

ISRG Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (ISRGJAHSS)



ISRG PUBLISHERS

Abbreviated Key Title: ISRG J Arts Humanit Soc Sci

ISSN: 2583-7672 (Online)

Journal homepage: <https://isrgpublishers.com/isrgjahss>

Volume – III Issue -II (March – April) 2025

Frequency: Bimonthly



The Fear of Replacement: How AI Panic in Journalism Mirrors Existential Crisis in Industry

James Hutson

Lindenwood University, USA <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0578-6052>

| **Received:** 19.03.2025 | **Accepted:** 24.03.2025 | **Published:** 09.04.2025

***Corresponding author:** James Hutson

Lindenwood University, USA <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0578-6052>

Abstract

This study systematically examines the portrayal of artificial intelligence (AI) errors, such as hallucinations and deepfakes, in journalistic contexts, evaluating whether these narratives reflect a broader existential anxiety about AI's role in reshaping journalism. Using a systematic literature review combined with a qualitative content analysis of recent AI-focused news reports, this study identifies recurring themes in media coverage to assess the accuracy and context of reported AI errors relative to actual technological limitations and affordances. Findings suggest that while AI errors are comparatively rare, they receive amplified coverage, often fueling public mistrust in AI technologies. Nevertheless, a balanced examination reveals that AI, when integrated responsibly, can complement journalistic workflows, enhancing accuracy and efficiency in fact-checking and data analysis. This study concludes that while media narratives contribute to a climate of exaggerated skepticism, AI's potential to support rather than supplant journalism remains underexplored. Emphasizing ethical integration, oversight, and the preservation of human creativity, this work advocates for a nuanced approach to AI in journalism that supports both innovation and integrity.

Keywords: AI hallucinations, Deepfakes, Media bias, AI in journalism, Fear of automation

I. Introduction

Recent years have witnessed a notable rise in media coverage on AI-related issues, such as hallucinations, deepfakes, and disinformation (Bakir & McStay, 2020; Shin et al., 2022; Nguyen & Hekman, 2024). These concerns not only reflect the potential dangers of these technologies but Serdouk and Bessam (2023) note also underline a prevailing apprehension within journalism

regarding the potential of the technology to disrupt traditional roles. Van Dalen (2024) has also looked into how journalists are responding to professional competition of generative AI, observing AI models performing complex tasks, including content generation, data analysis, and automated reporting, with

proficiency. This well-known anxiety parallels the broader uncertainty many industries face in the era of automation.

At the same time, journalists have reported on the negative impact AI can have on the news. Notably, AI-generated deepfakes have demonstrated real-world consequences, such as during the 2024 New Hampshire primary when AI-driven robocalls impersonated prominent figures like Joe Biden, allegedly dissuading voters from participation (Lindsay, 2024; Torkington, 2024). Such incidents amplify public and journalistic concern over such disruptive capacities. Nevertheless, these anxieties sometimes heighten responses to isolated incidents of AI misuse. In the 2024 U.S. election cycle, for instance, AI-generated content exacerbated misinformation, including a misleading political advertisement that misrepresented former President Trump's support for a candidate. This use of AI to create deceptive content stirred debate, although the direct impact on voter behavior remains unclear (Rascoe, 2023). Media coverage tends to spotlight these cases, reinforcing public distrust in AI technologies and drawing parallels to earlier media challenges, such as misinformation during the 2016 U.S. election (Allcott & Gentzkow, 2017).

While AI-generated errors, such as hallucinations, attract substantial media scrutiny, instances of bias and inaccuracies also persist in human journalism (Olayinka & Odunayo, 2024). For example, Fox News has faced criticism over perceived political biases and recent high-profile legal challenges for alleged misinformation, such as the defamation suit from Dominion Voting Systems, which underscored the broader consequences of misinformation (Greenberg, 2020). Thus, the selective focus on AI's limitations can obscure its potential contributions to journalism, such as streamlining fact-checking processes and increasing operational efficiency (Torkington, 2024). This identity crisis within journalism reflects a broader challenge across sectors as they adapt to automation, highlighting how concerns surrounding AI often overshadow its potential to augment human roles rather than replace them (Sirén-Heikel, Kjellman, & Lindén, 2023).

