future visibility.

These developments carry normative implications for democratic communication. News recommenders do not simply optimize convenience; their design can advance or undermine exposure to diverse information, deliberative quality, and opportunities for citizens to encounter socially significant issues (Helberger, 2019). Audience perceptions also matter, as comparative gatekeeping research indicates that trust may differ according to whether news selection is attributed to professional journalists or social-media algorithms, reinforcing the continuing legitimacy of human editorial judgment even within automated environments (Scheffauer, Goyanes & Gil de Zúñiga, 2024).

Platform gatekeeping is becoming still more complex as artificial intelligence enters news gathering, production, optimization and distribution. Evidence from news organizations in the United Kingdom, United States and Germany shows that AI is increasingly embedded across the gatekeeping chain, strengthening logics of efficiency, predictability and calculability while redistributing control among editorial, commercial and technological actors (Simon, 2025). Platforms should therefore be understood not as passive conduits but as active institutional gatekeepers whose algorithms, metrics, infrastructures and commercial priorities shape the visibility conditions under which digital journalism reaches the public and influences the informational architecture of contemporary public life.

2.2 Personalization and Selective News Exposure

Personalization has become a central mechanism of digital news consumption because platforms increasingly tailor information environments to inferred interests, prior behaviour, search histories and interaction patterns. Rather than presenting identical news agendas to all users, recommender systems construct differentiated pathways through which audiences encounter stories, sources and viewpoints. Experimental evidence demonstrates that these systems do not produce a uniform effect on selective exposure; their influence depends on how recommendation objectives are designed and whether systems prioritise preference congruence, diversity or other editorial values (Knudsen, 2023).

This conditionality matters because selective exposure emerges from algorithmic filtering and individual choice. In social-media environments, users make decisions while scanning feeds before deciding whether to click and engage more deeply, meaning that exposure is filtered at multiple behavioural levels (Ohme & Mothes, 2020). News recommender design can nevertheless redirect these patterns. Diversity-oriented recommenders have been shown to increase exposure to a broader range of content, particularly when personalization is combined with diversity objectives rather than optimized solely around predicted preferences (Joris et al., 2024).

The underlying logic of personalization depends on behavioural data. Real-time analytics frameworks demonstrate how behavioural signals can be integrated with operational information to generate adaptive and individualized responses, illustrating the wider data logic on which personalized digital environments depend (Akhigbe, Falemi& Akin-Oluyomi, 2023). External search behaviour can similarly function as a dynamic signal of changing demand, enabling systems to adjust selections in response to emerging user interests (Akanbi, Ganiu & Sunday, 2025). Within news ecosystems, however, such responsiveness requires safeguards because optimizing narrowly for observed preferences can repeatedly privilege familiar themes while reducing opportunities for incidental discovery.

These tensions are increasingly relevant in African media systems. Nigerian media organizations are expanding their use of artificial intelligence for content production, audience analysis and social-media management, creating foundations for data-driven and potentially personalized news delivery (Talabi et al., 2025). In South Africa, newsroom research similarly shows that social-media algorithms affect personalization, placement and distribution decisions, while commercial pressures encourage organizations to adapt content strategies to algorithmic preferences (Lingbondo, 2025). Personalization therefore reshapes selective exposure through a continuous interaction among audience behaviour, algorithmic prediction, editorial strategy and platform optimization, making exposure diversity an increasingly important criterion for evaluating responsible digital news systems.

2.3 Visibility and Public Opinion Formation

Visibility is a precondition for influence in digital news environments because issues that occupy prominent positions in feeds, search interfaces and social networks gain greater opportunities to enter public attention. Contemporary agenda formation is increasingly distributed across professional media, platforms and networked audiences. Analysis of political issues across traditional and social media shows that public attention develops through reciprocal interactions rather than a one-directional transfer from news institutions to citizens (Neuman et al., 2014). This makes prominence itself politically consequential.

Social media can extend agenda-setting effects by exposing users to public affairs content even when they have not actively sought political information. Experimental evidence indicates that incidental exposure and social filtering can increase the perceived importance of issues circulated through social networks, demonstrating how visibility may shape public agendas under fragmented media choice (Feezell, 2018). Yet exposure does not produce uniform attitudinal convergence. A field experiment involving cross-cutting political content found that exposure to opposing viewpoints could, under particular conditions, reinforce rather than diminish

polarization, highlighting the importance of prior identities in opinion formation (Bail et al., 2018).

Public opinion is also shaped through the social circulation of visible content. Selective sharing can amplify frames congruent with users' beliefs, allowing retweeting and reposting practices to elevate particular interpretations of political events while marginalizing alternatives (Aruguete & Calvo, 2018). Exposure patterns can subsequently influence expression: incidental encounters with counter-attitudinal information may encourage stronger partisans to seek congenial material and share political information within their networks, reinforcing relationships between visibility, selection and expression (Weeks et al., 2017).

