



IRSTI 19.71

<https://doi.org/10.32523/2616-7174-2025-153-4-137-149>

Issues of journalistic ethics in the context of generative artificial intelligence: based on material from Kazakhstan and China

N. Adalihan¹, A.I. Skripnikova*², N.T. Shyngyssova³

^{1,2,3}al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

(E-mail: adalkhan_nazina@live.kaznu.kz, sai.kz@mail.ru*, nazgul.shyngyssova@kaznu.kz)

Abstract: Generative AI is entering everyday newsroom work and changing how news is made, shared, and trusted. Tools that draft text, rewrite copy, and help produce multimedia can speed up output, but they also raise ethical problems around verification, attribution, accountability, privacy, and transparency. This study examines how these problems are being translated into journalism ethics education in Kazakhstan and China from 2018 to 2025. Using a comparative thematic review, we analyze publicly available regulations and policy notices, selected media cases, industry, fact-checking materials, and university documents such as program descriptions, syllabuses, and course outlines. The findings show two routes of adaptation. In Kazakhstan, visible cases such as deepfakes and misinformation have pushed gradual, practice-based change in newsroom routines and teaching tasks. In China, change is driven more by formal rules that require disclosure, labeling, basic records, and human review for higher-risk content. In both contexts, ethics education is moving from rule learning to routine building that can be practiced and assessed. The trade-off differs, with unevenness on one side and rigidity on the other. Ethical judgment still matters when automated systems shape what audiences see and trust.

Keywords: generative artificial intelligence, journalism, ethics, media education, cross-cultural comparison.

Introduction

In recent years, generative AI has become part of everyday newsroom work and has started to change how news is gathered, edited, and distributed. Tools for drafting text, rewriting copy, producing images, and assisting with audio or video editing can speed up output. They also shift when and where editorial judgement is made. Choices about what gets covered, how it is presented, and how widely it spreads are shaped more and more by metrics and platform recommendation systems [1]. Alongside the gains in efficiency, news organizations face a new set of ethical pressures. Verification can be squeezed for time, attribution can become less clear, and it can be harder to explain where information came from. When content moves through

Received: 26.11. 2025; Accepted: 16.12. 2025; Available online: 31.12.2025

137

*for the corresponding author

multiple tools, editorial workflows, and platform systems, responsibility for mistakes is easier to blur, which affects public expectations about credibility and trust [2].

In this situation, journalism ethics education has to answer a practical question. How can programs turn verification routines, clear sourcing habits, and responsibility for corrections into concrete learning goals, classroom tasks, and assessment criteria. Students need to practice making decisions that can be explained and checked, not only repeated as principles. Yet many curriculum updates still treat AI mainly as a technical topic. Ethics is often mentioned in general terms, while students receive limited training in procedures they can actually apply and be evaluated on. At the same time, there is still too little comparative research that connects public policy choices and industry practices to what is taught in the classroom. This gap is especially clear in work that compares Kazakhstan and China and explains how differences in approach become differences in training.

The article compares Kazakhstan and China not to present either as a model, and not to make a value judgement about political systems, but to understand how different ways of managing generative content shape newsroom practice and ethics education. This follows a governance view of education, where standards, accountability, and measurable routines increasingly shape what is taught and assessed [3]. In Kazakhstan, the pressure has often come from visible risks such as deepfakes and misinformation. The growth of fact-checking work and cooperation between media actors and other institutions has encouraged gradual changes in training and teaching. In China, the approach has relied more on clear rules about what must be disclosed, how content should be labeled and when humans must review high-risk material. These choices influence what journalism schools emphasize and how students are trained. Using publicly available policy texts, formal documents, and representative media events from 2018 to 2025, the study traces how these differences develop and what they suggest for ethics education reform in the AI era.

Literature review

Journalism research has gradually shifted from analyzing news output to examining the systems that shape it. Recent work pays more attention to how tools, platforms, and newsroom routines influence what gets published, how it is edited and how it reaches audiences. Studies of automated and algorithm supported journalism follow the same move. Instead of focusing on finished texts, researchers have looked inside news organizations to understand workflows, decision-making and how responsibility changes when software takes on a larger role [1]. Algorithms are often treated as structural forces across the whole production chain, from newsgathering to editing and distribution [4], [5]. Related work on platforms and social media asks how recommendation systems shape visibility and attention, with concerns about narrowed exposure and unequal outcomes [6]. As deepfakes and other fabricated media become more common, both researchers and practitioners have argued for practical safeguards, including clearer sourcing, visible labeling, watermarking and more consistent correction procedures [7]. In Kazakhstan, this has encouraged more focus on governing virtual presenters and synthetic content. M. Yessimova and T. Shevyakova examine the ethical risks of deepfakes for news presentation and public trust, and discuss detection and response options with relevance for both newsroom practice and journalism education [8]. Industry and training initiatives echo this direction. The Kazakhstani Media Academy (2024) calls for strengthening editorial judgement and helping students understand how AI and platform systems shape what audiences see. At

the same time, projects such as Stopfake.kz and Factcheck.kz have expanded fact-checking work by monitoring claims, verifying content, and providing public explanations.

