Media and Journalism Research Center
November 2024

CONTROL BEYOND CODE

Ownership and Financial Insights of AI Used in Journalism

Author:
Sydney Martin

Editor:
Marius Dragomir

Table of Contents

Introduction

A free and independent press is the cornerstone of all democratic societies. The recent wave of unprecedented technological advancements, such as generative AI, has the potential to either reinforce or challenge this foundation. Private technology companies are releasing generative AI products that are subsequently adopted by media and journalists for tasks such as writing news articles, fact-checking information, or predicting newsworthy events before they occur. These innovative AI solutions have the potential to transform newsrooms by enhancing efficiency, accuracy, and accessibility in news production. However, as AI gains traction for both public and private use, its limitations are rapidly being identified.

As a tool created by humans that relies on human knowledge and behavior as a guide, AI has a history of making mistakes and perpetuating human biases. Furthermore, these AI tools are predominantly owned and operated by private sector entities, indicating that financial and ownership factors influence the efficacy of generative AI tools. In order to maintain the integrity of media and journalism in the age of AI, it is essential to understand who has a stake in these AI tool companies and how AI is being used by the media. This will ensure the protection of consumers, democracy, and truth.

This report marks the initial phase of a larger initiative aimed at fostering transparency and informed decision-making regarding the use of AI tools in media and journalism. To this end, the report investigates the ownership, financial information, and intended use of 100 AI tools used by newsrooms around the world. In addition to a quantitative analysis of 17 variables, this report includes a case study of a fact-checking AI used on content from the Israel-Hamas war. This case study illustrates the importance of maintaining the utmost transparency for private AI companies and of ensuring that journalists are fully informed about the tools they use to create news content.

Executive Summary

The lack of transparency among the 100 AI tool companies canvassed in this study gives rise to concerns about the reliability and impartiality of their products for journalistic use. Only 33% of AI tool companies demonstrate sufficient transparency, with 67% lacking critical data on ownership, finances, and other basic information. In the absence of this data, it is challenging to ascertain how an AI tool company is influenced by investors or stakeholders, its size, or the individuals or entities that can be held accountable for the tool. This is a significant indicator of potential challenges, not only for the future of journalism, as news media and journalists rely on these tools, but also for the future of communications, as these entities gain increasing influence in shaping narratives online.

In light of the various applications of AI in media and journalism, the lack of transparency is a significant concern, particularly with regard to the transparency of AI tools utilized for fact-checking information in journalism. Of the 100 AI tools identified, 23 included AI fact-checking services, and of these 23, only five (21%) could be classified as adequately transparent. 13 of them, or over 56% of the total, are considered not transparent.

Unwittingly, journalists and newsrooms using these AI fact-checking tools may be working with biased companies that could compromise the integrity of their work. Furthermore, consumers may be unaware of the source of this AI-generated information, which is being disseminated by journalists and presented as factual. The use of opaque AI companies in news reporting could have a significant impact on democratic values and the public's perception of truth. Further investigation is necessary in this area.

The more financially successful and popular AI tool companies employed by media and journalists appear to be Claude AI, Dataminr, Notion, Grammarly, and Jasper AI. All of these companies have been labeled as adequately transparent. As AI companies gain in popularity and meet certain financial benchmarks, it is possible that federal or local transparency regulations will be introduced. However, this study did not directly explore the role of regulation in promoting transparency, making it difficult to determine why some AI companies in this report were very transparent while others were not. Another factor that could influence the level of transparency exhibited by an AI company is the country in which they are headquartered and conduct their operations. While it would appear that, of the 100 companies in this study, those headquartered in the U.S. were more likely to be adequately transparent, this cannot be accurately deduced given the sample size and the qualified convenience sampling method. A more comprehensive and systematic study is needed to determine why and how these companies are avoiding the disclosure of basic company information.

Importantly, while major technology companies such as Google, Amazon, and Microsoft have recently expanded their portfolios to include AI, this study is focused on companies that are more specifically engaged in the AI industry through their specialization in AI products. Given that tech giants offer a wide range of products beyond AI, these were not included in our dataset. Nevertheless, it is probable that tech giants will continue to exert a significant influence within the AI industry, and they may even acquire some of the smaller companies mentioned in this report.

Consequently, it is notable that based on the valuation, revenue, and funding amounts included in the dataset, the majority of AI tool companies included in this report could be classified as startups or small businesses. While there is no universally accepted definition of a startup or small business, a commonly used guideline in the technology industry is the "50, 100, 500" rule. This rule states that when a company has less than US$ 50 million in revenue, less than 100 employees, and a valuation under $500 million, they may still be considered a startup.[1]

In the absence of available data regarding the number of employees at these AI companies, it is unclear how many meet the criteria for a company with less than 100 employees. However, it appears that the majority of these companies would fall within the US $50 million revenue and/or the US$ 500 million threshold for classification as a startup. Given the recent emergence of AI, it is understandable that the majority of these companies have not yet reached beyond the small business level. A longitudinal study on the financial and ownership information of these 100 AI companies, and any additional ones, would be beneficial for understanding growth trends in the industry.

[1] Mia Sullivan. Startup vs. Small Business: What's the Difference?. 22 July 2024. Hubspot. https://blog.hubspot.com/sales/startup-vs-small-business

Methodology

The sampling method for this study was primarily one of qualified convenience, and data collection took place between April and June of 2024. To identify suitable AI tools for analysis, search engines such as Google were queried using search terms similar to: "artificial intelligence tools for journalists and newsrooms." The search results yielded hundreds of online articles that advertised and evaluated AI tools for journalistic purposes. A considerable number of these articles were authored by journalists who were drawing on their own experiences of experimenting with AI in their work.

The initial pool for sample selection consisted of articles written by journalists about AI tools they found useful. A few additional AI tools were selected based on the explicit claim on their official websites that the tool was created for journalists and newsrooms. In essence, the selection criteria applied resulted in the inclusion of AI tools that had been endorsed by a journalist for use in journalism or explicitly intended for journalistic or newsroom purposes.

Beyond these two criteria, the selection process was based on convenience. The first 100 AI tools that appeared on the search engine and met the aforementioned criteria were selected. This qualified convenience sampling ensures that the AI tools selected for analysis are actually used by newsrooms and journalists, albeit to varying degrees and with various levels of popularity. Furthermore, since this study is concerned with exploring the AI industry, tech giants like Google and Microsoft were not included for analysis; these companies would not reflect the AI industry due to their involvement in a myriad of other products, and including them would likely skew our findings about the AI industry.

Once the sample of 100 AI tools for media and journalism was selected, the next step was to identify the owner of each tool (i.e., the AI tool company). In some instances, the AI tool was owned by a company, LLC, Ltd., or other entity that used a name different from the AI tool itself, and this discrepancy was noted. It is important to note that all subsequent information about the AI tool was extracted from the AI tool's website and the financial information of the ownership entity.

The data gathered on each AI tool company was classified as either primary or secondary information. The primary information variables were selected based on their potential to provide the most insightful and relevant insights for identifying possible biases or conflicts, as well as for gauging the size, stability, and overall health of the company responsible for the AI tool. The primary information variables are as follows:

(1) Name of AI product
(2) Ownership
(3) Headquarters location
(4) Founder(s)
(5) Latest valuation
(6) Latest revenue
(7) Total funding acquired
(8) Number of investors
(9) Number of funding rounds
(10) Lead investor(s)
(11) Investor name(s)
(12) Primary services (uses)

While the significance of the majority of these variables is evident, it is crucial to grasp the importance of the three financial markers (total funding, latest valuation, and latest revenue) for the analysis in this report.

First, the valuation of a company indicates its monetary value (in USD for this report), based on factors such as the company's assets and liabilities, market position, and potential for growth. It is also important to note that a company's valuation can be used to indicate its financial performance in comparison to other companies within the same market and with similar products. Secondly, a company's latest revenue is defined as their total income from sales before expenses. This figure can also be used to indicate company growth.

Finally, the total amount of funding is the sum of all investments made into a specific company. A company's funding amount can demonstrate their financial health, market trends, and projected popularity of their product(s), as indicated by the number of funding rounds. These three financial markers collectively provide insight into the financial health, growth potential, and overall stability of each AI tool company.

In contrast, the secondary information variables are more pertinent for contextual purposes, including:

(13) Known media customers/users
(14) Other notable customers/users
(15) Notable partners or affiliates
(16) Branch location(s)
(17) Number of users

To collect and cross-check the data regarding the primary and secondary information variables for each AI tool company, three main sources were used: (1) the AI tool company's official website, (2) CrunchBase, and (3) PrivCo. The latter two sources are private companies that specialize in collecting and publishing the financial data of other private companies. By cross-checking the collected data across multiple private and public sources, we have taken every possible step to ensure the accuracy of the information included in this report. Any discrepancies have been accounted for. In instances where data was unavailable from the aforementioned sources, the designation "NA" was used to indicate that the variable in question lacked the necessary information.

Another variable that requires further elaboration is the "primary services (uses)" category. The phrases included in this category are designed to indicate the primary use of the AI tool, the type of AI employed, or the service provided to journalists. For instance, "Generative Text" denotes that the AI tool is utilized for prompt generation, rephrasing, translation, editing, summarization, and even the composition of full articles on a specific subject. The following is a list of definitions for each of the phrases found under the "Primary Services (Uses)" category.

- Generative Visuals: this includes AI that does video editing and image production.
- Generative Analysis: this includes AI services such as search-engine optimization (SEO), audience analytics, and data insights for marketing purposes.
- Generative Audio: this includes AI intended to edit audio recordings or replicate voices.
- Generative Organization: this includes AI services such as workflow optimization, document organization, clustering, and centralization.
- Fact-Checking: this includes AI services like reverse image searching, reverse video searching, and other cross-checking services.
- Database: this indicates that the AI identified is actually a collection of different AI tools and resources for journalists or newsrooms.

It is crucial to understand the intended uses of AI tools in journalism and newsrooms to uncover how they are currently being used and to inform future research into how potential algorithmic biases within AI could influence the content they produce.

In addition to qualifying the data based on primary and secondary variables, each AI tool was further categorized using a typology. This was done to provide insight into the transparency level of each AI tool company, specifically in terms of the amount of desired information that was available.

To summarize,

- The adequately transparent AI tools companies: have at least 75% (9/12) of the primary data fields filled – in other words, the vast majority of the primary data for these AI tool companies was available to be included.
- The somewhat transparent AI tools companies: have between 33% (4/12) and 66% (8/12) of the primary data fields filled – in other words, some of the primary data for these AI tool companies was available to be included.
- The not transparent AI tools companies: have 25% (3/12) or less of the primary data fields filled – in other words, little to none of the primary data for these AI tool companies was available to be included.

The final output of this taxonomy is a spreadsheet that lists 100 AI tools, categorized by the 17 variables of interest and transparency level. The complete database, created as part of this study, is available on MJRC's website.

Research Limitations

This report provides an overview of 100 companies that offer AI media and journalism resources. It should be noted that this is not a comprehensive list of all companies offering AI tools intended or used for journalistic purposes. The qualified convenience case selection method used in this report means that the included AI tools were not randomly selected. In addition to the selection criteria, there are also website algorithms like Search Engine Optimization (SEO), cookie preferences, and other computer settings that were not controlled during online searches for identifying AI tools used by journalists. For instance, the preponderance of AI tools in this dataset may be concentrated in North America due to the researcher's laptop being set to the North American region. It should be understood that the analysis of these 100 companies is not intended to be widely generalizable. Rather, it is specifically focused on a sample of AI tools for media and journalism that are either (a) used by journalists or (b) promoted for journalistic use.

It is also important to bear in mind that the information collected and attributed to each AI tool is based on the entity that owns the tool. To illustrate, the AI fact-checking tool, "Particle.News," is owned by Mina Labs, Inc. Consequently, the financial data included in this report was sourced from Mina Labs, Inc. This indicates that the financial data in the primary variable fields is not necessarily specific to the AI tool itself, but rather to the company as a whole that owns it. Therefore, when an AI tool is owned by a company with multiple products, it is not possible to determine how much of their funding, revenue, or valuation can be attributed to the specific AI tool being focused on here.

While not a limitation, it should be noted that the level of transparency for each AI tool and their owners is defined by the availability of information from three sources (CrunchBase, PrivCo, and the AI tool companies' official websites). If the majority of the data of interest is not available on any of these three sources at the time of collection, the AI tool is deemed not transparent for the purposes of this report. This does not mean that the information may be not available through other sources that were not included in the researcher's review.

Due to the limitations of time and resources, it was not feasible to conduct a comprehensive investigation of all potential sources of company information. Two easily accessible and popularized databases, along with the official AI tool's website, were selected for data collection. The main reason for choosing these sources is that they are easily accessible for non-expert audiences, and accessibility is the bedrock of transparency. If an AI company technically has its basic data available through an obscure and hard to find source, no reasonable person would consider that to meet the basic tenets of transparency. Still, while we believe our labels are justified, when classifying these AI tools as adequately transparent, somewhat transparent, or not transparent, it is essential to consider that these categories are based on the specific definitions, scope, and purpose outlined in this paper.

Key Findings

Level of Transparency

Of the 100 AI tools under review, only 33% had at least 9/12 of the primary data point of interest completed. This indicates that, according to the criteria set forth in this paper, only 33% of the AI tool companies analyzed could be considered to have adequate transparency. In contrast, 42% of the companies surveyed are not transparent, with three or fewer primary data fields completed; this lack of transparency hinders the ability to assess important financial and ownership information for these AI companies. The remaining 25% of companies demonstrated some transparency, with 4–8/12 of the primary data points filled in. Overall, the vast majority of AI tools lacked adequate information for collection and analysis. Without comprehensive knowledge of ownership, investors, and other financial information for these AI tools in journalism, potential biases cannot be fully understood by those using them.

Geographic Origin

Of the 100 AI tool companies included in the study, 74 had an identifiable country where their operations are based. However, the locations of the remaining 26 companies remain unknown. Of the AI tool companies with headquarters locations available for inclusion, 47% are headquartered in North America, 19% are in Europe, 5% are in Asia, and 3% are in the Middle East. Some 43% of AI tool companies are headquartered in the United States. Of those, 25 companies (or 58%) have been classified as adequately transparent, 12 (or 27%) as somewhat transparent, and five (or 11%) as not transparent. Of the 19 companies headquartered in Europe, only three (or 15%) are considered to be adequately transparent, eight (or 42%) are considered to be somewhat transparent, and eight (or 42%) are considered to be not transparent. Of the few AI tools in Asia, only one in five was considered adequately transparent (from India), and of the remaining AI tools headquartered in the Middle East, two were adequately transparent while the remaining one was somewhat transparent.

Popular Types of AI Tools for Journalists

Our analysis indicated that 40% of the AI tools in the sample offered a single primary service, while 60% provided multiple AI capabilities. The most prevalent type of AI utilized in the dataset was generative text, with 61% of the AI tools offering capabilities for article writing, editing, translation, and summarization for journalists.

The next most common type of AI in the dataset was generative visuals, with 47% of the AI tools including the ability to create generative images and videos, as well as to automatically edit visual content. The least prevalent types of AI were generative audio (5%) and generative analysis (15%). Fact-checking features were included in 23% of the AI tools, while generative organization was included in 22%.

Financials

Of the 100 AI tools companies, only 25 had valuation information available, only 24 had revenues available, and only 43 had total funding amounts available. Accordingly, the following findings are limited to the AI tools for which information was available for each financial variable.

The latest valuations for the 25 AI tool companies with available data ranged from US$ 3 million to US$ 10 billion, with a median of US$ 41 million and a mean of US$ 2.01 billion. The company with the lowest available valuation is Narrato, at US$ 3 million as of 2023. Narrato is one of five AI tool companies with a valuation below US$ 10 million. At the other end of the spectrum, five AI tool companies had valuations above US$ 1 billion, with three valued at or above US$ 10 billion.

However, the majority of the AI tool companies canvassed by the study have a valuation between $6.5 million and $100 million. It is worth noting that the five AI tool companies valued above US$ 100 million could be considered outliers, which could influence the mean valuation.

In terms of revenue, the figures ranged from $925,000 to $430 million. Approximately 75% of the companies had revenues at or below US$ 18 million, while 25% had revenues at or above US$ 31 million. The AI tool company with the lowest latest revenue is Compose AI at $925,000. This is one of three AI tool companies with revenues of US$ 1 million or less. The median revenue of these 24 AI tool companies is US$ 6.75 million, while the mean revenue is US$ 48.43 million.

The total funding received by AI tool companies from investors ranged from a minimum of US$ 100,000 to a maximum of US$ 7.6 billion, reflecting a notable disparity in investment levels. Just over half (51%) of the companies received less than US$ 10 million in investments, while the remaining 49% received US$ 10 million or more. Only two AI tool companies (4.6%) received investments in excess of US$ 1 billion, while only ten (23%) secured funding of US$ 100 million or more. The median total funding amount for the 43 AI tools with available information is US$ 8 million, while the mean is approximately US$ 246.7 million.

Top AI tools companies with the largest amount of total funding via investments

Company	Funding, in US$ million
Claude AI (Anthropic)	7,600 - 7,750
Dataminr	1,050 - 1,100
Grammarly	400
Notion	343
AI21 Labs	326

Source: Media and Journalism Research Center based on data collected from third-party sources (see Methodology) • Created with Datawrapper

Top AI tools companies with the highest latest valuations, 2018–2024

Company	Funding US$ million
Notion	10
Dataminr	4
Jasper AI	2
Descript	550
Writer	400

Source: Media and Journalism Research Center based on data collected from third-party sources (see Methodology) • Created with Datawrapper

Top AI tools companies with the highest latest revenue*

Company	Funding US$ million
Claude AI (Anthropic)	430
Dataminr	320
Grammarly	99
Notion	93
Jasper AI	82

**data available for years ranging from 2020 to 2023*

Source: Media and Journalism Research Center based on data collected from third-party sources (see Methodology) • Created with Datawrapper

It is notable that the owners of Claude AI, Dataminr, and Notion are in the top five for all three financial markers (funding, valuation, and revenue). As a result, these companies could be considered some of the larger and more financially successful AI tool companies within the scope of the present dataset. Nevertheless, it is uncertain whether they would be classified as a startup based on their revenue and the lack of available employee data. All three companies are headquartered in the United States and specialize in generative text, generative analysis, and generative organization. It is also noteworthy that these AI tools are used by journalists and newsrooms, with examples including Dataminr, which is employed by prominent media outlets such as CNN, AccuWeather, and Radio Free Europe. However, none of these companies exclusively cater to AI solutions for media or journalism; consequently, a diverse range of industries and individuals rely on these AI tools.

Investors & Ownership

Of the 100 AI tool companies in our dataset, only 48 had a list of investors available. However, due to various limitations, we were unable to cross-check the veracity of these lists for a few of the companies. For instance, Get Clarity is an AI tool that has an investor list published on its website, but no investor data is available on CrunchBase or PrivCo. Some 62% out of 100 AI tool companies had confirmable ownership, while the owners of 38 AI tools in the dataset remain unknown.

Y Combinator, an investment firm, was a listed investor in eight of the 48 AI tools companies with available investor information, the highest number of any other investor in the study. Given that Y Combinator is an investment firm focused on technology-based products and startups, its involvement in these AI tools is not unexpected. Google is the next most common investor, with investments in four of the AI tools under review. Notably, out of the six AI tools with the largest amount of funding, Google is an investor in three.

The AI tool with the highest valuation, revenue, and amount of funding is Claude AI, which is owned by Anthropic. This AI tool has secured investment from a number of prominent investors, including Spark Capital, Google, and Amazon. Spark Capital is also an investor in Grammarly, an AI tool with one of the highest valuations among all AI tool companies included in the analysis. It is also noteworthy that, in light of their reputations, The Vanguard Group and BlackRock have each made investments in different AI tools used by media and journalists (e.g., Writer and Grammarly). While these points of intersection and repetition among major firms may be of interest, they do not indicate any significant conflicts or biases based on the available information in this study.

A more detailed analysis reveals the presence of key influencers in the AI field who are shaping the future of media and journalism. For example, Amit Gupta serves on the board of Y Combinator and is the founder of the AI tool SudoWrite. However, due to a lack of available information, it is unclear whether SudoWrite received funding from Y Combinator or, if so, the extent of that funding. Vinod Khosla, the founder of Khosla Ventures, also serves on the board of Kleiner Perkins, an investment firm. Through Khosla Ventures and Kleiner Perkins, Khosla has been involved in four past investments related to AI tools. Furthermore, Fabrice Grinda, a board member of FJ Labs, made an individual investment in the AI tool Dataminr, and FJ Labs also made an investment in this same AI tool company.

Case Study

Who's Fact-Checking the Israel-Hamas War?

Get Clarity, or simply Clarity, is a fact-checking cybersecurity tool powered by AI that was established in 2022. Clarity is classified as not transparent in this study because, out of the 12 primary information variables, only three were available: the company's name, its founders, and a list of investors (which may not be complete and is not verifiable beyond their website). Nevertheless, Clarity claims that its fact-checking services are utilized by numerous prominent newsroom clients, including Fox News, Bloomberg, Financial Times, The Sun, and Fortune, among others. Additionally, they appear to prioritize the advancement of democratic principles, as evidenced by their "Democracy Advisory Board," which comprises individuals from CNN, Democracy Capital, Stanford University, and even Canada's former Minister of Defense.

While the headquarters of Get Clarity is not verifiable, the Clarity Team is composed entirely of individuals currently from or residing in Israel, including the three members of their Leadership Team, Michael Matias, Natalie Fridman, and Gil Avriel. Prior to founding and assuming the role of CEO at Clarity, Matias served for five years as an officer in the Israeli Intelligence Corps, a branch of the Israeli military. Avriel also served in a governmental capacity, acting as a legal advisor for the Israeli National Security Council at the Office of the Prime Minister of Israel for 14 years prior to his involvement with Clarity.

Clarity and Matias have recently been featured in numerous tech news articles and interviews. In the majority of these articles, Matias is cited as promoting Clarity's role in verifying content related to the Israel-Hamas war for newsrooms, media outlets, and even governments. For example, a TechCrunch article about Clarity stated that:

> "...it appears to have carved out a niche. Initially, Clarity... sought customers in news publishers and the public sector, including the Israeli government. (Matias claims that Clarity is helping authenticate and verify videos coming out of the Israel-Hamas conflict.) But it's since expanded to identity verification providers and other, unnamed 'large enterprises.'"[2]

[2] Kyle Wiggers. Clarity raises $16M to fight deepfakes through detection. 15 February 2024. TechCrunch. https://tinyurl.com/22kdvcs7.

In another interview, Matias told reporters:

> "'When we started Clarity, we anticipated there to be an inflection point for the mass distribution of deepfakes around the US elections...I think the war in Gaza expedited a lot of that, particularly in images...We work very actively with intelligence agencies and government organizations to verify the media in the context of the war... including hostage videos, including media from the field... A lot of the media that we're dealing with is definitely in the context of the war.'"[3]

In these and other interviews, Matias has confirmed Clarity's close relationship with the Israeli government and their work fact-checking[4] the Israel-Hamas war.[5] Clarity's close relationship with the Israeli government, as well as Matias' and Aviel's previous lines of work, may present potential conflicts of interest in their role fact-checking the Israel-Hamas war for newsrooms. In light of the Israeli government's clear stake in the Israel-Hamas content that Clarity is tasked with verifying or debunking, there is a potential for the integrity of Clarity to be called into question on the grounds of apparent bias.

This case demonstrates the significance of transparency regarding the ownership and financial data of AI companies, particularly given their growing influence in shaping online narratives.

[3] Amanda Florian. CEO of deepfake detector startup talks AI and disinformation. 29 February 2024. IT Brew. https://www.itbrew.com/stories/2024/02/29/ceo-of-deepfake-detector-startup-talks-ai-and-disinformation
[4] Wiggers. Clarity raises $16M..., cit.
[5] Michael Matias: "We're racing towards mass skepticism about content and information. But the truth will prevail." 31 October 2023. CTech. https://www.calcalistech.com/ctechnews/article/byfh4000mp

Conclusions

This study is an exploratory investigation into the transparency of AI tool companies used in journalism. It provides important insights concerning the understudied intersection between AI and news. However, it only illuminates a small part of the picture. There are several avenues for future research that could contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of transparency and bias in AI tool companies. This will be crucial for identifying potential issues with these AI tools in newsrooms and developing solutions to address them.

While the study does not explore any potential algorithmic biases in these AI tools, future research should also investigate this issue to gain a deeper understanding of how AI used by the media may be biased beyond just financial and ownership factors. It is important to note that several critics have highlighted potential issues with the algorithms and data sources used by AI in other contexts,[6] especially policing.[7] These include concerns about racial discrimination and the inaccuracy of information verification.[8] It is essential that these same issues are explored in the context of media and journalism, given the serious implications for the free and independent press.

While there has been a rapid increase in research on the use of AI in media and journalism, there is still much to be discovered about the ownership structures and financial performance of the companies that offer these services. This study was designed to initiate data collection on this topic and may, in fact, prompt further research. Given the vital role of a free press in a democracy and the importance of truth in journalism, such research is needed to protect the public and journalists from potential bias in news reporting, especially since technologies such as AI are rapidly advancing.

[6] Christina Swarns. When Artificial Intelligence Gets It Wrong. 19 September 2023. The Innocence Project. https://innocenceproject.org/when-artificial-intelligence-gets-it-wrong/.
[7] Matthew Guariglia. What Can Go Wrong When Police Use AI to Write Reports? 8 May 2024. Electronic Frontier Foundation, https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2024/05/what-can-go-wrong-when-police-use-ai-write-reports.
[8] OHCHR. (2024). Racism and AI: "Bias from the past leads to bias in the future." https://www.ohchr.org/en/stories/2024/07/racism-and-ai-bias-past-leads-bias-future.

Annex: Definitions

AI: Abbreviation for Artificial Intelligence, which is broadly defined as "the theory and development of computer systems able to perform tasks normally requiring human intelligence, such as visual perception, speech recognition, decision-making, and translation between languages" (Oxford Dictionary).

AI tool: In the context of this report, this is a product powered by at least one type of AI and used to assist journalists, media outlets, or newsrooms in their work.

AI tool company: The entity that owns or is otherwise responsible for a specific AI tool.

Type of AI & Primary Services (use): What the AI tool is intended to be used for (e.g. generative text, video, audio etc.).

Media and Journalism Research Center

Legal address
Tartu mnt 67/1-13b, 10115,
Tallinn, Harju Maakond, Estonia

Postal address
6 South Molton St, London,
W1K 5QF, United Kingdom

MJRC has an academic cooperation agreement with
Universidade de Santiago de Compostela (USC)
Colexio de San Xerome, Praza do Obradoiro s/n,
CP 15782 de Santiago de Compostela.

Contact
www.journalismresearch.org
mjrc@journalismresearch.org

Artificial Intelligence (AI) Disclosure Statement
No AI tools were used in the creation of this report, which was written entirely by MJRC experts and editors.