African digital publics reveal comparable interactions between visibility and collective meaning-making. During South Africa's #RhodesMustFall movement, Twitter facilitated counter-memory, activist communication and the public circulation of claims challenging established institutional narratives, demonstrating how networked visibility can broaden arenas of contestation (Bosch, 2017). At the interpersonal level, Nigerian evidence shows that social media and peer pressure are associated with behavioural outcomes among adolescents, underscoring the significance of socially mediated influence within digitally connected environments (Sabbah & Alausa, 2021). Public opinion formation in algorithmically mediated news systems should therefore be understood as an iterative process in which computational ranking, journalistic agendas, social endorsement, prior beliefs and networked interaction jointly determine which issues become visible, salient and consequential.

2.4 Bias, Inequality, and Information Visibility

Algorithmic visibility is inherently distributive: every ranking decision elevates some information while relegating other material to less visible positions. In digital news environments, inequality therefore arises not only from whether people can access information, but also from how platforms order competing sources, topics, and voices. Search systems can systematically privilege particular sites while excluding or demoting others, demonstrating that apparently technical relevance judgments may carry consequential social and political values (Introna & Nissenbaum, 2000).

Bias can also emerge through uneven source representation. Research on Google News found limited evidence for strong personalization-driven filter bubbles, yet identified systematic overrepresentation of some outlets and underrepresentation of others, showing that diversity problems may persist even without extreme individual personalization (Haim, Graefe & Brosius, 2018). Algorithmic curation similarly changes media exposure on social platforms: auditing Twitter timelines revealed increases in some dimensions of source diversity alongside fewer

external links and differential amplification of topics, illustrating how ranking systems redistribute informational attention rather than merely organize it neutrally (Bandy & Diakopoulos, 2021).

Visibility inequalities are also adaptive. Content producers learn platform signals and modify practices to secure reach, creating what has been described as a “visibility game” in which users strategically respond to opaque algorithmic rules. Those with greater resources, expertise or platform knowledge may be better positioned to optimize content and sustain prominence, while less knowledgeable actors face heightened risks of invisibility (Cotter, 2019). Such disparities extend to audiences. Evidence from Germany identifies an emerging algorithmic divide in which awareness and knowledge of AI-driven news selection vary across age, education, and other sociodemographic characteristics, potentially producing unequal capacities to interpret algorithmically curated information (Eder & Sjøvaag, 2024).

These mechanisms are cumulative rather than isolated. A user disadvantaged by weak connectivity may also possess lower algorithmic literacy, encounter narrower source repertoires, and have fewer opportunities to contest ranking outcomes. At the producer level, under-resourced organizations may struggle to generate the engagement signals that platforms reward with visibility.

Digital inequality begins even earlier, at the level of access. South African journalism education research demonstrates how disparities in devices, connectivity and participation can produce unequal opportunities to benefit from digitally mediated information environments (Nkoala & Matsilele, 2023). Comparable infrastructural constraints appear in Nigeria, where mobile-network coverage can determine whether digitally mediated services are practically reachable beyond major urban centres, revealing how geographic connectivity conditions participation in platform systems (Alaka, Ajayi & Bolaji, 2022). Affordability further compounds such inequalities: evidence from low-income Nigerian commuters shows that willingness and capacity to adopt digitally booked services are sensitive to economic conditions and cost burdens (Ajayi, Alaka & Tihamiyu, 2023). For digital news, these intersecting inequalities mean that visibility cannot be assessed solely by algorithmic fairness; it must also account for who can connect, who understands ranking systems, who can strategically respond to them, and whose information is repeatedly privileged or obscured.

Table 1. Illustrative pathways of information visibility inequality

Inequality dimension	Visibility mechanism	Groups potentially disadvantaged	Implication for digital news
Ranking bias	Unequal algorithmic prioritization	Lower-ranked sources and perspectives	Reduced discoverability
Source concentration	Repeated prominence of established outlets	Smaller and alternative publishers	Narrower information plurality
Algorithmic literacy	Unequal understanding of curation	Less digitally knowledgeable users	Reduced ability to interpret rankings
Infrastructure access	Connectivity and device disparities	Rural and low-income populations	Unequal access to news ecosystems
Affordability	Data and participation costs	Economically constrained audiences	Restricted frequency and depth of access
Optimization capacity	Ability to adapt to platform signals	Under-resourced content producers	Persistent visibility disadvantages

2.5 Transparency and Explainable News Algorithms

Transparency in algorithmically mediated news requires more than disclosure that automated systems are operating. Meaningful transparency should enable audiences to understand why particular stories are recommended, which factors shape rankings, and how editorial choices intersect with computational processes. Research on algorithmic transparency in news organizations shows that disclosure can operate across data, models, inferences and interfaces, but excessive technical detail can overwhelm users rather than illuminate decision-making (Diakopoulos&Koliska, 2017).

Explainability therefore concerns the intelligibility of algorithmic decisions. Users often construct incomplete mental models of curated feeds and may not recognize how ranking systems selectively structure what they see, creating a gap between algorithmic mediation and perceived neutrality (Rader & Gray, 2015). Experimental evidence indicates that transparency has a non-linear relationship with trust: insufficient explanation can generate suspicion, while excessive information may reduce confidence by increasing complexity and cognitive burden (Kizilcec, 2016). Effective disclosure must consequently be proportionate, contextual and actionable.