In China, policy work centers on frameworks for algorithm governance and generative content labeling (Cyberspace Administration of China, 2022; 2023). These frameworks place responsibility on platforms to monitor generated content and manage what they allow to circulate. In practice, this means clear labels, basic production records and more transparent sourcing. Important gaps remain. It is still difficult to measure how far synthetic content spreads, to test results across datasets and to clarify responsibility when automated systems cause harm. As generative AI becomes more common in news work, journalism ethics research has begun to shift from broad principles toward how ethics is implemented through rules, routines and oversight.

As newer generative systems have spread, familiar risks have become harder to ignore. Deepfakes are easier to produce, bias can be subtle, and generated text can sound confident while still being wrong. This leaves journalism with a basic question: how to protect authenticity while keeping responsibility clear. In response, Western research and media bodies have called for practical safeguards, such as clearer sourcing, visible labels on altered content, technical markers like watermarks, and faster, more consistent correction routines.

Formal requirements set a baseline, and platforms carry much of the day-to-day enforcement. The emphasis is on disclosing AI use, labeling, keeping basic production records and applying human review for higher-risk content. Supporters argue that this turns ethics into routines that can be followed in real newsrooms and platform work. In Kazakhstan, researchers and industry groups often focus on how information control, public trust and journalism education shape each other. R. Zhaxylykbayeva et al. show, through comparative work, that AI-generated content can change how audiences in Kazakhstan judge whether news feels authentic and trustworthy [9]. They include fact-checking practice and exercises on recognizing AI-generated content as part of professional development for journalists. A review of extant research indicates a notable degree of sophistication in the construction of interdisciplinary ethical frameworks. Even so, the research still has clear blind spots. We know much less about what actually changes in classrooms, how responsibility is handled inside institutions, and what measurable effects these policies have in real-world work.

Transformation in Journalism Education and AI Literacy.

As journalism education takes generative AI more seriously, research focus is shifting from fixing tools to redesigning how ethics and skills are taught. New frameworks from international bodies, governments and industry groups argue that students need critical judgement, not only operational skills. Many of them also promote a simple sequence for training: identify AI-generated material, verify key claims, then decide how it can be used and governed in practice (Poynter Institute 2024; PBS SRL 2024). Audience-focused research has supported curriculum updates such as clearer source reliability declaration, explainability training and stronger fact-checking modules [10]. In Kazakhstan, several empirical studies and initiatives speak directly to journalism education and AI literacy. Comparative work on how audiences judge AI-assisted journalism provides a rationale for bringing verification and ethics routines into classroom practice [9]. A survey of 103 journalists and students by E. Bainyasheva et al. maps current AI use, ethical concerns, and key challenges; it offers data that can inform competency indicators and evaluation in training programs [11]. Experiments by S. Ayapova and A. Skripnikova, which compare how people distinguish human and AI-produced texts, also support more concrete classroom tasks built around identification and verification exercises [12].

In China, both scholars and policy documents treat AI as more than a tool. They link it to core values such as authenticity, fairness, and responsibility to the public. In teaching and practical training, this often translates into simple expectations: disclose when AI is used, label synthetic or altered content, and be able to explain how key outputs were produced [13], [14]. Evidence from both international and local work points to the same conclusion. Simply adding one AI chapter to an existing course is not enough. If generative tools are changing how journalism works, then ethics training has to be redesigned as well. Programs need to teach values, practical skills, and everyday routines with learning goals that can be clearly stated and fairly assessed. What remains weak is comparison across institutions and across countries, as well as shared standards for judging whether these changes actually work in practice.

Methodology

Generative AI is now part of routine newsroom work in many places, and that shift is forcing journalism programs to rethink what ethics training should look like. The focus here is journalism ethics education, not the technology itself. Kazakhstan and China are compared because they respond differently in public policy, newsroom routines and university training. The study covers the period from 2018 to 2025, when automated tools became more common, deepfake controversies grew more visible and official responses became easier to trace over time.

