

Values-Based Governance of Artificial Intelligence in Jordanian Media Institutions: An Islamic Ethical Approach Informed by Expert Perspectives

Saqer Rasheed Ahmad Alammouri^{1,2*}, Fauziah Binti Hassan¹, Ihab Ahmed Ra'uf Awais¹

¹ Faculty of Leadership and Management, Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia (USIM), Bandar Baru Nilai, 71800 Nilai, Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia

² Amman, Jordan

*Corresponding author: Saqer_rashed@yahoo.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33102/uij.808>

ABSTRACT

The rapid adoption of artificial intelligence (AI) in journalism has outpaced the development of institution-level safeguards in many Arab media environments. This study examines values-based AI governance in Jordanian media institutions through a secondary qualitative analysis of eleven expert interviews originally collected in 2024 for a broader doctoral study. Rather than conducting a de novo line-by-line recoding of every transcript, the present analysis re-examined governance-relevant coded segments across all eleven participants together with their surrounding transcript passages and analytical memos. Five empirical themes emerged: credibility and verification; human responsibility and institutional accountability; justice, representation and non-bias; privacy and data protection; and local adaptation with continuous institutional learning. These themes were then interpreted through Islamic ethical principles and established AI-governance scholarship. The resulting framework does not claim to invent new governance principles; it contextually integrates existing governance ideas with Jordanian expert evidence and Islamic ethical reasoning. It links normative values to professional safeguards, organisational structures, and legal-societal alignment across the AI lifecycle.

Keywords: algorithmic accountability; data stewardship; human oversight; maqasid al-Shariah; public interest

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence (AI) is now embedded in several stages of journalistic work, including information retrieval, transcription, translation, data analysis, drafting, visual production, audience analytics, recommendation, and distribution. Generative AI has expanded this range by enabling systems to produce fluent text, realistic images, synthetic audio, and automated summaries at a scale that was previously unavailable to most newsrooms. These tools can reduce routine work and support investigative and data-driven journalism, but their benefits are inseparable from risks concerning factual accuracy, hallucinated information, discriminatory outputs, privacy, intellectual property, source protection, labour displacement, and responsibility for published material (Gutiérrez-Caneda et al., 2024; Shi & Sun, 2024). The central professional question is therefore no longer whether journalists may use AI, but under what conditions, for which tasks, and with what institutional safeguards.

Manuscript Received Date: 24/6/2026

Manuscript Acceptance Date: 30/7/2026

Manuscript Published Date: 14/8/2026

©The Author(s) (2026). Published by USIM Press on behalf of Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial reuse, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. For commercial reuse, please contact penerbit@usim.edu.my

C O P E COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATION ETHICS



International policy has converged around values such as human dignity, fairness, transparency, privacy, safety, human oversight, and accountability. The UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence places human rights and dignity at the centre of AI governance (UNESCO, 2021). The updated OECD AI Principles respond to the growth of general-purpose and generative systems by strengthening commitments to safety, privacy, information integrity, and responsible stewardship (OECD, 2024). The Council of Europe Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence similarly requires governance compatible with human rights, democracy, and the rule of law (Council of Europe, 2024). In journalism, the Paris Charter on AI and Journalism affirms editorial independence, professional responsibility, transparency, and the continuing accountability of media organisations for material produced with AI (Reporters Without Borders, 2023).

However, agreement on principles does not guarantee responsible practice. A recurrent problem in AI ethics is the gap between high-level commitments and the organisational mechanisms needed to implement them. Responsible AI governance requires structures that allocate authority, procedures that assess and monitor risk, and relationships that enable coordination with technology providers, regulators, professionals, and affected communities (Papagiannidis et al., 2025). Journalism research has reached a similar conclusion: newsroom guidelines are multiplying, yet evidence remains limited on how those guidelines are enforced, audited, and connected to actual editorial workflows (Porlezza & Schapals, 2024). Human oversight can be nominal rather than meaningful, transparency can be reduced to a label, and accountability can disappear among journalists, managers, developers, and vendors.

The challenge is particularly important in Jordan. The Jordanian National Charter for AI Ethics and the Jordan Artificial Intelligence Strategy and Implementation Plan 2023-2027 provide a national policy foundation for transparent, fair, secure, and socially responsible AI use. The strategy also prioritises capacity building, research, investment, and a supportive legislative environment, while Jordan's Personal Data Protection Law No. 24 of 2023 establishes a legal basis for protecting personal data (Ministry of Digital Economy and Entrepreneurship [MoDEE], 2022, 2023; Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, 2023). Yet national policies do not automatically specify how a media institution should approve a tool, protect confidential sources, review generated output, disclose synthetic content, test bias, handle complaints, or assign responsibility when harm occurs.

This article addresses that implementation gap through the concept of values-based governance. Values-based governance treats ethical values as criteria for institutional design and decision-making rather than as abstract statements. A value becomes operational when it is associated with a responsible actor, a procedure, evidence of compliance, and a review mechanism. In a newsroom, for example, truthfulness requires more than an aspiration to accuracy: it requires verification protocols, source documentation, human editorial approval, and a correction process. Privacy requires data minimisation, limits on uploading confidential material to external systems, contractual controls, and impact assessment. Accountability requires an identified human decision-maker with sufficient knowledge, authority, time, and the ability to refuse or suspend a system.