In news recommendation, explanations can connect recommended articles to interpretable topics or user interests, allowing audiences to understand the rationale behind content selection rather

than confronting opaque relevance scores. Topic-centred models demonstrate that recommendation accuracy and interpretability can be pursued simultaneously when explanatory features are designed into the system (Liu et al., 2024). Human-centred research further shows that explainability strengthens trust when users can understand not merely what an algorithm produced, but why its reasoning appears causally plausible and coherent (Shin, 2021).

These principles require attention in uneven media environments. Nigerian journalism is beginning to incorporate artificial intelligence into professional routines, yet institutional capacity, technological resources and professional norms remain important determinants of responsible adoption (Kperogi&Ishiekwene, 2025). Across Southern African journalism education, limited conceptual clarity about AI and uneven training have contributed to uncertainty and trust deficits, reinforcing the need for explainability literacy alongside technical adoption (Ncube et al., 2025).

Explainable news algorithms must also respect cognitive limits. Human-machine interaction research emphasizes that system design should account for cognitive workload because complex interfaces and excessive informational demands can impair comprehension and effective decision-making (Adamolekun et al., 2025). For digital news, this implies explanation mechanisms that are concise, layered and user-controllable: audiences should be able to see principal reasons for a recommendation, inspect additional detail when desired, and distinguish editorial judgments from automated ranking. Such design would make transparency operational by connecting disclosure, comprehension and user agency without transforming explainability into another source of informational overload itself.

2.6 Accountability and Platform Governance

Platform governance concerns the institutional arrangements through which digital intermediaries exercise, justify, and constrain power over content, users, publishers, and public communication. Because platforms simultaneously design technical infrastructures, establish private rules, moderate speech, and shape information visibility, accountability cannot be reduced to voluntary corporate disclosure. A governance perspective instead requires clear allocation of responsibilities among platforms, regulators, civil society, news organizations, and users, recognizing that these actors occupy unequal positions within digitally mediated communication systems (Gorwa, 2019).

Cooperative models are especially important where public values such as pluralism, safety, and freedom of expression depend on decisions distributed across multiple institutions. Responsibility should therefore be shared without becoming diffuse: platforms must remain answerable for design and enforcement choices, while public authorities establish legitimate

standards and oversight mechanisms (Helberger, Pierson & Poell, 2018). This becomes particularly significant as automated moderation scales platform control. Machine-learning systems can improve consistency and speed, yet their technical limitations, classification errors, and political assumptions create accountability risks when consequential decisions are delegated to opaque infrastructures (Gorwa, Binns & Katzenbach, 2020).

For news ecosystems, governance must also address prominence. Platforms influence whether public-interest journalism is discoverable, deprioritized, or displaced by commercially optimized material; consequently, accountability frameworks should specify who sets visibility rules, which institutions can scrutinize them, and what remedies follow when public-value objectives are compromised (Rozgonyi, 2023). Comparative regulatory experience also indicates that co-regulation must balance governmental authority, commercial platform power, and user participation rather than presuming that any single actor can legitimately govern digital communication alone (Zhu, 2025).

Nigeria illustrates the importance of context-sensitive co-regulation. The country's Platform Code of Practice represents a shift toward imposing duties on intermediaries themselves, although effective enforcement still depends on regulatory capacity, information access, and managing power asymmetries between national authorities and transnational technology companies (Obia, 2025). African governance experience further demonstrates that technological transformation requires ethical leadership and credible policy implementation if formal frameworks are to translate into accountable institutional practice (Enaifoghe, Dlamini & Agwuna, 2020).

Technical governance also matters. Secure access-control architectures illustrate how accountability can be embedded through differentiated permissions, traceable authorization, and protected information exchange rather than relying solely on procedural promises (Shittu & Nabil, 2023). Applied to digital news platforms, effective governance therefore requires transparent rules, auditable algorithms, independent review, proportionate sanctions, accessible appeals, secure data stewardship, and clearly identifiable responsibility across the full chain of algorithmic decision-making within increasingly complex transnational information ecosystems today.

2.7 Future Digital News Consumption

Future digital news consumption is likely to be defined by a transition from feed-based discovery toward conversational, generative, and adaptive information environments. Rather than selecting stories solely from lists, audiences may interact with AI systems that retrieve, summarize, compare, translate, and contextualize news in response to individualized prompts. This shift

could make news access faster and more convenient, but audience acceptance will depend on trust, transparency, and perceptions of responsible use. Cross-national survey evidence shows that publics expect generative AI to affect journalism substantially while remaining concerned that its use could reduce news transparency and trustworthiness (Fletcher & Nielsen, 2024).

Generative systems may blur the boundary between news production and consumption. Large language models can transform journalistic material into summaries, question-and-answer exchanges, personalized explainers, audio scripts, or multilingual outputs, allowing audiences to navigate issues through iterative dialogue rather than passive reception. Yet these capabilities are accompanied by risks involving fabrication, attribution, bias, and overreliance on synthetic outputs, making editorial verification and disclosure central to their responsible incorporation into journalism (Pavlik, 2023).