Evidence comes from publicly available materials in both countries. The core set includes laws, regulations, policy notices, official guidance on media, online information, and AI governance. It also includes professional and industry materials such as newsroom guidelines, regulator standards, and outputs from fact-checking organizations. To connect governance and practice to education, the review draws on accessible university documents, including program standards, curriculum descriptions, course outlines, syllabuses and reform documents. Materials with clear provenance and traceable publication details are treated as primary evidence. Items without a stable source are not used to support key claims. Commentary pieces are used only as context.

A small set of widely discussed cases links documents to practice. The goal is not to list every incident, but to select cases where ethical questions are observable. Cases were chosen when the public timeline is clear, the ethical issue is concrete and the public response could plausibly affect training or teaching. The analysis asks one guiding question: how do rules and public debate shape what journalists do and what journalism programs train students to do? Policy and industry developments were mapped chronologically to identify turning points that matter for ethics education, such as labeling duties, disclosure expectations new oversight.

Manual coding was used throughout. Each document was read with notes on what it requires, what it assumes, and what it treats as a problem. Repeated ideas were grouped into themes that recur across countries and document types, including authenticity, fairness, accountability, transparency, privacy, and authorship. The comparison is organized across four areas: regulation, institutions, platforms and education. Key claims were checked across more than one source type when possible, for example, comparing an official rule with an industry guideline and a public record from a fact-checking body, to reduce reliance on a single narrative.

Research & Results

Kazakhstan PathAnalysis:

Kazakhstan looks like a path pushed forward by visible problems, not by one complete law rolled out from the start. A clear early signal came in February 2020, when Atameken Business introduced the virtual newsreader iSanj, modeled on actor Sanjar Madi. The technology itself

was not the main point. The public reaction was. Automated delivery moved from a backstage tool to a front-stage newsroom scene. That made trust questions unavoidable. Audiences started asking how to understand what is real. Newsrooms faced a practical choice about disclosure. They also faced a harder question about responsibility when something goes wrong. Speed can rise fast. Verification time often does not.

After that, the response looked patchy and uneven. Some outlets tightened sourcing. Others added clearer notices for altered or synthetic material. Some tried to correct faster. These steps helped, but they did not solve the core problem. Practices still vary widely across newsrooms. Smaller teams often lack staff, training, and time. Labels can be ignored or misunderstood, and social platforms can spread synthetic video faster than journalists can verify it. The same type of content may be handled differently in different places, and that inconsistency can become a credibility problem.

Institutional change is clearer in the last two years, but it needs careful separation. The Law “On Mass Media” that took effect in June 2024 mainly updates the broader media governance environment and sets background rules for the sector. More specific expectations about warnings and labeling tend to sit in the wider AI governance agenda and related policy discussion. Another visible shift came in August 2025, when a disinformation countering center was launched under the Central Communications Service. This strengthens national-level checking capacity and encourages verification and correction as routine work, not only crisis response.

Education shows the change most directly. The clearest sign is not a general call to strengthen ethics, but a shift in what students are asked to do. Public course descriptions and training materials increasingly treat verification, sourcing, disclosure and correction as skills that can be practiced and assessed. This is useful, but it has limits. Courses can end up chasing the latest incident, and training can slide toward avoiding mistakes rather than building judgment. Students may learn to label and document, but get less practice explaining evidence, communicating uncertainty or defending editorial decisions in public. At the al-Farabi Kazakh National University, AI and journalism ethics appear in training goals and course content. The university has an AI technology use policy with an ethics chapter for teaching and learning, including a ban on fraud or deception and rules for unauthorized use. Program descriptions also emphasize judging AI’s impact on journalism, anticipating use cases and taking social responsibility. Learning outcomes include applied skills and trend analysis in the digital media environment. Comparative work between AI-generated content and traditional journalism also appears in thesis and case assignments, making the topic visible in assessment, not only in lectures.

A wider ecosystem is also forming around these classroom shifts. Government-led initiatives are building links with professional groups and civil society to support fact-checking, literacy and training. One example is the partnership between StopFake.kz and the newer disinformation countering center, which works on identifying and correcting AI-generated images and videos and producing case briefs and training materials that can be reused in education. Other institutions show similar movement. L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University includes a five-credit course on Digital Media and Artificial Intelligence. At the al-Farabi Kazakh National University, the journalism faculty has registered an Artificial Intelligence and Media program that covers AI, neural networks, big data, data science, Python and related topics. UNESCO Almaty has supported this direction since 2024 through a Media and Information Literacy training program for Central Asian media and universities, with workshops in 2024 and 2025, that provide shared materials and reference points for cooperation across public institutions, media, and universities [15].