The article also applies an Islamic ethical lens. This lens does not replace law, human-rights standards, or technical risk management. Rather, it grounds governance in concepts that carry normative force in Jordanian society: *tabayyun* (verification), *sidq* (truthfulness), *amanah* (trust and responsibility), *adl* (justice), preservation of dignity and privacy, prevention of harm, and pursuit of *maslahah* (public benefit). Recent scholarship has demonstrated that Islamic ethics can contribute to plural and context-sensitive AI governance by integrating virtue, accountability, justice, welfare, and human dignity (Elmahjub, 2023; Raquib et al., 2022). Recent work in *Ulum Islamiyyah* has likewise explored the ethical management of AI from Islamic perspectives and developed jurisprudential guidance for responsible digital content (Mat Jubri Shamsuddin et al., 2025; Yunos & Hamdan, 2025).

The study reanalyses qualitative data originally collected for a broader doctoral project (Author, 2024). The doctoral study examined AI ethics and digital transformation across professional standards, privacy, global charters, and the development of an ethical framework. The present article asks a narrower and distinct institutional question: how can expert-identified values and risks be organised as accountable governance arrangements inside Jordanian media institutions? This distinction shifts the unit of analysis from a general ethical model to institutional authority, procedures, evidence, monitoring, and redress.

1.1 Research Problem, Question and Objectives

The research problem is the absence of an empirically grounded framework that connects Islamic and journalistic values with operational AI governance inside Jordanian media institutions. Existing policy documents define desirable principles, and previous studies describe ethical concerns, but the intermediate organisational layer remains underdeveloped. This layer determines who approves an AI system, how risks are classified, what data may be processed, when disclosure is required, how bias is tested, and who answers to the

public.

The study is guided by the following question: What are the components of values-based AI governance in Jordanian media institutions, and how can they be grounded in Islamic ethics and translated into implementable institutional mechanisms in light of expert perspectives?

The objectives are to: (a) identify the values and institutional risks that experts associate with AI use in Jordanian media; (b) interpret those values through recent AI-governance scholarship and Islamic ethics; (c) specify professional and organisational mechanisms that make the values actionable; and (d) propose a multi-layer governance framework suitable for the Jordanian media environment.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 AI, Journalism and Ethical Risk

AI-supported journalism is a socio-technical practice rather than a purely technical innovation. The reliability of an output depends not only on the model but also on the source data, prompt, editorial context, user competence, organisational incentives, interface design, and time available for review. A technically capable system can therefore produce unethical outcomes when it is introduced into a workflow that rewards speed without verification or when users lack the authority to challenge its output. Conversely, a limited tool may be useful when its purpose is narrow, its data are controlled, and its outputs are independently reviewed.

Recent research identifies recurring risks. Shi and Sun (2024) describe how generative AI transforms content production while raising questions about accuracy, copyright, bias, and accountability. Interviews with journalists and experts by Gutiérrez-Caneda et al. (2024) highlight privacy, transparency, fairness, professional autonomy, and the need for regulation. Dierickx et al. (2024) emphasise that trustworthy journalism depends on the quality and governance of data, not merely on model performance, and call for stronger AI and data literacy among journalists. Hagendorff's (2024) scoping review shows that generative AI risk extends to hallucination, harmful content, security, privacy, discrimination, labour, and concentration of power.

Arabic-language studies identify parallel concerns. Seddar and Touati (2022) connect algorithmic practices with media credibility and journalistic legitimacy, particularly where programmed bias undermines fairness. Harfoush and Ramadan (2024) report concerns among journalists about deepfakes, fabricated news, intellectual-property infringement, and the effect of AI on media freedom. Motawea (2024) finds that institutional use of AI for fact-checking remains uneven and that technological tools do not overcome misinformation when professional awareness and legal implementation are weak. These findings demonstrate that the problem is not a shortage of ethical concerns but the absence of systematic institutional responses.

2.2 From Ethical Principles to Governance

AI ethics typically asks what values should guide design and use. Governance asks how authority, incentives, procedures, and evidence are organised so that those values shape practice. Papagiannidis et al. (2025) classify responsible AI governance practices as structural, relational, and procedural. Structural practices allocate roles, committees, resources, and accountability. Relational practices organise collaboration with internal and external stakeholders. Procedural practices govern the AI lifecycle, including design, procurement, testing, deployment, monitoring, audit, and retirement. This classification is valuable for journalism because editorial decisions cross professional, technical, legal, and commercial boundaries.

Porlezza and Schapals (2024) argue that AI ethics in journalism remains fragmented between academic debate and newsroom practice. A newsroom may issue an ethical guideline without defining what counts as substantial AI use, who must approve it, or what happens when the guideline is violated. Lassiter and Dalben (2026) therefore propose a risk-management approach in which guidance is proportionate to the likelihood and severity of harm. Risk-sensitive governance avoids both extremes: prohibiting every use regardless of context and allowing all uses under a generic requirement for human review.

For this study, values-based governance is defined as the systematic translation of normative commitments into four elements: designated responsibility, an operational procedure, auditable evidence, and periodic review. The approach is values-based because legal compliance is treated as a minimum rather than the full ethical standard. It is governance-oriented because it focuses on decision rights, organisational routines, monitoring, and redress.