The institutional implications are significant. Generative AI intervenes in core journalistic activities such as writing, interpretation, synthesis, and knowledge representation, potentially altering established norms of authorship, professional authority, and editorial control (Lewis et al., 2025). Future consumption systems may therefore place audiences in contact not simply with published articles but with machine-mediated representations of journalism assembled dynamically from multiple sources.

African news ecosystems are likely to experience this transformation unevenly. Evidence from Nigeria, Ghana, Kenya, and South Africa indicates that journalists already approach AI through mixed orientations of optimism, caution, and pragmatism, suggesting that adoption will be shaped by professional norms, resource availability, and perceived ethical risks rather than technological possibility alone (Umejei et al., 2025). In Nigeria, use of AI in news gathering and reporting demonstrates growing institutional experimentation, while concerns around credibility, employment, accuracy, and ethical practice remain influential in determining how extensively automation enters newsroom routines (Talabi et al., 2024).

Audience response will ultimately determine whether AI-mediated news becomes normalized. Research across ten African countries shows that perceptions of AI-generated news are shaped by trust, transparency, bias concerns, demographic differences, and digital literacy, indicating that technological adoption cannot be separated from users' interpretive capacities (Gondwe, 2025). Future news systems will therefore need visible provenance, accessible correction mechanisms, clear distinctions between human and machine contributions, and meaningful options for users to control personalization.

Organizational readiness will further shape the pace and quality of adoption. Comparative evidence on generative-AI integration demonstrates that infrastructure, governance maturity,

workforce capability, and managerial preparedness influence whether AI can be deployed responsibly and at scale (Ayinde, Ojukwu & Ohunyon, 2025). These principles transfer directly to news organizations confronting unequal resources and rapidly changing audience expectations.

More autonomous architectures may eventually coordinate multiple specialized agents for retrieval, verification, summarization, recommendation, translation, and personalization. Research on distributed multi-agent AI demonstrates how coordinated autonomous systems can improve adaptability and scalability through specialized agents operating toward shared objectives (Akanbi, Ganiu & Sunday, 2025). In digital journalism, however, such architectures should remain subject to editorial supervision, traceable source attribution, public-interest safeguards, and user override. The future of digital news consumption will consequently depend not simply on increasingly intelligent interfaces, but on whether innovation preserves human agency, source diversity, journalistic accountability, and informed participation within algorithmically mediated public communication.

Conclusion

This study examined how algorithmic systems shape the discovery, visibility, circulation, and interpretation of digital news, with particular attention to their implications for public opinion, transparency, accountability, and emerging patterns of media consumption. The review established that contemporary news access is no longer governed solely by professional editorial judgment. Platform ranking systems, recommendation engines, engagement metrics, and artificial intelligence now operate as consequential gatekeeping mechanisms that determine which issues, sources, and perspectives become prominent or remain peripheral.

The study further demonstrated that personalization can improve relevance and convenience while simultaneously narrowing exposure when systems optimize excessively for prior behaviour, predicted preferences, or commercial engagement. Algorithmic visibility was shown to influence public attention by shaping issue salience, repeated exposure, and opportunities for social amplification. These processes, however, are not evenly distributed. Digital divides, unequal algorithmic literacy, infrastructural disparities, and differences in optimization capacity can produce asymmetries in whose content is seen, trusted, and acted upon.

The analysis also clarified that transparency alone is insufficient unless audiences and institutions can understand, interrogate, and challenge algorithmic decisions. Explainable systems, independent auditing, clear responsibility structures, accessible redress mechanisms, and proportionate regulatory oversight are therefore essential components of credible platform governance. As generative AI, conversational interfaces, automated summaries, and multi-agent

systems become more influential in news consumption, the central challenge will be preserving journalistic integrity and user autonomy within increasingly adaptive information environments.

Accordingly, news organizations and platforms should adopt human-centred recommendation practices, disclose meaningful ranking principles, strengthen algorithmic literacy, conduct bias and impact assessments, and preserve editorial oversight over automated outputs. Regulators should promote interoperable transparency standards, independent scrutiny, and effective appeal mechanisms. Future research should prioritize comparative evidence from underrepresented regions, longitudinal studies of opinion effects, and empirical evaluation of AI-mediated news interfaces. Collectively, these measures can help ensure that technological innovation expands informed participation without sacrificing pluralism, accountability, or democratic resilience.