China's Path Analysis:

China's path looks more rule-driven and institution-led. An early signal came in late 2018, when Xinhua and Sogou presented an AI news anchor at the World Internet Conference. After that, the automated presentation looked more official. It was easier for the public to treat it as normal. Ethical questions surfaced sooner as a result. Audiences asked, what counts as a real broadcast. Newsrooms had to decide how much to explain. Regulators were also pushed to respond faster, and later public policy texts began to put more weight on risk and responsibility.

From 2022 onward, policy requirements became clearer. The Administrative Provisions on Deep Synthesis in Internet Information Services introduced labeling duties and stressed avoiding misleading the public. Responsibility is framed mainly at the level of platforms and service providers, not only individual journalists. In 2023, the Interim Measures for the Administration of Generative AI Services broadened the scope to more generative services and added expectations around content management, complaint handling, and provider responsibility. Together, these rules shift ethics from general principles to checkable duties inside the workflow, such as labeling, record keeping, response procedures and responsibility assignment. Records become routine, not just a crisis tool.

When rules emphasize disclosure, labeling and human review for higher risk content, courses tend to teach these steps as standard practice. Public reform and training materials often focus on habits that can be inspected, such as documenting how content was produced, labeling altered or synthesized media clearly and adding a second round of verification for sensitive topics. This makes tasks easier to specify, but it can narrow ethics into compliance. Students may get good at completing checklists, while getting less practice making judgments under uncertainty or explaining evidence to audiences who do not trust labels.

Industry practice then reinforces the same direction. Public reporting and institutional releases suggest that large media organizations scale up generative tools early to raise efficiency. Xinhua, People's Daily, and CCTV.com moved sooner into wider use of automated writing, AI voice work and synthetic editing. The People's Daily Research Institute has noted that these capacities push news production toward around-the-clock operation. Job roles shift as a result. Editors are not only rewriting and gatekeeping; they also monitor tools, workflows and post-publication risk signals. Efficiency gains also bring new controversy. Xinhua's AI anchor improved delivery speed, but it also triggered debate about authenticity and emotional expression. Audiences ask whether machine delivery feels real; and when something misleads, they ask who is responsible.

The Communication University of China has promoted AI-focused education reform and held seminars on inclusion and ethics, and its course Artificial Intelligence in Journalism and Communication links algorithm transparency to ethical responsibility in course objectives and training tasks [16]. Fudan University has launched multidisciplinary AI courses that include governance and risk management. Jinan University has released an AI-oriented curriculum plan that highlights interdisciplinary and project-based training. In journalism and communication classes, project assignments are becoming more common. Students practice transparency, data compliance, clear labeling and verification routines in near-real editorial and distribution settings. Course goals put more emphasis on the combined skills of identifying, verifying and managing risk. Ethics becomes something students do, not only something they discuss.

This institution led path also has weaknesses that affect education quality. Ethics can shrink into compliance, so students become skilled at completing steps, but less practiced at judgment under uncertainty. Rules can also make practice rigid, with risk control crowding out editorial

experimentation and debate. Responsibility may look clearer on paper, yet still blur in practice when platforms, media outlets, tech suppliers and outsourced teams share one chain. The costs are also real. Human review, compliance work and record keeping take time and staff, which large organizations can absorb more easily than smaller ones. Finally, labeling does not guarantee trust. Audiences may ignore labels, distrust them or not understand what they mean. Without explanation, labels alone rarely solve the credibility problem.

So, the strengths of China's approach are clear. It moves fast and teaching can be turned into trainable tasks. The discomfort is just as clear. It may produce people who are good at executing procedures, but not always people who can make sound judgments in complex situations and explain those judgments well. For journalism ethics education, that gap is the hardest one to close.

A more detailed comparison is given in Table 1.