Moreover, the current technological transformation offers an opportunity to reconsider the essence of work, especially in fields like journalism, where AI increasingly automates essential tasks. Rather than succumbing to fear, stakeholders in various industries can explore how AI might complement rather than replace human efforts. Present-day AI models already enhance journalistic workflows by automating content generation, streamlining fact-checking, and enabling personalized news curation for audiences, positioning the technology as an effective tool for efficiency (Helmus, 2022). As these capabilities continue to evolve, the traditional responsibilities of journalists are expected to shift, with a stronger emphasis on high-level functions such as editorial judgment, investigative reporting, and ethical decision-making.

A fundamental consideration in this shift is whether human agency in news production will remain essential or if automation can fully assume these roles. Human biases inherently influence the interpretation of events, presenting a question of whether machines, despite their objectivity, can or should entirely replace human insights (Prabhudesai et al., 2023). While AI is positioned to take over many technical and procedural journalism tasks, researchers argue for the enduring value of human input, especially in interpreting culturally nuanced or sensitive issues (Hassan et al., 2024). Although advanced models demonstrate increased cultural specificity, current AI still struggles with nuances outside familiar

datasets, particularly when processing information rooted in non-Western traditions (Xue et al., 2024). Consequently, the role of human journalists is likely to evolve toward responsibilities requiring empathy, moral judgment, and complex interpretation—capabilities that AI, even with advancements, cannot fully replicate.

II. Amplification of AI Errors in Media

The focus of the media on AI errors, such as hallucinations and deepfakes, has significantly contributed to sensationalist narratives that distort public understanding of these technologies (Pocol et al., 2023). AI hallucinations—when AI produces false or incorrect information—are often highlighted, but their frequency and impact can be exaggerated, especially in politically charged contexts. For instance, during the 2024 U.S. election cycle, an AI-generated robocall impersonating President Joe Biden was sent to New Hampshire voters, advising them to stay home during the state's primary election. This call, despite being quickly identified as a fake, caused confusion and raised alarms about the potential misuse of AI in electoral interference. The robocall was traced to a Texas-based AI startup, and the incident highlighted the ease with which AI can be deployed to manipulate public opinion during sensitive political periods (Mirza, 2024; Weiner & Norden, 2023). Similarly, a deepfake video titled *The Hustle* (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OwLUGvoFbRk>) (Figure 1) including political figures such as Kamala Harris, Joe Biden, and Donald Trump, created by the Dor Brothers as political satire, sparked a discussion around the need for regulation of such technologies. Despite its clear label as satire, the video fueled concerns about the potential misuse of AI (Hutson & Smith, 2024). The video portrayed Trump in a comedic scenario, but its wide circulation demonstrated the growing anxiety surrounding AI's role in shaping public perception during elections.



Figure 1. The Dor Brothers, *The Hustle*, 2024 (Public Domain)

These examples highlight how AI hallucinations and deepfakes are amplified by the media, particularly during election years when the stakes are high, and public perception can easily be swayed. In 2018, Jordan Peele collaborated with BuzzFeed to create a

deepfake video featuring former President Barack Obama (**Figure 2**) (<https://youtu.be/cQ54GDm1eL>). The video, which showed Obama delivering outlandish statements like "Killmonger was right" and swearing, was voiced by Peele while AI-manipulated Obama's facial expressions to match (Fuster, 2018). The purpose of the video, as with The Dor Brothers, was to demonstrate the growing potential of deepfakes and the dangers they posed in spreading misinformation. Peele used this creative approach to warn viewers about verifying the authenticity of digital content, especially as deepfake technology advances. In reality, deepfakes are often used in exaggerated scenarios, such as fabricating stories about deepfake porn in schools, where the scale of the issue has been blown out of proportion (Gibson, 2020).



Figure 2. Synthesizing Obama: lip sync from audio. Jordan Peele, Monkeypaw productions / BuzzFeed (CC 4.0)

Media outlets frequently capitalize on AI errors and deepfakes to amplify public anxiety, framing these technologies as grave threats to democratic processes. Fox News, for example, has contributed to this narrative by highlighting the misuse of AI in political contexts, such as the circulation of AI-generated deepfake videos during the 2024 election cycle (Mirza, 2024). However, while misuse of the technology in elections is concerning, it is often simpler methods, such as mislabeling videos or text-based misinformation campaigns, that have proven far more effective in manipulating public opinion (Heley, Gaysnynsky, & King, 2022). Furthermore, such deepfakes have been falsely attributed with unprecedented powers to disrupt political processes. In reality, many deepfakes have not had the impactful influence that was initially feared. For example, while deepfakes were expected to significantly affect the 2024 elections, the technology was still in its infancy in terms of mass accessibility and effectiveness. What was feared to be a flood of deepfakes turned out to be a trickle, with most manipulations relying on more traditional forms of media distortion (Baccari & Chadwick, 2020; Hameleers, 2024).