References

1. Adamolekun, A., Logah, F.X., Alabi, C., Baanye, J., Wilson, M., Ganiu, O. et al. (2025) 'Toward a unified framework for multimodal cognitive workload assessment in human-machine interaction systems', SSRN Electronic Journal, SSRN 5235980. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.5235980.
2. Ajayi, O., Alaka, O.B. and Tiamiyu, R. (2023) 'Willingness to pay for shared and digitally booked transport among low-income commuters after fuel price increases', International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies, 3(6), pp. 3059–3070. DOI: 10.62225/2583049X.2023.3.6.6813.
3. Akanbi, O., Ganiu, O.S. and Sunday, E.A. (2025) 'A demand-driven inventory assortment framework: Leveraging external search data for SKU scalability', Gyanshauryam: International Scientific Refereed Research Journal, 8(5), pp. 272–305. DOI: 10.32628/GISRRJ.
4. Akanbi, O., Ganiu, O.S. and Sunday, E.A. (2025) 'A multi-agent AI framework for swarm intelligence in autonomous mobile robot (AMR) fleet coordination', International Journal of Scientific Research in Humanities and Social Sciences, 2(1), pp. 81–109. DOI: 10.32628/IJSRHSS.
5. Akhigbe, R., Falemi, A. and Akin-Oluyomi, O.T. (2023) 'A conceptual model for improving customer experience using workforce behavior and real-time operational data', International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation, 4(6), pp. 1322–1338. DOI: 10.54660/IJMRGE.2023.4.6.1322-1338.
6. Akhigbe, R., Falemi, A. and Akin-Oluyomi, O.T. (2024) 'An advanced framework for technology adoption that supports employee readiness in modern organizations'.
7. Akhigbe, R., Falemi, A. and Akin-Oluyomi, O.T. (2025) 'An advanced governance model for improving transparency, accountability and strategic execution in complex

- enterprises', *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies*, 5(6), pp. 1169–1188. DOI: 10.62225/2583049X.2025.5.6.5341.
8. Alaka, O.B., Ajayi, O. and Bolaji, O. (2022) 'Mobile network coverage and road surface condition as joint constraints on digitally booked transport beyond state capitals', *International Journal of Engineering and Modern Technology*, 8(5), pp. 142–168. DOI: 10.56201/ijemt.v8.no5.2022.pg142.168.
9. Ananny, M. and Crawford, K. (2018) 'Seeing without knowing: Limitations of the transparency ideal and its application to algorithmic accountability', *New Media & Society*, 20(3), pp. 973–989. DOI: 10.1177/1461444816676645.
10. Aruguete, N. and Calvo, E. (2018) 'Time to #Protest: Selective exposure, cascading activation, and framing in social media', *Journal of Communication*, 68(3), pp. 480–502. DOI: 10.1093/joc/jqy007.
11. Ayinde, M., Ojukwu, P.U. and Ohunyon, G. (2025) 'Organizational readiness for generative AI integration in healthcare operations: Comparative management capabilities between the U.S. and low- and middle-income countries', *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies*, 5(6), pp. 2207–2222. DOI: 10.62225/2583049X.2025.5.6.6007.
12. Bail, C.A., Argyle, L.P., Brown, T.W., Bumpus, J.P., Chen, H., Hunzaker, M.B.F., Lee, J., Mann, M., Merhout, F. and Volfovsky, A. (2018) 'Exposure to opposing views on social media can increase political polarization', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(37), pp. 9216–9221. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1804840115.
13. Bakshy, E., Messing, S. and Adamic, L.A. (2015) 'Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on Facebook', *Science*, 348(6239), pp. 1130–1132. DOI: 10.1126/science.aaa1160.
14. Bandy, J. and Diakopoulos, N. (2021) 'More accounts, fewer links: How algorithmic curation impacts media exposure in Twitter timelines', *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 5(CSCW1), Article 78, pp. 1–28. DOI: 10.1145/3449152.
15. Bauer, C., Bagchi, C., Hundogan, O.A. and van Es, K. (2024) 'Where are the values? A systematic literature review on news recommender systems', *ACM Transactions on Recommender Systems*, 2(3), Article 23, pp. 1–40. DOI: 10.1145/3654805.
16. Beam, M.A. (2014) 'Automating the news: How personalized news recommender system design choices impact news reception', *Communication Research*, 41(8), pp. 1019–1041. DOI: 10.1177/0093650213497979.
17. Bodó, B. (2019) 'Selling news to audiences – A qualitative inquiry into the emerging logics of algorithmic news personalization in European quality news media', *Digital Journalism*, 7(8), pp. 1054–1075. DOI: 10.1080/21670811.2019.1624185.