Table 1. Kazakhstan – China AI media ethics education comparison

Comparison Dimensions	Kazakhstan	China	Analysis
Governance Logic	Drivers are initiated from the bottom up. Governance structures are taking shape gradually through a mix of practical initiatives and institutional learning, including Kazmedia, StopFake.kz, university curricula, and international cooperation.	The following factors are particularly significant. The Regulations on the Management of Deepfakes and the Interim Measures for the Management of Generative AI Services, work together as a closed loop that links registration, identification, and accountability.	In China, regulation usually sets the baseline first, and education then builds those duties into professional training. In Kazakhstan, visible practice and public response often come first, and institutions later absorb them through formal rules and policy.
Level of Institutional Implementation	Government leadership is relatively limited, while educational institutions, international organizations, and the media play the leading role.	National-level oversight is clearly defined, with the Cyberspace Administration of China, the National Radio and Television Administration, and the Ministry of Education participating jointly.	Kazakhstan's model reflects collaborative governance, but strong institutional constraints are still relatively limited.
Educational Response Model	Case-based learning is a practical entry point. Universities now offer courses such as Artificial Intelligence and Journalism Ethics, Digital Media and Artificial Intelligence, and Generative Content Identification, sometimes with external partners.	Higher education institutions are updating their curricula by adding courses such as AI journalism ethics and algorithmic journalism. At the national level, the Ministry of Education's 2023 teaching quality guidelines for journalism and communication majors treat AI as a core competency.	Policy has moved more slowly. In 2024, the Ministry approved an interuniversity standard on using AI in higher education, while broader enforceable requirements are still developing.

	In China, the curriculum is more institutionalized and standardized. In Kazakhstan, curriculum change is more practice led, with implementation driven by projects and real world experimentation.		
Notable Projects	i-Sanj Virtual Anchor (2020), StopFake.kz FactChecking Platform (2020-2025), UNESCO Almaty Project (2024-2025).	Xinhua News Agency AI Anchor (2018), People's Daily Intelligent Editing System (2020), Tsinghua University Journalism AI Lab (2021).	Both countries are implementing educational innovations through "AI journalism practices".
Ethical Issues	Key concerns include content authenticity, misinformation detection, social trust, and the risk of technology abuse.	Key priorities include algorithm transparency, traceability, data fairness, and editorial accountability.	China places more weight on structural control, while Kazakhstan puts greater emphasis on social trust.
Institutional Outcomes	A collaborative mechanism is forming across media, education, and society, which has helped ethical awareness become more widespread.	A national standards system and an AI service registration mechanism are in place, and ethics education is being incorporated into higher education reform.	Both trajectories are moving toward ethical institutionalization.

Kazakhstan's shift in ethics education is being pulled forward by concrete newsroom problems and public attention. Early high visibility experiments made trust and responsibility hard to ignore, and day to day routines started to change before rules fully caught up. Universities are responding by turning verification, disclosure and correction into teachable tasks, that can be practiced and assessed. The remaining tension is that fast, practice led change can stay uneven, so consistency and public explanation become the next pressure points.

China's shift in ethics education is being pulled forward by rules and institutional requirements. Early high profile uses of AI in news made automation feel official; and regulators moved quickly to set expectations for disclosure, labeling, record keeping and human review for higher risk content. Universities are responding by turning these steps into routine training tasks that can be practiced, checked and graded. A rule led approach can end up as box ticking, which leaves judgement and public explanation behind. It can also raise costs and make work feel rigid. And when platforms, newsrooms and tech providers share the same workflow, responsibility can still look blurry to the public.

Comparative Education Practices

Based on the public materials we reviewed, Kazakhstan and China are moving along two different routes when generative content enters journalism. The difference is not only in policy language. It is visible in newsroom routines. It is also visible in what students are trained to do, and what they are graded on. Across both routes, the emphasis is shifting away from tool use alone and toward accountable processes, where disclosure, traceability and responsibility are treated as teachable and assessable routines [17].

Kazakhstan is pushed by visible incidents and public debate. Education often follows concrete problems as they surface. Teaching leans on real cases and regional projects. Students are asked to trace a full workflow, from inputs and data to outputs, publication and distribution, and to mark where risk enters at each step. This turns ethics into practice. It also makes the responsibility dimension harder to avoid, because stronger AI capacity in newswork also raises editorial and ethical responsibility [18]. It allows fast adjustment when new issues appear. Similar topics can be taught in very different ways across universities and outlets. Smaller teams may lack staff, tools or stable training materials. Case-based teaching can also chase the latest controversy. Students may become good at reacting, but less good at building a steady standard that still holds when public attention shifts. The result is quick adaptation, which can remain fragmented.

China is pulled more by rules. Disclosure, labeling and human checks are treated as baseline duties; and they flow into training. This makes teaching easier to standardize and assess. Students can be evaluated on concrete actions, such as verification steps, record keeping, and when human review is required for higher-risk items. Ethics becomes routine work, rather than a personal promise. The trade-offs are clear. Ethics can narrow into compliance. Checklist-driven classes can prepare students who document steps well, but who get less practice making judgments under uncertainty or explaining decisions to skeptical audiences. Rigidity is another risk. When risk control dominates, newsroom choices can become more cautious and debate can narrow. Responsibility can also stay blurred. Even with records, accountability can still be disputed.