2.3 Islamic Ethical Foundations

Islamic ethical reasoning provides a coherent basis for interpreting the values identified in the interviews. The Qur'anic command to verify consequential information (Qur'an 49:6) establishes *tabayyun* as a duty relevant to AI-generated claims. The requirement to speak in a sound and upright manner (Qur'an 33:70) connects accuracy with truthful representation and avoidance of deceptive synthesis. The command to return trusts to their rightful holders and judge with justice (Qur'an 4:58) supports *amanah* and accountable human decision-making. Justice must be maintained even where preferences or interests create pressure to depart from it (Qur'an 5:8). The prohibition on spying (Qur'an 49:12) and the affirmation of human dignity (Qur'an 17:70) provide a normative foundation for privacy, source protection, and restrictions on synthetic impersonation.

These principles can be integrated through *maqasid al-Shariah*. AI-supported media can affect the protection of intellect through information quality, the protection of dignity and honour through privacy and reputational safeguards, the protection of property through intellectual-property and data rights, and the protection of social welfare through a trustworthy information environment. A *maqasid* approach evaluates consequences as well as intentions: whether the system produces benefit, distributes risk fairly, and avoids preventable harm.

Raquib et al. (2022) propose a virtue-based Islamic ethics for AI that links technical design to moral character and social responsibility. Elmahjub (2023) argues for plural ethical benchmarking in which Islamic values contribute to global AI governance without being reduced to a decorative cultural supplement. Yunos and Hamdan (2025) show that Islamic principles of justice, beneficence, privacy, and transparency can guide the management of AI risk, while Mat Jubri Shamsuddin et al. (2025) develop jurisprudential guidance for digital content creation. In media studies, Khallaf (2024) identifies verification, source attribution, privacy, and protection of the public interest as Qur'anic principles of ethical media work. Together, these studies support an approach in which Islamic ethics is translated into governance criteria rather than presented as an abstract moral preface.

2.4 Jordanian Policy Context

Jordan has established several relevant national instruments. The National Charter for AI Ethics articulates values derived from human, religious, and social principles and emphasises fairness, transparency, privacy, accountability, safety, and the prevention of monopolistic or harmful uses (MoDEE, 2022). The Jordan Artificial Intelligence Strategy 2023-2027 links AI adoption with capacity building, research and development, entrepreneurship, and a legislative environment that supports safe use (MoDEE, 2023). The Personal Data Protection Law No. 24 of 2023 provides a legal framework for processing personal data and protecting data-subject rights (Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, 2023).

These instruments provide a national normative and legal foundation, but media-specific implementation remains necessary. Journalistic work involves confidential sources, unpublished documents, rapid publication, public-interest exceptions, reputational harm, and the editorial use of images and audio. A sector-specific governance framework is therefore needed to connect national commitments with newsroom roles and decisions.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design and Data Provenance

This article uses a qualitative secondary-analysis design based on interview material originally collected for an unpublished doctoral dissertation on AI ethics and digital transformation in Jordanian media (Author, 2024). The original doctoral inquiry was broader: it examined AI uses and professional standards, privacy and data protection, the role of international charters, and the development of an ethical framework. The present article was developed around a subsequent, narrower research question concerned specifically with values-based institutional governance. No new participants, interviews, or field data were added.

The secondary analysis was therefore not a republication of the doctoral findings under a new title. It asked a different question of the existing dataset. The unit of reanalysis was the governance-relevant coded segment together with sufficient surrounding transcript context to preserve meaning. The researcher did not undertake a *de novo* line-by-line recoding of every complete transcript. Instead, all previously coded material relevant to credibility, transparency, privacy, justice, professional responsibility, regulation, training, monitoring, and adaptation of international charters was retrieved across the eleven interviews, reread in context, compared across professional domains, and reorganised around institutional responsibility, process, evidence, review, and learning.

3.2 Participants and Data Collection

The dataset comprised eleven purposively selected experts with professional experience relevant to Jordanian media and AI governance. Their backgrounds included journalism and newsroom leadership, media education and research, AI and digital transformation, law and public policy, professional associations, civil society, and international advisory work. Several participants held more than one relevant role. This diversity enabled comparison among editorial, technical, legal, educational, and public-interest perspectives without treating any single professional domain as representative of the whole sector.

The original semi-structured and in-depth interviews were conducted between April and August 2024. Interviews were conducted face to face or, where required, through electronic communication, lasted approximately 50-70 minutes, and were audio-recorded with participant consent. The recordings were transcribed and subsequently coded in MAXQDA 2024. In the present article, participants are anonymised as P1-P11; broad professional-domain descriptors are added to selected quotations solely to make cross-domain evidence visible to the reader.

Participant domain	Relevant expertise	Contribution to this analysis
Journalism and media leadership	News production, editorial decision-making, professional associations, media freedom	Editorial risk, credibility, human oversight and public trust
Media education and research	Journalism education, ethics, curriculum and professional training	AI literacy, institutional culture and capacity building
AI and digital transformation	AI systems, data, algorithmic ethics and organisational transformation	Data quality, bias, transparency, technical monitoring and system limitations
Law, policy and civil society	Digital regulation, data protection, rights and public-interest advocacy	Legal accountability, privacy, redress and local policy alignment

Table 1: *Participant domains and their analytical contribution*

3.3 Data Analysis

The original interview material had been coded by the researcher in MAXQDA 2024. The code system included credibility, transparency, privacy and personal-data protection, justice and representation, professional responsibility, technical and legal challenges, verification, security, non-bias, gender balance, digital innovation, international charters, training, and monitoring. For this article, the researcher conducted a directed secondary thematic analysis focused on the narrower governance question. All eleven participants contributed material to the reanalysis.

The secondary analysis proceeded in five stages. First, governance-relevant coded segments were retrieved across the eleven interviews and reread with their surrounding transcript passages and associated analytical notes where available; this step was used to avoid decontextualising short coded extracts. Second, the material was organised around four analytical questions: Which value or professional concern is at stake? What institutional risk threatens it? Where do participants locate responsibility? What forms of institutional action, monitoring, or learning do they discuss? Third, patterns were compared across professional domains so that convergent and role-specific perspectives could be distinguished. Fourth, candidate themes were checked against divergent material, including the view that enforceable law may be more effective than voluntary ethical charters. Fifth, only after the empirical themes were stabilised were they interpreted through Islamic ethics and existing AI-governance scholarship to develop the contextualised framework presented in Sections 5 and 6.

The analysis was interpretive rather than statistical. Code frequencies reported in the doctoral project were used only as an orienting aid and were not treated as estimates of prevalence in Jordanian media. The analytical boundary was deliberately maintained: Section 4 reports what the experts said and the empirical patterns identified in their accounts; Section 5 provides the authors' interpretation in relation to Islamic ethics and existing scholarship; and Section 6 presents the authors' governance synthesis and recommendations. Quotations were translated from Arabic into English, with semantic fidelity prioritised over literal word order.

3.4 Trustworthiness and Research Ethics

Trustworthiness was supported by the documented interview guide, audio recording and transcription, systematic MAXQDA coding in the original study, comparison across professional groups, analytical notes, peer review of the broader doctoral study, and review of divergent views. For the present secondary analysis, an audit trail was maintained between each empirical theme, the underlying coded passages, the professional domains represented in the evidence, and the later interpretive claims. The separation of empirical results from Islamic-ethical interpretation and governance recommendations was used as an additional transparency

safeguard.

The original doctoral study was conducted under the research-ethics procedures applicable to the degree-granting institution. Participants provided consent for recording, analysis, and scholarly reporting. The present article uses deidentified evidence, introduces no new participants, and makes no empirical claims beyond the original dataset. The institutional ethics-approval reference is being verified separately and will be supplied to the journal when confirmed.

4.0 RESULTS

The secondary analysis produced five empirical themes. In this section, the themes are reported as patterns in the interview material only. Islamic ethical interpretation, comparison with AI-governance scholarship, and the authors' institutional recommendations are intentionally deferred to Sections 5 and 6.

4.1 Credibility and Verification

Across professional domains, participants treated factual credibility as the primary condition for legitimate AI use in media. They associated risk not only with explicitly false information but also with fabricated sources, synthetic images presented as real, incomplete context, and fluent text that appears authoritative despite being inaccurate. A civil-society and media-freedom participant argued that AI should be subject to "the same professional yardstick as professional media" and should not generate or reproduce unreal images or texts "as if they were facts" (P2, civil society/media freedom).

The same concern appeared in a media-academic account of human review. One participant explained that AI is "for assistance in the work, not a substitute for journalistic and media work" and described reviewing AI-generated text in the manner of an editor-in-chief reviewing an editor (P8, media academic/practitioner). From a technical-ethics perspective, another participant warned that AI can "distort facts and direct news in a way that serves particular interests" if its use is not ethically constrained (P4, AI ethics/technical expertise).

Taken together, these accounts show that participants understood credibility as a process rather than a property of the final text alone. Verification, source reliability, contextual completeness, and continuing human editorial judgement were recurring features of their descriptions. The interview evidence also indicates that concern increases when AI output reaches the public directly or concerns politically, socially, or reputationally consequential information.

4.2 Human Responsibility and Institutional Accountability

Participants repeatedly resisted the idea that responsibility could be transferred to an automated system. A media-education participant stated that "there must be a party responsible for the design and use of these applications" and linked responsibility to guidance and monitoring rather than to the technology alone (P3, media education/research). A legal and digital-policy participant similarly emphasised that media organisations should clarify roles and responsibilities and that individuals and institutions involved in AI should remain accountable for harms arising from its use (P10, law/digital policy).

The interviews also contained a meaningful divergence concerning the relative force of ethics and law. A journalists' association representative argued that previous professional charters had not been sufficient to control the media field and maintained that updated laws would be more effective for AI-related conduct (P9, journalism/professional association). This view did not negate ethical responsibility, but it challenged any assumption that voluntary principles alone would be self-enforcing.

The empirical pattern is therefore not simply a preference for more rules. Participants located accountability in identifiable human and institutional actors and debated the mechanisms through which that accountability should become effective. Their accounts referred to responsibility for design and use, internal monitoring, legal enforceability, correction of harmful outcomes, and the need for institutions to remain answerable even when technologies are supplied by external vendors.