18. Bosch, T. (2017) 'Twitter activism and youth in South Africa: The case of #RhodesMustFall', *Information, Communication & Society*, 20(2), pp. 221–232. DOI: 10.1080/1369118X.2016.1162829.
19. Bucher, T. (2012) 'Want to be on the top? Algorithmic power and the threat of invisibility on Facebook', *New Media & Society*, 14(7), pp. 1164–1180. DOI: 10.1177/1461444812440159.
20. Cotter, K. (2019) 'Playing the visibility game: How digital influencers and algorithms negotiate influence on Instagram', *New Media & Society*, 21(4), pp. 895–913. DOI: 10.1177/1461444818815684.
21. DeVito, M.A. (2017) 'From editors to algorithms: A values-based approach to understanding story selection in the Facebook news feed', *Digital Journalism*, 5(6), pp. 753–773. DOI: 10.1080/21670811.2016.1178592.
22. Diakopoulos, N. (2015) 'Algorithmic accountability: Journalistic investigation of computational power structures', *Digital Journalism*, 3(3), pp. 398–415. DOI: 10.1080/21670811.2014.976411.
23. Diakopoulos, N. and Koliska, M. (2017) 'Algorithmic transparency in the news media', *Digital Journalism*, 5(7), pp. 809–828. DOI: 10.1080/21670811.2016.1208053.
24. Eder, M. and Sjøvaag, H. (2024) 'Artificial intelligence and the dawn of an algorithmic divide', *Frontiers in Communication*, 9, Article 1453251. DOI: 10.3389/fcomm.2024.1453251.
25. Enaifoghe, A., Dlamini, N.P. and Agwuna, L.U. (2020) 'African economic integration development in technological transformation: Accessing the importance of ethical leadership for policy implementation in SADC', *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, 12(6(J)), pp. 11–20. DOI: 10.22610/jeb.v12i6(J).3102.
26. Fadero, S., Oyesiji, S.O., Nwakamma, S. and Jooda, D. (2018) 'IT governance frameworks (COBIT/ITIL) and their impact on regulatory compliance in Nigerian insurance firms', *IRE Journals*, 2(5), pp. 478–496. DOI: 10.64388/IREV2I5-1722619.
27. Feezell, J.T. (2018) 'Agenda setting through social media: The importance of incidental news exposure and social filtering in the digital era', *Political Research Quarterly*, 71(2), pp. 482–494. DOI: 10.1177/1065912917744895.
28. Flaxman, S., Goel, S. and Rao, J.M. (2016) 'Filter bubbles, echo chambers, and online news consumption', *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 80(S1), pp. 298–320. DOI: 10.1093/poq/nfw006.
29. Fletcher, R. and Nielsen, R.K. (2018) 'Are people incidentally exposed to news on social media? A comparative analysis', *New Media & Society*, 20(7), pp. 2450–2468. DOI: 10.1177/1461444817724170.

30. Fletcher, R. and Nielsen, R.K. (2024) What Does the Public in Six Countries Think of Generative AI in News? Oxford: Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism. DOI: 10.60625/risj-4zb8-cg87.
31. Gondwe, G. (2025) 'Perceptions of AI-driven news among contemporary audiences: A study of trust, engagement, and impact', *AI & Society*, 40, pp. 5637–5648. DOI: 10.1007/s00146-025-02294-x.
32. Gorwa, R. (2019) 'What is platform governance?', *Information, Communication & Society*, 22(6), pp. 854–871. DOI: 10.1080/1369118X.2019.1573914.
33. Gorwa, R., Binns, R. and Katzenbach, C. (2020) 'Algorithmic content moderation: Technical and political challenges in the automation of platform governance', *Big Data & Society*, 7(1), pp. 1–15. DOI: 10.1177/2053951719897945.
34. Haim, M., Graefe, A. and Brosius, H.-B. (2018) 'Burst of the filter bubble? Effects of personalization on the diversity of Google News', *Digital Journalism*, 6(3), pp. 330–343. DOI: 10.1080/21670811.2017.1338145.
35. Harambam, J., Helberger, N. and van Hoboken, J. (2018) 'Democratizing algorithmic news recommenders: How to materialize voice in a technologically saturated media ecosystem', *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 376(2133), Article 20180088. DOI: 10.1098/rsta.2018.0088.
36. Hassan, I. (2023) 'Dissemination of disinformation on political and electoral processes in Nigeria: An exploratory study', *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 10(1), Article 2216983. DOI: 10.1080/23311983.2023.2216983.
37. Helberger, N. (2019) 'On the democratic role of news recommenders', *Digital Journalism*, 7(8), pp. 993–1012. DOI: 10.1080/21670811.2019.1623700.
38. Helberger, N., Pierson, J. and Poell, T. (2018) 'Governing online platforms: From contested to cooperative responsibility', *The Information Society*, 34(1), pp. 1–14. DOI: 10.1080/01972243.2017.1391913.
39. Introna, L.D. and Nissenbaum, H. (2000) 'Shaping the Web: Why the politics of search engines matters', *The Information Society*, 16(3), pp. 169–185. DOI: 10.1080/01972240050133634.
40. Joris, G., Vercoutere, S., De Clercq, O., Van Damme, K., Mechant, P. and De Marez, L. (2024) 'Nudging towards exposure diversity: Examining the effects of news recommender design on audiences' news exposure behaviours and perceptions', *Digital Journalism*, 12(8), pp. 1118–1139. DOI: 10.1080/21670811.2022.2106445.
41. Karlsson, M., Van Couvering, E. and Lindell, J. (2022) 'Publishing, sharing, and spreading online news: A case study of gatekeeping logics in the platform era', *Nordicom Review*, 43(2), pp. 190–213. DOI: 10.2478/nor-2022-0012.
42. Kizilcec, R.F. (2016) 'How much information? Effects of transparency on trust in an algorithmic interface', in *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in*