Seen together, the comparison points to a trade-off in what each route makes easier to teach. Kazakhstan more easily builds judgment through close contact with real cases, but struggles with consistency. China more easily turns key steps into reliable routines, but can produce procedural correctness with weak explanation. This is where ethics education is tested. Not in whether a label exists, but in whether future journalists can defend decisions with clear reasons, state limits and handle uncertainty without hiding behind a checklist.

Discussion & Conclusion

This study has clear limits. The evidence comes mainly from public policy texts and publicly available course materials. It does not systematically include classroom observation, student work, learning outcomes or long term follow up. On the Kazakhstan side, continuity is also an issue. Some education related information is not published regularly. As a result, the paper describes patterns visible in documents. It cannot yet show, how much student competence changes, or which teaching designs work best. Future research could build a multilingual, multimodal database on AIGC related ethics education in journalism to support experiments, longitudinal tracking and more comparable evaluation of routine steps such as disclosure, labeling, verification and correction. It should also clarify responsibility boundaries in human machine news production, especially when editors, virtual presenters and algorithmic systems share the same chain.

Across the materials reviewed, AIGC no longer reads as a simple technical add on. It works more like a structural force, that reshapes newsroom routines and the training systems behind them. This pushes journalism ethics away from rule recital and toward institutional design and classroom practice. Kazakhstan looks more practice led and collaborative. Visible cases and fact-checking work can move quickly into teaching tasks and media literacy activities. The benefit is speed. The cost is unevenness, since disclosure and correction routines can differ across outlets and universities, and training resources are not always stable. China looks more rule led and education embedded. Duties around disclosure, labeling, traceability and human review are

easier to translate into routine training and assessment. This can standardize teaching and make evaluation more consistent. The cost is that ethics can narrow into compliance. Students may become strong at procedures and documentation, while getting less practice in judgment under uncertainty and explanation to skeptical audiences. Neither route is a gold standard. The value of the comparison is that it makes the trade-off visible.

One reason these trade-offs matter is that a mature ethics of algorithms is still hard to define. Algorithm is an umbrella term that covers too many different systems and contexts. That makes simple universal rules difficult to apply across cases [19]. This paper, therefore, takes an education centered view of ethics institutionalization. Ethics becomes practical when it is built into the curriculum structure, learning tasks and assessment. It shifts from external constraint to routines that can be practiced, tested and revised. This adds a non-Western comparative lens to research that often relies on Western newsroom cases or training agendas. It also helps explain why initiatives for responsible use of generative tools can sound similar in principle, but differ in how they work on the ground [20]. It also shifts ethics research closer to educational processes and capability building, not only professional statements.

The implications are straightforward. Kazakhstan would benefit from clearer teaching benchmarks shared across institutions, built through collaboration between universities, media organizations and fact-checking platforms. The goal is not uniform ideology, but shared minimum routines and shared teaching materials that reduce duplication and resource gaps. China would benefit from more space for institution-specific teaching design inside a rule led environment. Disclosure, labeling, traceability, and accountability can remain baseline duties, while training also requires students to justify decisions in messy cases where evidence is incomplete, sources conflict, or trust is low. In both contexts, universities can define measurable ethics competencies and place them within assessment. This includes identifying generative content, evaluating transparency claims and practicing correction responsibility when errors spread. Public facing education matters as well. Open courses, newsroom open days and joint workshops can help audiences understand AI-assisted production and what labels mean. Without this, labels can turn into background noise.

Taken together, AIGC places journalism ethics education at a crowded interface between technology, values, institutions and society. Kazakhstan shows how project driven work and public engagement can generate teaching momentum, but also how unevenness persists when standards and resources are fragmented. China shows how rule clarity can support stable routines and standardized teaching tools, but also how training can tilt toward procedural correctness without strong explanation skills. The core issue is not tool proficiency. It is whether students can build an accountable workflow and explain it plainly. That is where trust is won or lost in high-efficiency news environments that also carry high risk.

The contribution of the authors:

Adalikhan N. – author of the study concept, analysis of the situation in China, data visualization, table preparation, and article writing.

Skripnikova A.I. – corresponding author, provided translation support for the study, analyzed and compiled the data, edited the text, organized and structured the material, and ensured technical formatting in accordance with standards.