The fixation the media has with errors and deepfakes of the new technology contributes to a cycle of distrust, where the public grows increasingly skeptical of the information they consume. This phenomenon is known as the "liar's dividend"—the idea that as deepfakes become more prevalent, people will start doubting even legitimate information, claiming it to be a deepfake whenever it is convenient (Shirish & Komal, 2024). This narrative has been exploited by various political actors globally, undermining not only elections but also trust in public institutions (Goldberg, 2024). Ultimately, while AI errors like hallucinations and deepfakes present legitimate concerns, the amplification of these issues seen in the media often overshadows the more pressing reality that human actors are the ones wielding these tools, often with malicious intent (Carpenter, 2024). Media outlets should be more responsible in reporting on these technologies, offering a balanced

perspective that highlights both the limitations of AI and its potential benefits, rather than fueling sensationalist fears.

III. Human Journalists vs. AI: A Comparative Analysis

The media frequently exaggerates the limitations of new technologies, focusing on occasional AI errors like deepfakes and hallucinations while downplaying human journalistic failings. AI errors, while notable, are comparatively rarer than human mistakes. For example, AI-generated content in news outlets has an accuracy rate as high as 90%, but media outlets often fixate on the 10% of errors, which include notable but isolated instances of misinformation (Stewart, Lyubashenko, & Stefanek, 2023). In contrast, human journalists can have error rates ranging from 20% to 30%, particularly in fast-paced, politically charged contexts (Ndungu, 2023). This selective focus on failings of models creates a biased narrative that undermines its potential, even though human reporters have been responsible for spreading vastly more false information over the years (Himma-Kadakas & Ojamets, 2022).

In fact, AI technologies have been used for some time to complement journalistic work by improving accuracy and efficiency. AI-driven tools are particularly adept at cross-referencing vast amounts of data quickly, streamlining fact-checking processes. For instance, tools like Wordsmith and Heliograf have been used in newsrooms to produce factually accurate content rapidly, reducing human error in mundane reporting tasks (Torrijos, 2021). Moreover, these systems can scour hundreds of documents and sources in seconds, helping journalists avoid inaccuracies and speeding up information gathering. In election coverage or reporting on complex issues, AI systems help journalists by analyzing trends, extracting key points, and identifying potential biases in datasets that human journalists might miss through human-in-the-loop strategies of collaboration (Leiser, 2022).

Such augmentation has proven necessary given that human journalists are prone to error, particularly under time pressure or in politically sensitive situations. A recent study found that nearly 59% of articles related to political news contained some level of bias or inaccuracies (Van der Linden, Panagopoulos, & Roozenbeek, 2020). These errors arise from personal biases, editorial pressures, and the rush to publish breaking news. For example, during the 2020 U.S. election, several prominent news outlets retracted or revised stories due to errors or misreporting. Fox News, in particular, has been criticized for its coverage, which often reflects political leanings, resulting in the dissemination of biased or incomplete information. These errors highlight the persistent issue of human fallibility in journalism (Freitag et al., 2024).

On the other hand, AI, unlike human reporters, can operate without emotional or political bias. By relying on objective data, and with appropriate training, the tools can improve accuracy in reporting and help eliminate partisan slant in journalism (Whang et al., 2023). Tools, such as natural language processing algorithms, can analyze content for bias, flag potential inaccuracies, and provide more balanced reporting (Jahan & Oussalah, 2023). Moreover, the systems can process vast quantities of data without fatigue, identifying trends that human reporters might overlook. Despite these advantages, media narratives often emphasize occasional failings, such as deepfakes and hallucinations, which are more infrequent but sensationalized for dramatic effect. These isolated

incidents should not overshadow the potential of emergent technologies to revolutionize journalism through improved accuracy and efficiency.