- Computing Systems. New York: Association for Computing Machinery, pp. 2390–2395. DOI: 10.1145/2858036.2858402.
43. Knudsen, E. (2023) ‘Modeling news recommender systems’ conditional effects on selective exposure: Evidence from two online experiments’, *Journal of Communication*, 73(2), pp. 138–149. DOI: 10.1093/joc/jqac047.
 44. Kperogi, F.A. and Ishiekwene, A. (2025) ‘Light in a digital black hole: Exploration of emergent artificial intelligence journalism in Nigeria’, *Journal of Applied Journalism & Media Studies*, online first, pp. 1–22. DOI: 10.1386/ajms_00164_1.
 45. Levy, R. (2021) ‘Social media, news consumption, and polarization: Evidence from a field experiment’, *American Economic Review*, 111(3), pp. 831–870. DOI: 10.1257/aer.20191777.
 46. Lewis, S.C., Guzman, A.L., Schmidt, T.R. and Lin, B. (2025) ‘Generative AI and its disruptive challenge to journalism: An institutional analysis’, *Communication and Change*, 1, Article 9. DOI: 10.1007/s44382-025-00008-x.
 47. Lingbondo, K.L. (2025) An investigation into the implications of social media algorithms on news personalisation, placement, distribution, and monetisation in South African newsrooms. Master’s dissertation. Johannesburg: University of Johannesburg.
 48. Liu, D., Greene, D., Li, I., Jiang, X. and Dong, R. (2024) ‘Topic-centric explanations for news recommendation’, *ACM Transactions on Recommender Systems*, 3(2), Article 17, pp. 1–25. DOI: 10.1145/3680295.
 49. Mitova, E., Blassnig, S., Strikovic, E., Urman, A., Hannak, A., de Vreese, C.H. and Esser, F. (2023) ‘News recommender systems: A programmatic research review’, *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 47(1), pp. 84–113. DOI: 10.1080/23808985.2022.2142149.
 50. Møller, L.A. (2024) ‘Designing algorithmic editors: How newspapers embed and encode journalistic values into news recommender systems’, *Digital Journalism*, 12(7), pp. 926–944. DOI: 10.1080/21670811.2023.2215832.
 51. Munoriyarwa, A., Chiumbu, S. and Motsaathebe, G. (2023) ‘Artificial intelligence practices in everyday news production: The case of South Africa’s mainstream newsrooms’, *Journalism Practice*, 17(7), pp. 1374–1392. DOI: 10.1080/17512786.2021.1984976.
 52. Napoli, P.M. (2014) ‘Automated media: An institutional theory perspective on algorithmic media production and consumption’, *Communication Theory*, 24(3), pp. 340–360. DOI: 10.1111/comt.12039.
 53. Ncube, L., Mofokeng, R.W., Chibuwe, A., Munoriyarwa, A. and Kakujaha-Murangi, A. (2025) “‘Mind the gap”: Artificial intelligence and journalism training in Southern African journalism schools’, *Media Practice and Education*, pp. 1–17. DOI: 10.1080/25741136.2025.2464483.

54. Neuman, W.R., Guggenheim, L., Jang, S.M. and Bae, S.Y. (2014) 'The dynamics of public attention: Agenda-setting theory meets big data', *Journal of Communication*, 64(2), pp. 193–214. DOI: 10.1111/jcom.12088.
55. Nieborg, D.B. and Poell, T. (2018) 'The platformization of cultural production: Theorizing the contingent cultural commodity', *New Media & Society*, 20(11), pp. 4275–4292. DOI: 10.1177/1461444818769694.
56. Nkoala, S. and Matsilele, T. (2023) 'The influence of the digital divide on emergency remote student-centred learning during the COVID-19 pandemic: A case study of journalism education', *SN Social Sciences*, 3, Article 47. DOI: 10.1007/s43545-023-00626-6.
57. Obia, V. (2025) 'Digital policy and Nigeria's Platform Code of Practice: Towards a radical co-regulatory turn', *Data & Policy*, 7, e12. DOI: 10.1017/dap.2025.1.
58. Ohme, J. and Mothes, C. (2020) 'What affects first- and second-level selective exposure to journalistic news? A social media online experiment', *Journalism Studies*, 21(9), pp. 1220–1242. DOI: 10.1080/1461670X.2020.1735490.
59. Oywer, B.A., Booker, N., Owilla, H.H. and Kimweli, P. (2023) 'Online audiences and gatekeeping: User comments and their influence on editorial processes in newsrooms in Kenya', *European Scientific Journal*, ESJ, 19(16), p. 105. DOI: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n16p105.
60. Pavlik, J.V. (2023) 'Collaborating with ChatGPT: Considering the implications of generative artificial intelligence for journalism and media education', *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 78(1), pp. 84–93. DOI: 10.1177/10776958221149577.
61. Rader, E. and Gray, R. (2015) 'Understanding user beliefs about algorithmic curation in the Facebook News Feed', in *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. New York: Association for Computing Machinery, pp. 173–182. DOI: 10.1145/2702123.2702174.
62. Rozgonyi, K. (2023) 'Accountability and platforms' governance: The case of online prominence of public service media content', *Internet Policy Review*, 12(4). DOI: 10.14763/2023.4.1723.
63. Rydenfelt, H., Haapanen, L., Haapoja, J. and Lehtiniemi, T. (2024) 'Personalisation in journalism: Ethical insights and blindspots in Finnish legacy media', *Journalism*, 25(2), pp. 313–333. DOI: 10.1177/14648849221138424.
64. Sabboh, G.M. and Alausa, S.S. (2021) 'School climate, self-efficacy, social media and peer pressure as correlates of aggressive behaviour among secondary school adolescents in Ibadan Metropolis, Oyo State, Nigeria', *International Journal of Academic Management Science Research*, 5(11), pp. 43–51.
65. Scheffauer, R., Goyanes, M. and Gil de Zúñiga, H. (2024) 'Social media algorithmic versus professional journalists' news selection: Effects of gate keeping on traditional and

- social media news trust', *Journalism*, 25(4), pp. 755–778. DOI: 10.1177/14648849231179804.
66. Shin, D. (2021) 'The effects of explainability and causability on perception, trust, and acceptance: Implications for explainable AI', *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 146, Article 102551. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijhcs.2020.102551.
67. Shin, D., Zhou, S. and Rasul, A. (2025) 'Towards responsible AI journalism: Mapping journalists' perceptions of AI ethics', *Journalism*, OnlineFirst. DOI: 10.1177/14648849251363045.
68. Shittu, H. and Nabil, M. (2023) 'Smart supply chain management with attribute-based encryption access control', in 2023 IEEE 13th Annual Computing and Communication Workshop and Conference (CCWC), pp. 198–204. DOI: 10.1109/CCWC57344.2023.10099268.
69. Simon, F.M. (2025) 'Rationalisation of the news: How AI reshapes and retools the gatekeeping processes of news organisations in the United Kingdom, United States and Germany', *New Media & Society*, OnlineFirst, pp. 1–21. DOI: 10.1177/14614448251336423.
70. Solomons, S. and Ndlovu, M.W. (2024) 'AI adoption in South African newsrooms: Exploring journalists' perceptions', *Communicatio: South African Journal for Communication Theory and Research*, 50(2), pp. 122–143. DOI: 10.1080/02500167.2024.2439971.
71. 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. and Aiyesimoju, A.B. (2025) 'Bandwagon of artificial intelligence use among media houses in Oyo State, Nigeria', *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 12, Article 2005. DOI: 10.1057/s41599-025-06263-z.
72. Talabi, F.O., Oyewole, J.A., Bello, S.A., Adefemi, V.O., Talabi, J.M., Adesile, T. and Oladele, P.O. (2024) 'Adoption of artificial intelligence in news gathering and reporting in Nigerian mass media', *Journal of Ecohumanism*, 3(8), pp. 8959–8968. DOI: 10.62754/joe.v3i8.5511.
73. Tawiah, A. (2025) 'Social media campaign strategies: A case study of political issue framing by 2024 presidential candidates in Ghana', *Journalism and Media*, 6(2), Article 72. DOI: 10.3390/journalmedia6020072.
74. Umejei, E. (2022) 'Chinese digital platform: "We write what the algorithm wants"', *Digital Journalism*, 10(10), pp. 1875–1892. DOI: 10.1080/21670811.2022.2151026.
75. Umejei, E., Ayisi, A., Phiri, M. and Tallam, E. (2025) 'Artificial intelligence and journalism in four African countries: Optimists, pessimists, and pragmatists', *Journalism Practice*, 19(10), pp. 2249–2265. DOI: 10.1080/17512786.2025.2489590.

76. Umeora, C.C., Duru, H.C. and Nnabuike, C.O. (2025) 'AI-driven news personalization in Nigeria: Enhancing user engagement and information accessibility', *Multidisciplinary Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, 2(1).
77. Wallace, J. (2018) 'Modelling contemporary gatekeeping: The rise of individuals, algorithms and platforms in digital news dissemination', *Digital Journalism*, 6(3), pp. 274–293. DOI: 10.1080/21670811.2017.1343648.
78. Weeks, B.E., Lane, D.S., Kim, D.H., Lee, S.S. and Kwak, N. (2017) 'Incidental exposure, selective exposure, and political information sharing: Integrating online exposure patterns and expression on social media', *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 22(6), pp. 363–379. DOI: 10.1111/jcc4.12199.
79. Wieringa, M.A. (2020) 'What to account for when accounting for algorithms: A systematic literature review on algorithmic accountability', in Hildebrandt, M. and Castillo, C. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. New York: Association for Computing Machinery, pp. 1–18. DOI: 10.1145/3351095.3372833.
80. Wu, S., Tandoc, E.C. and Salmon, C.T. (2019) 'Journalism reconfigured: Assessing human–machine relations and the autonomous power of automation in news production', *Journalism Studies*, 20(10), pp. 1440–1457. DOI: 10.1080/1461670X.2018.1521299.
81. Zhu, Y. (2025) 'A co-regulatory approach towards platform accountability and community governance: The shifting digital regulatory regime for international influencers on China's social media', *L'industria*, 46(3), pp. 359–382. DOI: 10.1430/118817.