4.3 Justice, Representation and Non-Bias

Justice was discussed primarily through representation and the quality of data. An AI and digital-transformation adviser argued that the data used by AI should represent "all sectors of society" - including people from different regions and social positions - because biased data become a source of biased decisions (P6, AI/digital-transformation advisory). The same participant connected fairness to whether people from different parts of

Jordan can recognise themselves in media representation rather than being systematically omitted.

A media-education participant similarly argued that AI models should be fair and free of gender, racial, and social discrimination and should be trained on diverse data to reduce unintended bias (P3, media education/research). A journalism representative added that credibility in Jordanian media should be accompanied by gender balance and by respect for the distinctive professional and ethical constraints of the local media environment (P9, journalism/professional association).

These accounts indicate that participants did not treat non-bias as a claim that an automated system is neutral by default. Fairness was linked to who is present in the data, whose experience is visible in the output, whether groups are represented comprehensively, and whether the resulting media account reproduces exclusion or distortion. The theme is therefore empirical evidence about representational justice; the operational mechanisms for assessing bias are developed later as part of the authors' governance synthesis.

4.4 Privacy and Data Protection

Privacy was one of the most recurrent concerns in the interview material. A government digital-policy adviser described privacy, confidentiality, and reliability as basic requirements and argued that AI-supported media outputs require an "audit [or] governance layer" able to classify what may and may not be published (P5, digital policy/government). An international AI adviser warned that some applications "may collect more data than is required", creating a direct privacy risk (P7, international AI advisory).

Participants also discussed privacy before the point of publication. A broadcast and media-education participant stated that institutions need policies defining the purposes for which intelligent applications are used and that users should be told how their personal data are collected and used (P11, broadcast/media education). Other interview material referred to encryption, keeping sensitive data inside institutional systems, staff training, and the risk of leakage when data are transferred outside organisational control.

The empirical theme therefore extends beyond conventional confidentiality. Participants connected privacy with purpose limitation, transparency in collection and use, organisational control over data, security, and the protection of individuals from excessive or unauthorised processing. Concerns about synthetic identity and reputational harm appeared elsewhere in the interviews, but the present theme is reported here as a data-protection pattern; its connection to human dignity is made explicitly in the Islamic-ethical discussion.

4.5 Local Adaptation and Continuous Institutional Learning

Participants generally regarded international AI principles and charters as useful reference points, while rejecting mechanical transplantation into the Jordanian media environment. A civil-society/media-freedom participant stated that international charters "open horizons for us, but we must adapt them to our culture and values in Jordan" (P2). An AI/technical participant similarly argued that global experience should be used selectively and applied "in a way that suits the Jordanian context" (P4, AI ethics/technical expertise).

Adaptation was also described as a continuing institutional process. A media-education participant identified training, continuous evaluation, analytical studies, and communication between local and international actors as practical steps for assessing whether global charters fit Jordanian media practice (P3, media education/research). A journalism representative proposed a committee of specialists in law and technology to examine what is compatible with Jordanian legislation and "take what suits our society and our Jordanian media field" (P9, journalism/professional association).

The fifth theme is therefore local adaptation combined with organisational learning, not harm prevention as a separate empirical category. Harm prevention and public benefit enter the article later as normative criteria derived from Islamic ethical reasoning and existing governance scholarship. The interview evidence itself supports recurring review, training, consultation, and context-sensitive interpretation of external standards as the empirical pattern.

Empirical theme	Participant emphasis	Representative professional domains	Analytical status in this article
Credibility and verification	Accuracy, source reliability, contextual completeness, non-deception, continuing human editorial review	Civil society/media freedom; media academic/practitioner; AI ethics/technical	Empirical theme; Islamic and governance interpretation follows in Section 5
Human responsibility and institutional accountability	Identifiable responsible actors, monitoring, legal enforceability, answerability for harmful outcomes	Media education; law/digital policy; journalism/professional association	Empirical theme, including a divergent law-versus-charter perspective
Justice, representation and non-bias	Representative data, fair visibility of social groups and regions, gender/social bias, completeness of representation	AI/digital-transformation advisory; media education; journalism/professional association	Empirical theme; operational bias controls are authors' synthesis in Section 6
Privacy and data protection	Purpose limitation, confidentiality, transparent collection/use, organisational control, security, prevention of excessive processing	Digital policy/government; international AI advisory; broadcast/media education	Empirical theme; dignity is added as an Islamic-ethical interpretation in Section 5
Local adaptation and continuous institutional learning	Context-sensitive use of international charters, recurring training, evaluation, consultation, legal-cultural fit	Civil society/media freedom; media education; journalism/professional association; AI ethics/technical	Fifth empirical theme; harm prevention/public benefit is not an empirical theme

Table 2: Empirical themes and cross-domain evidence in the secondary analysis

5.0 DISCUSSION

5.1 Analytical Separation and Empirical Contribution

The five themes reported in Section 4 are empirical patterns derived from the interview material: credibility and verification; human responsibility and institutional accountability; justice, representation and non-bias; privacy and data protection; and local adaptation with continuous institutional learning. They should not be read as a ready-made governance model. The contribution of the empirical analysis is to show how different professional domains in Jordan describe the problems that governance must address, including a divergent view that law may be more effective than voluntary charters.

The movement from those themes to governance controls is an authorial interpretation undertaken after the empirical analysis. This distinction matters because some proposed controls - such as formal impact assessment, AI registers, vendor clauses, or structured redress processes - are not direct quotations from participants. They are analytical translations informed jointly by the participant evidence, Islamic ethical principles, and existing governance scholarship. The article therefore avoids presenting the experts as having endorsed every element of the later framework.

5.2 Islamic Ethical Interpretation

Islamic ethics provides a normative vocabulary for interpreting the empirical concerns without replacing the

participants' own language. The credibility theme resonates with *tabayyun*, the duty to verify consequential information (Qur'an 49:6), and with *sidq* and sound speech (Qur'an 33:70). Human responsibility can be read through *amanah* and the obligation not to follow that of which one has no knowledge (Qur'an 4:58; 17:36). Concerns about bias and incomplete representation resonate with *adl* and equitable treatment (Qur'an 5:8), while privacy concerns are reinforced by the prohibition of spying and the protection of human dignity (Qur'an 49:12; 17:70). At this interpretive stage, *maqasid al-Shariah*, *maslahah*, and the prevention of *mafsadah* add a cross-cutting question that was not treated as a separate empirical theme: whether an AI use is likely to produce avoidable harm or undermine the public good.

5.3 Relationship to Existing AI-Governance Scholarship

The proposed framework builds on, rather than replaces or claims to originate, established AI-governance ideas. Structural, relational, and procedural governance practices are already well developed in the literature (Papagiannidis et al., 2025), while journalism scholarship has emphasised newsroom guidance, data governance, human oversight, risk proportionality, and the gap between principles and implementation (Dierickx et al., 2024; Porlezza & Schapals, 2024; Lassiter & Dalben, 2026). International instruments likewise foreground accountability, transparency, privacy, fairness, safety, and human oversight (UNESCO, 2021; OECD, 2024; Council of Europe, 2024). What the present study adds is contextual integration: it uses Jordanian expert evidence to identify locally salient institutional problems, interprets them through an Islamic ethical lens, and organises established governance mechanisms into a media-specific framework that is sensitive to Jordanian law, professional practice, and institutional capacity.

6.0 Proposed Values-Based Governance Framework

The framework below is an authors' synthesis, not a sixth empirical finding and not a claim to have invented the constituent governance mechanisms. It combines three sources: (1) the five empirical themes reported in Section 4; (2) Islamic ethical interpretation developed in Section 5.2; and (3) established AI-governance and journalism scholarship discussed in Section 5.3. Its purpose is to contextualise and operationalise these existing ideas for Jordanian media institutions across the AI lifecycle. The four layers are mutually reinforcing: normative values guide purpose, professional safeguards govern editorial practice, organisational structures allocate responsibility and resources, and the legal-societal environment supplies rights, oversight, and public participation.

6.1 Layer One: Normative Values

The normative layer consists of five governance values: (a) truthfulness and verification; (b) *amanah* and human accountability; (c) justice and non-discrimination; (d) privacy and human dignity; and (e) harm prevention and public benefit. The first four are directly connected to empirical themes identified in Section 4 and then interpreted through Islamic ethics. The fifth - harm prevention and public benefit - is explicitly a cross-cutting normative criterion derived from *maqasid*-oriented reasoning and the wider governance literature, not a fifth empirical interview theme. Every proposed AI use should therefore be assessed both for compliance with the empirical concerns identified by participants and for foreseeable wider harms or benefits.

6.2 Layer Two: Professional and Editorial Safeguards

- Risk classification. Uses should be classified as low, medium, or high risk according to subject matter, potential reach, reversibility, sensitivity of data, and harm to rights or reputation.
- Meaningful human approval. AI-supported news output should not be published without review by a competent person with authority to reject it. Fully automated publication should be prohibited for high-risk content.
- Verification and provenance. Factual claims, quotations, images, and source references generated or transformed by AI should be independently checked and documented.
- Disclosure. Audiences should be informed when AI has played a material role in generating or altering content whose synthetic nature could affect interpretation. Disclosure should be clear, proportionate, and accessible.
- Correction and redress. Institutions should maintain a visible correction process for AI-related errors, record the incident, notify affected persons where appropriate, and modify the workflow to prevent recurrence.
- Protection of sources and rights. Confidential data, unpublished investigations, and sensitive personal information should not be entered into unapproved public tools. Copyright, consent, and identity rights should be checked before publication.

6.3 Layer Three: Organisational Governance

- Written policy. The institution should define permitted, restricted, and prohibited uses; disclosure rules; data restrictions; risk levels; and incident procedures.

- Clear roles. Each use case should have an editorial owner, a technical or procurement owner, a data-protection reviewer where applicable, and senior-management accountability for risk acceptance.
- AI register. The organisation should maintain a register of tools, versions, vendors, purposes, data categories, responsible owners, assessments, incidents, and retirement decisions.
- Multidisciplinary governance function. A committee or designated function should include editorial, technical, legal, data-protection, training, and ethics expertise. For sensitive matters, external or Islamic-ethics expertise may be consulted.
- Impact assessment and audit. High-risk uses should undergo a documented assessment of accuracy, bias, privacy, security, intellectual property, labour effects, and public interest before deployment and at regular intervals.
- Vendor governance. Contracts should address confidentiality, data retention and reuse, model changes, security incidents, documentation, audit rights, and exit arrangements.
- Competence and protected challenge. Training should be mandatory and role-specific. Staff should be able to question or refuse unsafe use without retaliation.

6.4 Layer Four: Legal and Societal Alignment

Institutional policy should be aligned with Jordan's data-protection law, the National Charter for AI Ethics, media law, intellectual-property rules, and relevant international obligations. Sector-wide guidance should be developed through collaboration among the Ministry of Digital Economy and Entrepreneurship, the media regulator, the Jordan Press Association, universities, civil-society organisations, and media institutions. Public complaint channels and periodic transparency reporting can improve accountability, while AI and media literacy can help audiences understand labels, identify manipulation, and exercise their rights.

6.5 Lifecycle Application

Lifecycle stage	Required decisions	Minimum evidence	Escalation trigger
Before approval	Define purpose; classify risk; assess vendor, data and rights; assign owner	Use-case record; impact assessment; legal/data review; approval decision	Sensitive data, high public impact, synthetic identity, unclear vendor practices
During use	Restrict access; monitor performance; verify output; document human decisions	Activity log; review checklist; test results; version record	Repeated errors, bias indicators, security issue, model or policy change
Before publication	Check facts, context, rights and disclosure; obtain editorial approval	Source record; disclosure decision; named approver	Irreversible harm, vulnerable person, political/health/security claim, disputed evidence
After publication	Monitor complaints; correct; analyse incidents; notify affected parties; update controls	Correction log; incident report; remediation and learning record	Serious harm, data exposure, systemic error, regulatory complaint
Periodic review or retirement	Reassess benefit, risk, cost, vendor and alternatives; retire unsafe or unnecessary systems	Audit report; renewed approval or retirement decision	Risk exceeds benefit, controls ineffective, vendor opacity, safer alternative available

Table 3: Operational application across the AI lifecycle

7.0 IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

For media organisations, the framework provides a basis for AI policy, procurement checklists, editorial review, training, and incident response. Small organisations may not be able to establish a large committee, but proportionality should affect the form rather than eliminate the function. A smaller institution can designate responsible persons, use a shared sectoral checklist, restrict high-risk tools, and document decisions.

For policymakers and professional bodies, the results support a Jordanian sectoral guide for AI in media. Such a guide should translate the national charter and data-protection law into media-specific scenarios: source confidentiality, synthetic content, automated moderation, recommendation, personalised advertising,

archive use, and deepfakes. It should also provide a standard impact-assessment template and minimum disclosure language.

For universities and training providers, AI literacy should be integrated with journalism ethics rather than taught as a separate technical skill. Training should include verification of generated claims, data protection, model limitations, bias, copyright, synthetic-media identification, and the ethical reasoning needed to balance innovation and harm.

For future research, the proposed framework should be tested through case studies in newsrooms of different sizes and ownership structures. Researchers should examine actual policies, observe AI-supported workflows, audit selected tools, and evaluate how audiences understand disclosure. Comparative studies across Arab and Muslim-majority media systems would clarify which governance elements are context-specific and which are transferable.

8.0 LIMITATIONS

The study reanalyses data collected for a broader doctoral project and therefore inherits the boundaries of the original interview guide and 2024 fieldwork. The secondary analysis did not conduct a fresh line-by-line recoding of every complete transcript; it systematically re-examined all governance-relevant coded segments across the eleven interviews together with their surrounding transcript context and analytical notes. This approach is appropriate for the narrower secondary question but may not capture material that was never coded as relevant in the original project. The expert sample provides depth and cross-domain diversity but does not support statistical generalisation to all Jordanian media institutions. The proposed governance framework also requires testing through organisational case studies, policy audits, and observation of actual AI-supported newsroom workflows.

9.0 CONCLUSION

The secondary analysis identifies five empirical concerns that structure expert thinking about responsible AI in Jordanian media: credibility and verification; human responsibility and institutional accountability; justice, representation and non-bias; privacy and data protection; and local adaptation with continuous institutional learning. These findings show where institutional governance is needed, but they do not by themselves constitute the governance framework.

The Islamic ethical analysis subsequently interprets those concerns through *tabayyun*, *sidq*, *amanah*, *adl*, privacy, dignity, *maqasid*, and *maslahah*. This ethical lens strengthens rather than replaces contemporary governance standards. It gives locally intelligible normative reasons for verification, non-transferable human responsibility, fair representation, protection of data and identity, and attention to public consequences.

The article's contribution is therefore contextual rather than a claim of wholly novel governance concepts. It builds on established AI-governance ideas and organises them around evidence from Jordanian media experts and Islamic ethical reasoning. The resulting framework makes explicit how values can be connected to authority, procedure, evidence, monitoring, learning, and redress in a Muslim-majority media context.

Acknowledgements

Acknowledgements are omitted from the blind manuscript and will be restored after peer review if required.

Author Contributions

S.R.A.A.: Conceptualisation, methodology, investigation, data curation, formal analysis, and writing—original draft. F.B.H.: Supervision, methodology, validation, and writing—review and editing. I.A.R.A.: Supervision, validation, and writing—review and editing. All authors must approve the submitted version and agree to be accountable for the work.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflict of Interest

Fauziah Binti Hassan serves as Managing Editor of *Ulum Islamiyyah*. In accordance with the journal's publication ethics policy, she will take no part in initial screening, reviewer selection, peer review, editorial correspondence, or decision-making for this manuscript. The manuscript should be handled independently by the Editor-in-Chief or another editor without a conflict. The other authors declare no conflict of interest.

Use of Artificial Intelligence Tools

Generative AI tools were used only for English-language refinement, structural editing, and document formatting. No AI system was used to generate, modify, or analyse the original interview data. The authors retain full responsibility for the manuscript, its references, interpretations, and conclusions.

References

- Author. (2024). Details omitted for double-blind review [Unpublished doctoral dissertation].
- Council of Europe. (2024). Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law (CETS No. 225). <https://www.coe.int/en/web/artificial-intelligence/the-framework-convention-on-artificial-intelligence>
- Dierickx, L., Opdahl, A. L., Khan, S. A., Lindén, C.-G., & Guerrero Rojas, D. C. (2024). A data-centric approach for ethical and trustworthy AI in journalism. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 26, Article 64. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-024-09801-6>
- Elmahjub, E. (2023). Artificial intelligence (AI) in Islamic ethics: Towards pluralist ethical benchmarking for AI. *Philosophy & Technology*, 36, Article 73. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-023-00668-x>
- European Parliament and Council of the European Union. (2024). Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence. Official Journal of the European Union.
- Gutiérrez-Caneda, B., Lindén, C.-G., & Vázquez-Herrero, J. (2024). Ethics and journalistic challenges in the age of artificial intelligence: Talking with professionals and experts. *Frontiers in Communication*, 9, Article 1465178. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2024.1465178>
- Hagendorff, T. (2024). Mapping the ethics of generative AI: A comprehensive scoping review. *Minds and Machines*, 34, Article 39. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-024-09694-w>
- Harfoush, F. A. I., & Ramadan, A. A. (2024). Journalists' attitudes towards ethical challenges in the use of artificial-intelligence technologies and their implications for media freedom [Article in Arabic]. *Al-Zahraa Journal*, 34(2), 7335-7370. <https://doi.org/10.21608/zjac.2024.424242>
- Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. (2023). Personal Data Protection Law No. 24 of 2023. Official Gazette.
- Helberger, N., & Diakopoulos, N. (2023). The European AI Act and how it matters for research into AI in media and journalism. *Digital Journalism*, 11(9), 1751-1760. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2022.2082505>
- Khallaf, D. (2024). Ethical principles of media work in the Holy Qur'an [Article in Arabic]. *Afaq Journal for Research and Studies*, 7(2), 545-559.
- Lassiter, T., & Dalben, S. (2026). AI governance in journalism: A risk management approach for guidance on the use of generative AI. *Journal of Media Ethics*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23736992.2026.2658050>
- Mat Jubri Shamsuddin, M., Md Sawari, M. F., & Karim, F. (2025). Islamic guidelines for content creators: A jurisprudential framework. *Ulum Islamiyyah*, 37(3), 46-63. <https://doi.org/10.33102/uij.vol37no03.720>
- Ministry of Digital Economy and Entrepreneurship. (2022). National Charter for AI Ethics. Government of Jordan.
- Ministry of Digital Economy and Entrepreneurship. (2023). Jordan Artificial Intelligence Strategy and Implementation Plan 2023-2027. Government of Jordan.
- Motawea, N. A. (2024). Journalistic practices of news institutions in fact-checking under artificial-intelligence technologies: A study within the framework of hacktology theory [Article in Arabic]. *Journal of Media Research*, 72(1), 463-596. <https://doi.org/10.21608/jsb.2024.306209.1779>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2024). OECD AI Principles. <https://oecd.ai/en/ai-principles>
- Papagiannidis, E., Mikalef, P., & Conboy, K. (2025). Responsible artificial intelligence governance: A review and research framework. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 34(2), Article 101885. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2024.101885>
- Porlezza, C., & Schapals, A. K. (2024). AI ethics in journalism (studies): An evolving field between research and practice. *Emerging Media*, 2(3), 356-370. <https://doi.org/10.1177/27523543241288818>
- Raquib, A., Channa, B., Zubair, T., & Qadir, J. (2022). Islamic virtue-based ethics for artificial intelligence. *Discover Artificial Intelligence*, 2, Article 11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44163-022-00028-2>
- Reporters Without Borders. (2023). Paris Charter on AI and Journalism. <https://rsf.org/en/paris-charter-ai-and-journalism>
- Seddar, R., & Touati, N. (2022). Media credibility, artificial intelligence and the legitimacy of journalism [Article in Arabic]. *Journal of Social and Human Sciences*, 12(1), 360-383.
- Shi, Y., & Sun, L. (2024). How generative AI is transforming journalism: Development, application and ethics. *Journalism and Media*, 5(2), 582-594. <https://doi.org/10.3390/journalmedia5020039>
- UNESCO. (2021). Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000381137>

Yunos, A. S., & Hamdan, M. N. (2025). Managing the ethical implications of artificial intelligence in healthcare: An analysis from Islamic perspectives. *Ulum Islamiyyah*, 37(2), 20-27. <https://doi.org/10.33102/uij.vol37no02.639>