IV. The Existential Crisis of Identity in Journalism and Other Industries

The existential crisis that journalism faces due to the rise of AI mirrors similar anxieties in other industries such as healthcare and finance (Alkhalifah et al., 2024). Given the ability of these models to automate a significant portion of routine journalistic tasks, like fact-checking and content creation, has left many journalists wondering about their future role (Simon, 2024). As AI tools become more sophisticated, particularly in areas like news generation and reporting, there is a growing fear that machines will replace humans entirely. However, this concern is not limited to journalism. Industries such as healthcare and finance also grapple with the question of human relevance in a world increasingly dominated by automation. In healthcare, for example, AI is already being used to diagnose illnesses and predict outcomes, potentially minimizing the role of physicians in routine diagnosis (Zeb et al., 2024). Doctors and nurses, therefore, worry that AI systems could take over diagnostic and administrative tasks, leading to job cuts (Maleki Varnosfaderani & Forouzanfar, 2024). Similarly, the finance industry is witnessing similar tools that can analyze market trends and automate transactions, sparking concerns among financial analysts and brokers (Javaid, 2024). These industries reflect a shared narrative of existential anxiety about human labor, as automation takes on tasks once performed exclusively by humans. Yet, this fear often overlooks the reality that AI is currently best suited to augment, not replace, human roles. For example, AI may enhance doctors' decision-making abilities by providing faster, more accurate diagnostics, while leaving the more complex and nuanced care decisions to humans (Khalifa & Albadowy, 2024).

Rather than resisting the inevitable shift toward automation, industries need to adapt by redefining human roles. In journalism, this could mean shifting the focus from routine tasks, such as headline generation, to more investigative and interpretative reporting—areas where human creativity and ethical judgment are crucial. The same logic applies to other fields: in healthcare, models could handle routine diagnostics, freeing doctors to focus on patient relationships and complex treatments. In finance, AI can automate trading, while human experts focus on strategic financial planning and ethical considerations. The future of work should thus emphasize human-AI collaboration, where AI handles repetitive tasks, and humans manage the creative, ethical, and complex aspects of their jobs (Bankins, Hu, & Yuan, 2024).

In the end, the existential crisis in journalism offers valuable lessons for other sectors. The exaggerated skepticism toward AI often stems from a fear of job displacement, but it overlooks the potential for enhancement of human capabilities rather than replacement of them. Just as journalists are learning to leverage AI for efficiency without sacrificing quality, other industries should view AI as a tool for augmentation rather than replacement. Integrating AI into workflows can create a more efficient, innovative workforce, provided that humans retain oversight and control of the critical decision-making processes (Hurry, 2024).

Conclusion

The integration of AI in journalism represents both a challenge and an opportunity, not just for the news industry but for all sectors facing the rise of automation. While media outlets often sensationalize occasional errors, such as hallucinations and deepfakes, these incidents are far outweighed by the potential benefits AI brings to journalism in terms of efficiency, accuracy, and speed. AI has demonstrated its capacity to streamline repetitive tasks, freeing up human journalists to focus on more complex, investigative work. In doing so, AI complements human labor rather than replacing it entirely, offering new possibilities for collaboration between man and machine.

The fear surrounding AI is not unique to journalism—it mirrors concerns in healthcare, finance, and other sectors where automation threatens traditional roles. However, industries must move beyond this narrative of fear and adapt by redefining human work in ways that enhance and utilize AI's strengths. The path forward lies in embracing AI as a tool for augmentation, allowing humans to focus on creativity, ethical judgment, and strategic thinking. Such existential crises in the face of AI should serve as a model for other industries grappling with similar concerns. Rather than succumbing to exaggerated skepticism, the focus should be on integration—allowing AI to handle routine tasks while humans remain at the forefront of innovation, ethics, and leadership in their respective fields. By doing so, we can ensure that AI serves to complement, rather than diminish, the role of human creativity and judgment in the future of work.

Data Availability

Data available upon request.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

Funding Statement

NA

References

1. Alkhalifah, J. M., Bedaiwi, A. M., Shaikh, N., Seddiq, W., & Meo, S. A. (2024). Existential anxiety about artificial intelligence (AI)-is it the end of humanity era or a new chapter in the human revolution: questionnaire-based observational study. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 15, 1368122.
2. Allcott, H., & Gentzkow, M. (2017). Social media and fake news in the 2016 election. *Journal of economic perspectives*, 31(2), 211-236.
3. Bakir, V., & McStay, A. (2020). Empathic media, emotional AI, and the optimization of disinformation. In *Affective politics of digital media* (pp. 263-279). Routledge.
4. Bankins, S., Hu, X., & Yuan, Y. (2024). Artificial Intelligence, Workers, and Future of Work Skills. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 101828.
5. Carpenter, P. (2024). *FAIK: A Practical Guide to Living in a World of Deepfakes, Disinformation, and AI-Generated Deceptions*. John Wiley & Sons.
6. Freitag, J., Gochee, M., Ransden, M., Nyhan, B., Roschke, K., & Gillmor, D. (2024). The Corrections Dilemma: Media Retractions Increase Belief Accuracy

- but Decrease Trust. *Journal of Experimental Political Science*, 11(1), 90-101.
7. Fuster, J. (2018). Watch Jordan Peele's Fakeout Obama Warning About Fake News (Video). *The Wrap*. April 17, 2018: <https://www.thewrap.com/watch-jordan-peeles-fakeout-obama-warning-about-fake-news-video/>
 8. Gibson, K. (2020). Deepfakes and involuntary pornography: can our current legal framework address this technology?. *Wayne L. Rev.*, 66, 259.
 9. Goldberg, H. (2024). States Legislating Against Digital Deception: A Comparative Study of Laws to Mitigate Deepfake Risks in American Political Advertisements. Available at SSRN.
 10. Greenberg, J. (2020). How Fox News, Newsmax vote-rigging coverage squares with defamation law. *Politifact*. December 23, 2020: <https://www.politifact.com/article/2020/dec/23/how-fox-news-newsmax-vote-rigging-coverage-squares/>
 11. Hameleers, M. (2024). Cheap Versus Deep Manipulation: The Effects of Cheapfakes Versus Deepfakes in a Political Setting. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 36(1), edae004.
 12. Hassan, J. T., Baba, D., Ibrahim, A. A., & Elisha, J. D. (2024). Journalism and social-political conflict in contemporary society. *Journal of Language, Literature, Social and Cultural Studies*, 2(1), 46-58.
 13. Helmus, T. (2022). Artificial Intelligence, Deepfakes, and Disinformation. *Rand*. July 6, 2022: <https://www.rand.org/pubs/perspectives/PEA1043-1.html>
 14. Heley, K., Gaysynsky, A., & King, A. J. (2022). Missing the bigger picture: The need for more research on visual health misinformation. *Science Communication*, 44(4), 514-527.
 15. Himma-Kadakas, M., & Ojamets, I. (2022). Debunking false information: investigating journalists' fact-checking skills. *Digital journalism*, 10(5), 866-887.
 16. Hurry, B. (2024). *Transforming Workforce Management: Leveraging Advanced Analytics, AI, and Integrated Approaches for Performance Forecasting* (No. 12704). EasyChair.
 17. Hutson, J., & Smith, A. (2024). AI Satire and Digital Dystopia: The Dor Brothers Crafting Imperfection and Political Commentary in Contemporary Video Art. *ISRG Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(5).
 18. Jahan, M. S., & Oussalah, M. (2023). A systematic review of hate speech automatic detection using natural language processing. *Neurocomputing*, 546, 126232.
 19. Javaid, H. A. (2024). The Future of Financial Services: Integrating AI for Smarter, More Efficient Operations. *MZ Journal of Artificial Intelligence*, 1(2).
 20. Khalifa, M., & Albadawy, M. (2024). AI in diagnostic imaging: Revolutionising accuracy and efficiency. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine Update*, 100146.
 21. Leiser, M. R. (2022). Bias, journalistic endeavours, and the risks of artificial intelligence. In *Artificial Intelligence and the Media* (pp. 8-32). Edward Elgar Publishing.
 22. Lindsay, M. (2024). Election 2024: The Deepfake Threat to the 2024 Election. *Council on Foreign Relations*. February 2, 2024: <https://www.cfr.org/blog/election-2024-deepfake-threat-2024-election>
 23. Maleki Varnosfaderani, S., & Forouzanfar, M. (2024). The role of AI in hospitals and clinics: transforming healthcare in the 21st century. *Bioengineering*, 11(4), 337.
 24. Mirza, R. (2024). How AI deepfakes threaten the 2024 elections. *The Journalist's Resource*. February 16, 2024: <https://journalistsresource.org/home/how-ai-deepfakes-threaten-the-2024-elections/>
 25. Nguyen, D., & Hekman, E. (2024). The news framing of artificial intelligence: a critical exploration of how media discourses make sense of automation. *AI & society*, 39(2), 437-451.
 26. Olayinka, A. P., & Odunayo, S. (2024). The Role of Media Ethics in Shaping Public Perception: A Critical Analysis of Biased Reporting and Its Impact on Public Opinion. *Journal of African Innovation and Advanced Studies*.
 27. Pocol, A., Istead, L., Siu, S., Mokhtari, S., & Kodeiri, S. (2023, August). Seeing is no longer believing: A survey on the state of deepfakes, ai-generated humans, and other nonveridical media. In *Computer Graphics International Conference* (pp. 427-440). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.
 28. Prabhudesai, S., Yang, L., Asthana, S., Huan, X., Liao, Q. V., & Banovic, N. (2023, March). Understanding uncertainty: how lay decision-makers perceive and interpret uncertainty in human-AI decision making. In *Proceedings of the 28th international conference on intelligent user interfaces* (pp. 379-396).
 29. Rascoe, A. (2023). How real is the threat of AI deepfakes in the 2024 election? *Iowa Public Radio- NPR*. July 30, 2023: <https://www.iowapublicradio.org/2023-07-30/how-real-is-the-threat-of-ai-deepfakes-in-the-2024-election>
 30. Serdouk, A., & Bessam, A. C. (2023). Bots in Newsrooms: What Future for Human Journalists?. *Media Watch*, 14(1), 100-115.
 31. Sharockman, A. (2014). Fact-checking Fox, MSNBC and CNN: PunditFact's network scorecards. *Politifact*. September 16, 2014: <https://www.politifact.com/article/2014/sep/16/fact-checking-fox-msnbc-and-cnn-punditfacts-networ/>
 32. Shin, D., Hameleers, M., Park, Y. J., Kim, J. N., Trielli, D., Diakopoulos, N., & Baumann, S. (2022). Countering algorithmic bias and disinformation and effectively harnessing the power of AI in media. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 99(4), 887-907.
 33. Shirish, A., & Komal, S. (2024). A socio-legal enquiry on deepfakes. *California Western International Law Journal*, 54(2).
 34. Simon, F. M. (2024). Artificial Intelligence in the News: How AI Retools, Rationalizes, and Reshapes Journalism and the Public Arena.
 35. Sirén-Heikel, S., Kjellman, M., & Lindén, C. G. (2023). At the crossroads of logics: Automating newswork with artificial intelligence—(Re) defining journalistic logics from the perspective of technologists. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 74(3), 354-366.
 36. Stewart, J., Lyubashenko, N., & Stefanek, G. (2023). The efficacy of detecting AI-generated fake news using transfer learning. *Issues in Information Systems*, 24(2).

37. Torrijos, J. (2021). Semi-automated Journalism. *News media innovation reconsidered: ethics and values in a creative reconstruction of journalism*, 124-137.
38. Torkington, S. (2024) The US is drafting new laws to protect against AI-generated deepfakes. *World Economic Forum*. February 27, 2024.
39. van Dalen, A. (2024). Revisiting the algorithms behind the headlines. how journalists respond to professional competition of generative ai. *Journalism Practice*, 1-18.
40. Weiner, D. & Norden, L. (2023). Regulating AI Deepfakes and Synthetic Media in the Political Arena. *Brennan Center for Justice*. December 5, 2023: <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/regulating-ai-deepfakes-and-synthetic-media-political-arena>
41. Whang, S. E., Roh, Y., Song, H., & Lee, J. G. (2023). Data collection and quality challenges in deep learning: A data-centric ai perspective. *The VLDB Journal*, 32(4), 791-813.
42. Vaccari, C., & Chadwick, A. (2020). Deepfakes and disinformation: Exploring the impact of synthetic political video on deception, uncertainty, and trust in news. *Social media+ society*, 6(1), 2056305120903408.
43. Xue, B., Wang, H., Wang, W., Wang, R., Wang, S., Liu, Z., & Wong, K. F. (2024). A Comprehensive Study of Multilingual Confidence Estimation on Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13606*.
44. Zeb, S., Nizamullah, F. N. U., Abbasi, N., & Fahad, M. (2024). AI in Healthcare: Revolutionizing Diagnosis and Therapy. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences and Arts*, 3(3), 118-128.