Shyngyssova N.T. – compiled the literature review, interpreted domestic data, analyzed educational programs, and ensured the academic quality of the study.

References

1. Diakopoulos N. Automating the news: How algorithms are rewriting the media. Cambridge, (Massachusetts, 2019, 336 p.)
2. Thurman N., Lewis S. C. Algorithmic journalism and news automation: A review. *Digital Journalism*. 10(6), 733–752(2022). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2022.2033995>
3. Williamson B., Piattoeva N. Education governance and datafication: Beyond policy borrowing. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*. 19(3), 243–260(2021). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2020.1864755>
4. Napoli P. M. Social media and the public interest: Media regulation in the disinformation age. Columbia University Press, (2019). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7312/napo19194>
5. Graefe A. Guide to automated journalism. Columbia University: Tow Center for Digital Journalism. (2016). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7916/D8QZ2R37>
6. Noble S. U. Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism. NYU Press. (2018). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1pwt9w5>
7. UNESCO. Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence. Paris: UNESCO. (2021). [Electronic resource]. Available at: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000381137> (Accessed at: 02.08.2025).
8. Yessimova M. S., Shevyakova T. V. Deepfakes in the digital media age: Opportunities and threats. *Herald of KazNU. Journalism Series*. 3(73), 44–54(2024). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26577/HJ.2024.v73.i3.05>
9. Zhaxylykbayeva R., Burkitbayeva A., Zhakhyp B., Kabylgazina K., Ashirbekova G. Artificial intelligence and journalistic ethics: A comparative analysis of AI-generated content and traditional journalism. *Journal of Media*. 6(3), 105(2025). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/journalmedia6030105>
10. Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism. AI, automation, and the future of news: Editors' perspectives. University of Oxford. (2024). [Electronic resource]. Available at: <https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk> (Accessed at: 12.08.2025).
11. Bajnjasheva, E., Zhusupova, A., Markabaeva, G. Integracija tehnologij AI v zhurnalistiku Kazahstana: opyt, bar'ery i perspektivy[Integration of AI technologies in journalism in Kazakhstan: experience, barriers, and prospects]. *Vestnik KazNU. Seriya zhurnalistiki* [KazNU Bulletin. Journalism series]. 3 (77), 19–28(2025). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26577/HJ20257739>
12. Ayapova S. M., Skripnikova A. I. Media texts created by artificial intelligence and humans: Results of an experiment. *Herald of KazNU. Journalism series*. 64(2), 78–84(2022). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26577/HJ.2022.v64.i2.08>
13. Liu H. Ethical turn and governance framework of education in the era of artificial intelligence. *Modern Distance Education Research*. 6, 15–25(2021).
14. Zhang Z. Innovating journalism ethics education under the generative-AI context. *Journalism and Communication Review*. 4. 67–78(2023).
15. UNESCO Almaty. (2024). Media and information literacy in Central Asia: Regional report. Paris/Almaty: UNESCO.
16. Lu Jiayin. Artificial intelligence in journalism and communication [Course outline]. Communication University of China. (2024). [Electronic resource]. Available at: <https://cuc.edu.cn> (Accessed at: 27.08.2025).
17. OECD. Digital education outlook 2023: Learning in the age of AI. OECD Publishing. (2023). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1787/19939019>
18. Beckett C. New powers, new responsibilities: A global survey of journalism and AI. London School of Economics and Political Science. (2019). [Electronic resource] Available at: <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/polis/2019/11/18/new-powers-new-responsibilities/> (Accessed at: 10.09.2025).

19. Mittelstadt B. D., Allo P., Taddeo M., Wachter S., Floridi L. The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. *Big Data & Society*. 3(2), 1-21(2016). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951716679679>

20. Poynter Institute. AI literacy and media ethics for journalists: Training framework. St. Petersburg, FL: The Poynter Institute. (2024). [Electronic resource] Available at: <https://www.poynter.org/ai-ethics-journalism/> (Accessed at: 5.09.2025).

Н. Адалихан¹, А.И. Скрипникова², Н.Т. Шыңғысова³

^{1,2,3}*Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан*

Генеративті жасанды интеллект контекстіндегі журналистік этика мәселелері: Қазақстан мен Қытай материалдары негізінде

Аңдатпа. Генеративті жасанды интеллект редакцияның күнделікті жұмысының бір бөлігіне айналып, жаңалықты жасап, тарату және ақпараттық контентке сенімнің қалыптасуына ықпал етуде. Алғашқы мәтін немесе мәтінді қайта жазуға, мультимедиялық өнім дайындауға көмектесетін құралдар контенттің шығуын тездеткенімен, деректерді тексеру, автор мен дереккөздерді көрсету, жауапкершілік, есеп беру, құпиялылық және жариялылыққа қатысты этикалық мәселелер туындайды. Бұл зерттеуде осындай мәселелердің Қазақстан мен Қытайдағы журналистік этика білімінде 2018-2025 жылдар аралығында қалай іске асырылып жатқаны қарастырылады. Салыстырмалы тақырыптық шолу арқылы ашық нормативтік құжаттар мен ресми хабарламалар, іріктелген медиа оқиғалар, фактчекинг ұйымдарының материалдары, білім беру бағдарламалары, силлабустар сияқты университеттік құжаттар талданады. Зерттеу нәтижелері бейімделудің әртүрлі жолдарын көрсетті. Қазақстанда дипфейктер мен дезинформация өзгерістерді редакциялық практика мен оқу орындарына тәжірибеге сүйеніп, біртіндеп енгізсе, Қытайда өзгерістер технологияны қолдануды ашық көрсету, таңбалау, базалық жазбалар жүргізу, тәуекелі жоғары материалдарды адамдарға тексерту сияқты ресми талаптар арқылы жүзеге асырылды. Екі контексте де этиканы оқыту ережелерді үйренуден бастап, төселіп, бағалауға болатын жұмыс дағдыларын қалыптастыруға бағытталған. Дегенмен, ымырашылдықтың жоқтығы мен шектен тыс қатаңдық тәуекелдері үйлеспейді.

Түйін сөздер: генеративті жасанды интеллект, журналистика, этика, медиабілім беру, мәдениетаралық салыстыру.

Н. Адалихан¹, А.И. Скрипникова², Н.Т. Шыңғысова³

^{1,2,3}*Казахский национальный университет им. аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан*

Проблемы журналистской этики в контексте генеративного искусственного интеллекта: на материале Казахстана и Китая

Аннотация. Генеративный искусственный интеллект всё чаще становится частью повседневной работы редакций СМИ и меняет то, как создаются новости, как они распространяются, и как к ним формируется доверие. Инструменты, которые помогают использовать шаблоны, редактировать тексты и компоновать мультимедийные материалы, значительно ускоряют процесс выпуска медиа, но одновременно затрагивают этические аспекты, связанные с

ответственностью перед аудиторией, проверкой информации, указанием авторства. В исследовании рассматриваются, как вышеперечисленные вопросы переводятся в плоскость преподавания журналистской этики в Казахстане и Китае в период с 2018 по 2025 год. Используя сравнительный анализ изучены официальные нормативные документы, ключевые локальные медиа-кейсы, данные фактчекинговых организаций, а также университетские материалы, включая паспорта образовательных программ и syllabus курсов. Благодаря полученным результатам обозначились два разных варианта адаптации к существованию ИИ. В Казахстане заметные случаи распространения дипфейков постепенно привели к изменениям в профессиональной сфере и обучении журналистов с опорой на реальные кейсы. В Китае изменения в большей степени задаются официальными требованиями к обязательной маркировке, указанию использованных инструментов и проверке материалов ИИ человеком. Однако, в обоих контекстах обучение этике смещается от «слепого» ознакомления к формированию практических навыков, которые можно нарабатывать и оценивать в период профессионального обучения в вузе.

Ключевые слова: генеративный искусственный интеллект, журналистика, этика, медиа-образование, межкультурное сравнение.

Information about authors:

Adalihan N. – PhD-student of the Journalism Faculty, al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan.

Skripnikova A. – corresponding author, PhD, Journalism Faculty, al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty.

Shyngyssova N. – Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, Journalism Faculty, al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan.

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Адалихан Н. – PhD докторанты, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университетінің журналистика факультеті, Алматы, Қазақстан.

Скрипникова А. – корреспондент-автор, PhD докторы, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университетінің журналистика факультеті, Алматы, Қазақстан.

Шыңғысова Н. – филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университетінің журналистика факультеті, Алматы, Қазақстан.

Сведения об авторах:

Адалихан Н. – докторант факультета журналистики Казахского национального университета имени аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан.

Скрипникова А. – автор-корреспондент, доктор PhD, факультет журналистики Казахского национального университета имени аль-Фараби.

Шыңғысова Н. – доктор филологических наук, профессор, факультет журналистики Казахского национального университета имени аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан.