IGNATIAN
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH
www.icceph.com
ISSN 2984-9942

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN CAMPUS JOURNALISM: SCHOOL PAPER ADVISERS' CHALLENGES TO JOURNALISTIC INTEGRITY

Romel L. Tapalgo Jr. [1], Flora D. Canare [2]

[1] Mariveles National High School-Batangas II, Mariveles, Bataan, Philippines
[2] Graduate School, Bataan Peninsula State University-Main Campus, Balanga City, Bataan, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study examined the challenges faced by the secondary school paper advisers (SPAs) in the Schools Division of Bataan in integrating artificial intelligence (AI) into campus journalism while upholding journalistic integrity. Specifically, it assessed challenges related to truthfulness, fairness, originality, ethical reporting, and writers' credibility. The study employed a convergent parallel mixed-methods design and purposive sampling. Quantitative data were gathered through survey questionnaires, while qualitative data were collected through semi-structured interviews. Descriptive and comparative analyses revealed that SPAs extensively experienced challenges in upholding journalistic integrity. No significant differences were found in truthfulness, ethical reporting, and writers' credibility when advisers were grouped according to profile variables, indicating that they shared similar AI-related concerns. However, significant differences emerged in fairness and originality according to SPAs' length of experience, suggesting that professional experience influenced their perceptions of these challenges. Descriptive qualitative findings revealed concerns involving AI dependence, diminished student ownership and critical thinking, misinformation, weak accountability, and policy gaps. To address these concerns, SPAs promoted responsible AI use, reinforced accuracy and integrity, strengthened accountability, and advocated for policies and training. The integrated findings underscore the need for guidelines, sustained AI literacy training, close editorial supervision, and transparent disclosure of AI use. The proposed guidelines aim to balance technological innovation with strengthened adviser monitoring, ensuring that AI supports rather than replaces student journalists' independent thinking, creativity, authorship, and editorial judgment while safeguarding journalistic integrity and maintaining writers' credibility in campus journalism.

Keywords: *artificial intelligence, campus journalism, school paper advisers, journalistic integrity, writers' credibility, guidelines*

INTRODUCTION

The growing use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has significantly transformed journalism, reshaping how news is gathered, written, and distributed. In recent years, AI-powered tools have become increasingly accessible to journalists to enhance writing efficiency in terms of content generation, headline creation, fact-checking, and transcription. While technologies continue to evolve, they also improve productivity in newsroom operations. In campus journalism, these AI-powered tools are now being explored for their potential to help student journalists with writing tasks and editorial processes. Despite the opportunities that AI offers, its rapid use also raises concerns about journalistic integrity, such as bias, originality, truthfulness, and accountability. These journalistic values are challenged as news writers continue to integrate Artificial Intelligence into student publications.

Studies show that AI use has presented both advantages and disadvantages in journalism. AI can assist journalists with organizing information and enhancing news production. However, these benefits can compromise journalistic integrity when generated content lacks contextual understanding and editorial oversight. Issues such as transparency, data privacy, algorithmic bias, authorship, and accountability are at risk due to the use of AI in journalism (Gutiérrez-Caneda et al., 2024). These concerns suggest that although AI can improve the efficiency of journalistic work, safeguarding journalistic integrity requires continuous human intervention and adherence to ethical standards throughout the news production process.

The quality of information that AI produces relies on the origin from which those outputs were generated. It has been argued that quality data in journalism when AI is used must remain ethical and trustworthy and must be grounded in journalistic principles of accuracy, fairness, and transparency (Dierickx et al., 2024). AI-generated outputs may sound convincing and reliable, but when verified, they can be incomplete, biased, misleading, or inaccurate when the data used are poor. In campus journalism, where student journalists start building up their writing skills and confidence, these errors caused by AI, if unsupervised, can damage the credibility of the writer and the public trust in the information being communicated. Consequently, AI should serve as an extension of human capabilities instead of replacing human editorial judgment.

While AI-powered tools may compromise journalistic integrity and data quality, they may also be used to improve grammar, create headlines, edit articles, and develop multimedia content. The ability of AI has been recognized to enhance content creation and student reporting. However, they also highlighted that campus journalism also needs AI literacy, ethical guidelines, and responsible integration (Dalan & Enciso, 2023). Without clear ethical guidelines on AI use, the journalistic skills of the students may not fully develop as a result of excessive reliance on AI. Therefore, student journalists should

independently equip themselves with necessary journalistic skills such as fact-checking, authorship, and ethical decision-making despite access to AI.

Recognizing the increasing influence of AI in education, the Department of Education issued DepEd Order No. 003, s. 2026, titled "Foundational Guidelines on Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Basic Education," which sheds light on how teachers and students can utilize AI in the learning environment. Teachers may use AI to support teaching and learning, assessment, and school operations. Likewise, students may employ AI to support learning, such as information generation, writing improvement, and idea organization. The guidelines emphasize that teachers and students should not allow AI to replace human judgment and that AI must be guided by ethical, transparent, safe, and human-centered principles (DepEd, 2026). While these guidelines provide foundational guidance on the use of AI in education, they do not specifically address how AI will be used in campus journalism.

Despite the growing body of international and local literature on artificial intelligence in journalism, a clear research gap persists in the context of campus journalism, particularly at the local level. Most existing studies have focused on professional journalism, technological efficiency, or students' experiences with AI. However, limited attention has been given to the ethical and supervisory roles of secondary school paper advisers in addressing AI-related challenges in campus journalism. In the Philippine setting, empirical research examining the experiences of school paper advisers and the challenges they face in upholding journalistic integrity remains limited, particularly in the province of Bataan. This gap underscores the need to investigate the challenges experienced by secondary school paper advisers in safeguarding truthfulness, fairness, originality, ethical reporting, and student writers' credibility amid the integration of AI into campus journalism.

In response to this gap, the study examined the challenges that the school paper advisers experienced in upholding journalistic integrity amid AI integration in campus journalism. The findings served as the basis for developing guidelines that may inform training programs, school policies, and ethical practices for responsible AI use. These guidelines are intended to help advisers mentor student journalists in verifying information, preventing plagiarism, preserving originality, and maintaining accountability and writers' credibility.

Research Questions

This study aimed to examine the challenges faced by the secondary school paper advisers in the Schools Division of Bataan in integrating Artificial Intelligence into student publications while upholding journalistic integrity.

Specifically, it sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the secondary school paper advisers in terms of:
    1.1 age;

1.2 sex;
1.3 educational attainment;
1.4 length of service/experience as a school paper adviser; and
1.5 number of seminars and training attended in campus journalism?

2. What are the secondary school paper advisers' challenges of AI integration in campus journalism to journalistic integrity in terms of:
2.1 truthfulness;
2.2 fairness;
2.3 originality;
2.4 ethical reporting; and
2.5 writers' credibility:
2.5.1 student accountability
2.5.2 authorship recognition;
2.5.3 accuracy; and
2.5.4 professional reliability?

3. Is there a significant difference in challenges to journalistic integrity associated with AI when grouped according to their demographic profile?

4. How do the secondary school paper advisers describe the challenges of AI integration in campus journalism in relation to journalistic integrity?

5. What strategies and interventions do the secondary school paper advisers propose to address the challenges posed by AI use while upholding journalistic integrity?

6. Based on the findings of the study, what guidelines can be proposed for school paper advisers (SPA) to guide ethical AI use and uphold journalistic integrity in campus journalism?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study employed a convergent parallel mixed-methods design, in which quantitative and qualitative data were collected concurrently, analyzed independently, and integrated during the interpretation of the findings. Integrating quantitative and qualitative evidence allows the researcher to examine a problem from complementary perspectives while maintaining the methodological independence of each strand. For the quantitative phase, the study employed a descriptive-comparative research design. This design was used to measure the extent of challenges experienced by the school paper advisers when AI is integrated into student publications, as well as to determine whether their AI-related challenges differed significantly when they were grouped according to their demographic profile. For the qualitative phase, on the other hand, the study employed a qualitative descriptive research design. This design was utilized because the study sought direct descriptions of the challenges that the school paper advisers experienced amid AI integration in campus journalism. It also allowed the participants to share practical strategies and interventions for addressing AI-related concerns while upholding journalistic integrity and maintaining writers' credibility. With respect to

convergent parallel mixed-methods research design, convergence was established when the qualitative findings supported the quantitative results concerning the extent of AI-related challenges experienced by the school paper advisers.

Locale of the Study

This study was conducted in the Schools Division of Bataan, as it annually holds the Division Schools Press Conference (DSPC) to develop the journalistic skills and moral character of aspiring journalists. The division was selected because it has an active campus journalism program, and its school paper advisers have begun integrating artificial intelligence into student publications and are likewise facing challenges related to journalistic integrity and writers' credibility.

Respondents and Sampling Method

The respondents of the study were 38 secondary school paper advisers, who were selected through purposive sampling. The inclusion criteria for the respondents were established. School paper advisers must be currently teaching in public high schools in the Schools Division of Bataan for School Year 2026-2027. Also, they were officially designated as advisers of a school publication for at least 2 years. They were actively involved in mentoring student journalists in writing, editing, and publishing, particularly in contexts where digital or AI-assisted tools are used. Simultaneously, 10 school paper advisers underwent semi-structured interviews for the qualitative phase of the study. An informed consent form was obtained prior to the participation of the respondents in the study.

Research Instrument

For the quantitative phase, data were collected through the survey questionnaire composed of two parts:

Part 1. Demographic profile – items on age, sex, educational attainment, length of experience/service as SPA, and number of seminars attended related campus journalism.

Part 2. Perceived extent of challenges to journalistic integrity. It measured the challenges experienced by SPAs in relation to truthfulness, fairness, originality, ethical reporting, and writers' credibility when AI is integrated into student publications. The structured four-point Likert-scale questionnaire was contextualized and developed from relevant constructs, selected indicators, and empirical findings from previous studies by Peña-Alonso et al. (2025) titled *Journalists' Perceptions of Artificial Intelligence and Disinformation Risks*; Saatci (2025) titled *AI and Ethics: Scale Development for Measuring Ethical Perceptions of Artificial Intelligence Across Sectors and Countries*; and Florentino et al. (2026) titled *Artificial Intelligence for All? Brazilian Teachers on Ethics, Equity, and the Everyday Challenges of AI in Education*. They were modified to match the context of school paper advisers supervising AI-assisted campus journalism. Responses

were rated on a four-point Likert scale with the verbal interpretation of 1-strongly disagree; 2-disagree; 3-agree; and 4-strongly agree.

For the qualitative phase, data were gathered using semi-structured interview guide questions. The interview guide was contextualized from the inquiry areas and findings of previous studies of Gutiérrez-Caneda et al. (2024) titled *Ethics and Journalistic Challenges in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: Talking with Professionals and Experts*; and Alonso-Muñoz and Casero-Ripollés (2026) titled *Adoption of Generative AI in Higher Education: Perceptions of Journalism Students.* The inquiry areas from these studies were substantially modified to fit the context of campus journalism. The questions were contextualized around advisers' supervisory experiences, student use of AI, journalistic integrity, student writers' credibility, accountability, school policies, and proposed interventions.

Validity and Reliability

The research instruments were reviewed by experts with relevant professional backgrounds. They survey questionnaire was validated by three experts who have professional experience in the field of campus journalism. They assessed the clarity, relevance, practicality, language accuracy, and appropriateness for the intended respondents. Meanwhile, the semi-structured interview guide questions were validated by a psychometrician, who assessed the instrument's coherence, contextual appropriateness, language accuracy, and alignment with the research objectives. Feedback from the validators was incorporated, and revisions were made to improve clarity and eliminate ambiguity in the research instrument.

After expert validation, the instrument underwent pilot testing with English school paper advisers from the different Elementary schools within the Schools Division of Bataan, who were not part of the sample. The Cronbach's alpha for instrument reliability is 0.964, which is considered excellent. Pilot testing aimed at assessing the instrument's reliability, clarity of instructions, and relevance of the Likert-scale items, as well as the feasibility and appropriateness of the qualitative interview guide questions. The result of the pilot testing ensured that the final instrument was both valid and reliable for data collection among the targeted respondents in the Division of Bataan.

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher secured formal authorization prior to the data collection. It ensured that the conduct of the study complied with the division's administrative requirements and established research and ethical protocols. Upon approval of the request, an informed consent form was obtained from the prospective respondents. The consent form outlined the study's purpose, procedures, expected duration, possible benefits and risks, confidentiality measures, voluntary nature of participation, absence of monetary payment or remuneration, and participants' right to skip questions or withdraw from the study without facing any consequences. The quantitative phase was conducted by administering a survey questionnaire online through a Google Form. Meanwhile, the

qualitative phase was conducted concurrently with the quantitative phase using a semi-structured interview guide. The interviews were scheduled according to the participants' availability and were conducted either face-to-face or through an approved online meeting platform.

Data Analysis

The data collected through the survey questionnaire and semi-structured interview guide were analyzed systematically in accordance with the study's research objectives. Since the study employed a convergent parallel mixed-methods design, the quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed separately and subsequently integrated during the interpretation stage. The results from the two phases were merged to develop a comprehensive understanding of the challenges associated with artificial intelligence integration in high school campus journalism.

For the quantitative phase, data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics consistent with the descriptive-comparative research design. Frequency counts and percentages were used to describe the respondents according to age, sex, educational attainment, years of experience as school paper advisers, and number of relevant seminars or training programs attended. The mean and standard deviation were computed to determine the extent and variability of the challenges experienced by school paper advisers regarding AI integration.

Inferential statistics were used to determine whether significant differences existed in the school paper advisers' experiences of AI-related challenges when they were grouped according to their demographic profile. For variables with two independent groups, the Mann-Whitney U test was used. For variables with three or more independent groups, the Kruskal-Wallis H-test, a non-parametric test, was appropriately used since the data did not meet the assumptions for a one-way ANOVA. When the Kruskal-Wallis test produced a significant result, Dunn's post hoc comparison test was conducted to identify which specific groups differed significantly. All quantitative data were processed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences or SPSS, and the null hypotheses were tested at the 0.05 level of significance.

For the qualitative phase, the data were analyzed using thematic analysis with respect to the qualitative descriptive research design. This analysis was used to produce clear and organized descriptions of the challenges, experiences, perspectives, and proposed interventions of secondary school paper advisers regarding AI integration in campus journalism. With the participants' informed consent, the interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim to preserve the accuracy and completeness of their responses.

The interview transcripts were imported into MAXQDA and read repeatedly to familiarize the researchers with the data. Relevant statements were identified and assigned preliminary codes while remaining close to the participants' actual words and intended meanings. Similar codes were grouped into categories, which were

subsequently organized into broader themes representing the advisers' shared challenges, experiences, and proposed strategies. The codes, categories, and themes were repeatedly compared with the original interview transcripts to ensure that the findings accurately represented the participants' accounts and remained aligned with the qualitative research questions.

Consistent with the convergent parallel mixed-methods design, the quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed separately. The results from each phase were subsequently compared and integrated during the interpretation stage. Convergence was identified when the quantitative results and qualitative themes supported similar conclusions regarding the challenges of AI integration. This integrated analysis provided deeper insights that helped draw comprehensive conclusions regarding the challenges of AI integration on journalistic integrity. The findings were used to develop evidence-based recommendations and guidelines for the ethical use of AI in campus journalism within the Schools Division of Bataan.

Scope and Delimitations

The study was confined to public secondary schools in the Schools Division of Bataan. The division was selected because it has an active campus journalism program, and its schools have begun using digital technologies in student publications. Concentrating on this research locale allowed the study to provide a detailed and context-specific account of the challenges encountered by the school paper advisers. It also ensured that the findings and proposed guidelines were grounded in the conditions and experiences of public secondary school campus journalism within Bataan. Therefore, the findings specifically reflected the challenges and experiences of English school paper advisers in the public secondary schools and were not intended to represent all campus journalism advisers in the Philippines.

RESULTS

I. Quantitative Phase

The quantitative phase of the study employed a descriptive-comparative research design. It covered the respondents' demographic profile and the extent of the challenges to journalistic integrity when Artificial Intelligence is integrated into campus journalism. The comparative component determined whether significant differences existed in the extent of these challenges when respondents were grouped according to their demographic profile.

A. Profile of the Respondents

This section presents the profile of secondary school paper advisers in terms of age, sex, educational attainment, length of service/experience as a school paper adviser, and number of seminars and training attended in campus journalism.

Table 1 presents the profile of the secondary school paper advisers.

Table 1. Secondary School Paper Advisers Profile

Profile	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
20-30 years old	14	36.84
31-40 years old	18	47.37
41-50 years old	6	15.79
Sex		
Female	27	71.05
Male	11	28.95
Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	4	10.53
Units in Master's Degree	27	71.05
Master's Degree Holder	4	10.53
Units in Doctorate Degree	2	5.26
Doctorate Degree Holder	1	2.63
Length of service/experience as a school paper adviser		
1-5 years	22	57.89
6-10 years	11	28.95
11-15 years	5	13.16
Number of seminars and training attended in campus journalism		
1-5 seminars	23	60.53
6-10 seminars	6	15.79
11-15 seminars	3	7.89
None	6	15.79

Number of Cases = 38

B. School Paper Advisers' Challenges of AI Integration in Campus Journalism

This section shows the school paper advisers' challenges to journalistic integrity in terms of truthfulness, fairness, originality, ethical reporting, and writers' credibility in AI integration in Campus Journalism.

Table 2 presents the challenges to journalistic integrity in terms of truthfulness.

Table 2. Challenges to Journalistic Integrity in terms of Truthfulness

Indicators	Mean	SD	DI
1. AI-generated content sometimes contains unverifiable or inaccurate information.	3.42	0.60	Strongly Agree
2. Students depend on AI outputs without confirming factual correctness.	2.84	0.86	Agree
3. Extra time is needed to fact-check articles influenced by AI tools.	3.68	0.57	Strongly Agree
4. AI paraphrasing tools alter the factual meaning of original sources.	3.11	0.69	Agree

5. AI-generated details or claims sometimes appear fabricated or unsupported.	3.29	0.61	Strongly Agree
Composite Mean	**3.27**	**0.40**	**Strongly Agree | Extensively Experienced**

Table 3 presents the challenges to journalistic integrity in terms of fairness.

Table 3. Challenges to Journalistic Integrity in terms of Fairness

Indicators	Mean	SD	DI
1. AI-generated content occasionally reflects biased viewpoints.	3.18	0.61	Agree
2. Students rely on AI that may not present balanced or diverse perspectives.	3.11	0.76	Agree
3. Challenges arise in ensuring AI-supported articles remain impartial.	3.29	0.69	Strongly Agree
4. AI summaries oversimplify issues, affecting fair reporting.	3.24	0.68	Strongly Agree
5. Subtle biases in AI outputs are difficult to detect and correct.	3.08	0.71	Agree
Composite Mean	**3.18**	**0.52**	**Agree | Moderately Experienced**

Table 4 presents the challenges to journalistic integrity in terms of originality.

Table 4. Challenges to Journalistic Integrity in terms of Originality

Indicators	Mean	SD	DI
1. Students submit AI-generated texts as their own original work.	3.05	0.98	Agree
2. It is difficult to distinguish student-authored content from AI-generated writing.	2.39	1.00	Disagree
3. AI tools reduce opportunities for students to express creative ideas.	3.50	0.83	Strongly Agree
4. Risks of unintentional plagiarism increase when AI paraphrasing is used.	3.37	0.75	Strongly Agree
5. Overreliance on AI affects the development of students' authentic writing voice.	3.68	0.57	Strongly Agree
Composite Mean	**3.20**	**0.58**	**Strongly Agree | Extensively Experienced**

Table 5 presents the challenges to journalistic integrity in terms of ethical reporting.

Table 5. Challenges to Journalistic Integrity in terms of Ethical Reporting

Indicators	Mean	SD	DI
1. Students use AI tools without acknowledging their use.	3.26	0.79	Strongly Agree
2. Ensuring ethical guidelines are followed becomes harder with AI-generated drafts.	3.32	0.70	Strongly Agree
3. AI tools create content without considering journalistic ethics.	3.34	0.67	Strongly Agree

4. Students misuse AI to frame stories in ethically questionable ways.	3.18	0.83	Agree
5. AI-generated images or content raise concerns about authenticity and ethics.	3.45	0.72	Strongly Agree
Composite Mean	**3.31**	**0.62**	**Strongly Agree | Extensively Experienced**

Table 6 presents the challenges to journalistic integrity in terms of writers' credibility.

Table 6. Challenges to Journalistic Integrity in terms of Writers' Credibility

Indicators	Mean	SD	DI
1. Students rely on AI instead of doing the required writing work themselves.	2.95	0.90	Agree
2. Difficulties arise in determining how much effort a student contributed.	3.11	0.89	Agree
3. Students fail to take responsibility for mistakes produced by AI.	3.11	0.86	Agree
4. AI reduces student engagement in the writing and editing process.	3.42	0.76	Strongly Agree
5. Holding students accountable for checking AI-generated information is challenging.	3.13	0.91	Agree
Student Accountability	**3.14**	**0.69**	**Agree | Moderately Experienced**
1. It is difficult to verify if a submitted article was truly written by the student.	2.66	0.88	Agree
2. Students do not disclose the extent of AI assistance used.	3.03	0.75	Agree
3. AI contributions blur the line between student authorship and machine output.	3.21	0.81	Strongly Agree
4. Students present AI-generated content as their own original work.	3.03	0.88	Agree
5. Advisers struggle to accurately assess individual writing ability due to AI use.	2.84	0.86	Agree
Authorship Recognition	**2.95**	**0.61**	**Agree | Moderately Experienced**
1. AI-generated texts often lack proper citations or source verification.	3.21	0.78	Strongly Agree
2. Students assume AI-generated information is always correct.	3.22	0.84	Strongly Agree
3. AI tools sometimes produce outdated or contextually inaccurate information.	3.30	0.73	Strongly Agree
4. Advisers must spend additional time verifying AI-influenced content.	3.50	0.69	Strongly Agree
5. Inconsistent accuracy among AI tools affects the reliability of student articles.	3.47	0.65	Strongly Agree
Accuracy	**3.34**	**0.57**	**Strongly Agree | Extensively Experienced**
1. Students become less confident in their writing skills due to AI dependence.	3.11	0.92	Agree
2. AI use weakens discipline in following journalistic standards.	3.53	0.69	Strongly Agree

3. Students have difficulty producing consistent quality work without AI tools.	3.16	0.89	Agree
4. AI reliance affects students' development of sound editorial judgment.	3.42	0.72	Strongly Agree
5. Students overestimate the reliability and professionalism of AI-generated content.	3.37	0.75	Strongly Agree
Professional Reliability	**3.32**	**0.66**	**Strongly Agree | Extensively Experienced**
Composite Mean	**3.19**	**0.57**	**Agree | Moderately Experienced**

Table 7 presents the summary of challenges to journalistic integrity.

Table 7. Summary of Challenges to Journalistic Integrity

Indicators	Mean	SD	DI
Truthfulness	3.27	0.40	Extensively Experienced
Fairness	3.18	0.52	Moderately Experienced
Originality	3.20	0.58	Extensively Experienced
Ethical Reporting	3.31	0.62	Extensively Experienced
Writer Credibility	3.19	0.57	Moderately Experienced
Overall	**3.23**	**0.45**	**Extensively Experienced**

C. Differences in the Extent of Challenges

This section presents the comparative data analysis of the challenges.

Table 8 presents the challenges to journalistic integrity vis-à-vis age.

Table 8. Challenges to Journalistic Integrity vis-à-vis Age

Variables	Group	Mean	Mean Rank	H	Sig.	Decision on H_o	Interpretation
Truthfulness	20 to 30 years old	3.37	22.89	3.92	0.14	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	31 to 40 years old	3.27	19.25				
	41 to 50 years old	3.03	12.33				
Fairness	20 to 30 years old	3.21	21.18	1.41	0.49	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	31 to 40 years old	3.23	19.75				
	41 to 50 years old	2.93	14.83				
Originality	20 to 30 years old	3.24	21.68	1.24	0.54	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	31 to 40 years old	3.24	19.03				
	41 to 50 years old	2.97	15.83				
Ethical Reporting	20 to 30 years old	3.31	20.93	0.39	0.82	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	31 to 40 years old	3.33	18.75				
	41 to 50 years old	3.23	18.42				
Writers' Credibility	20 to 30 years old	3.25	22.57	2.30	0.32	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	31 to 40 years old	3.21	18.72				
	41 to 50 years old	2.98	14.67				
Overall	**20 to 30 years old**	**3.28**	**22.46**	**2.27**	**0.32**	**Failed to Reject**	**Not Significant**
	31 to 40 years old	**3.26**	**18.86**				
	41 to 50 years old	**3.03**	**14.50**				

at .05 level of Sig. (df=2)

Table 9 presents the challenges to journalistic integrity vis-à-vis sex.

Table 9. Challenges to Journalistic Integrity vis-à-vis Sex

Variables	Group	Mean	Mean Rank	U	Sig.	Decision on H_o	Interpretation
Truthfulness	Male	3.36	21.73	124.00	0.42	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	Female	3.23	18.59				
Fairness	Male	3.25	21.00	132.00	0.59	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	Female	3.15	18.89				
Originality	Male	3.22	20.82	134.00	0.64	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	Female	3.19	18.96				
Ethical Reporting	Male	3.38	22.73	113.00	0.24	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	Female	3.28	18.19				
Writers' Credibility	Male	3.18	20.91	133.00	0.62	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	Female	3.19	18.93				
Overall	**Male**	**3.28**	**22.32**	**117.50**	**0.32**	**Failed to Reject**	**Not Significant**
	Female	**3.21**	**18.35**				

at .05 level of Sig.

Table 10 presents the challenges to journalistic integrity vis-à-vis educational attainment.

Table 10. Challenges to Journalistic Integrity vis-à-vis Educational Attainment

Variables	Group	Mean	Mean Rank	H	Sig.	Decision on H_o	Interpretation
Truthfulness	Bachelor's Degree	3.35	24.00	1.99	0.57	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	with MA Units	3.25	18.11				
	Master's Degree	3.25	16.75				
	with Doctorate Units	3.50	25.50				
Fairness	Bachelor's Degree	3.30	22.50	1.38	0.71	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	with MA Units	3.19	19.41				
	Master's Degree	3.00	14.50				
	with Doctorate Units	3.00	15.50				
Originality	Bachelor's Degree	3.55	25.75	1.88	0.60	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	with MA Units	3.13	18.11				
	Master's Degree	3.15	17.50				
	with Doctorate Units	3.30	20.50				
Ethical Reporting	Bachelor's Degree	3.40	20.75	1.19	0.76	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	with MA Units	3.30	19.59				
	Master's Degree	3.10	13.75				
	with Doctorate Units	3.30	18.00				
Writers' Credibility	Bachelor's Degree	3.48	24.88	3.62	0.31	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	with MA Units	3.12	18.48				
	Master's Degree	3.00	12.75				
	with Doctorate Units	3.50	26.75				
Overall	**Bachelor's Degree**	**3.42**	**24.50**	**2.27**	**0.52**		**Not Significant**

	with MA Units	**3.20**	**18.85**		
	Master's Degree with Doctorate Units	**3.10**	**13.25**	**Failed to Reject**	
		3.32	**21.50**		

at .05 level of Sig. (df=3)

Table 11 presents the challenges to journalistic integrity vis-à-vis length of experience or service as a school paper adviser.

Table 11. Challenges to Journalistic Integrity vis-à-vis Length of Experience/Service as SPA

Variables	Group	Mean	Mean Rank	H	Sig.	Decision on H_o	Interpretation
Truthfulness	1 to 5 years	3.27	19.95	3.30	0.19	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	6 to 10 years	3.38	22.18				
	11 to 15 years	3.00	11.60				
Fairness	1 to 5 years	3.25	21.00	8.01	0.02	Reject	Significant
	6 to 10 years	3.31	22.36				
	11 to 15 years	2.60	6.60				
Originality	1 to 5 years	3.25	20.09	6.23	0.04	Reject	Significant
	6 to 10 years	3.33	23.27				
	11 to 15 years	2.68	8.60				
Ethical Reporting	1 to 5 years	3.47	21.77	5.61	0.06	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	6 to 10 years	3.22	19.73				
	11 to 15 years	2.80	9.00				
Writers' Credibility	1 to 5 years	3.26	20.11	4.49	0.11	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	6 to 10 years	3.23	22.55				
	11 to 15 years	2.78	10.10				
Overall	**1 to 5 years**	**3.30**	**20.57**	**7.65**	**0.02**	**Reject**	**Significant**
	6 to 10 years	**3.29**	**23.05**				
	11 to 15 years	**2.77**	**7.00**				

at .05 level of Sig. (df=2)

Table 12 presents the challenges to journalistic integrity vis-à-vis number of seminars attended related to campus journalism.

Table 12. Challenges to Journalistic Integrity vis-à-vis Number of Seminars Attended

Variables	Group	Mean	Mean Rank	H	Sig.	Decision on H_o	Interpretation
Truthfulness	None	3.00	11.83	6.10	0.11	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	1 to 5 seminars	3.38	22.89				
	6 to 10 seminars	3.13	15.83				
	11 to 15 seminars	3.20	16.17				

Fairness	None	3.20	20.17	0.22	0.97	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	1 to 5 seminars	3.18	19.20				
	6 to 10 seminars	3.10	18.75				
	11 to 15 seminars	3.27	22.00				
Originality	None	3.07	19.33	0.11	0.99	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	1 to 5 seminars	3.24	19.65				
	6 to 10 seminars	3.13	18.42				
	11 to 15 seminars	3.27	20.83				
Ethical Reporting	None	2.87	13.67	7.22	0.07	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	1 to 5 seminars	3.50	22.41				
	6 to 10 seminars	2.90	11.58				
	11 to 15 seminars	3.53	24.67				
Writers' Credibility	None	2.87	15.75	3.56	0.31	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
	1 to 5 seminars	3.30	21.30				
	6 to 10 seminars	2.94	13.75				
	11 to 15 seminars	3.42	24.67				
Overall	**None**	**3.00**	**15.50**	**2.48**	**0.48**	**Failed to Reject**	**Not Significant**
	1 to 5 seminars	**3.32**	**21.35**				
	6 to 10 seminars	**3.04**	**15.17**				
	11 to 15 seminars	**3.34**	**22.00**				

at .05 level of Sig. (df=3)

II. Qualitative Phase

The qualitative phase of the study employed a qualitative descriptive research design. It aimed to collect direct descriptions of the challenges experienced by the school paper advisers and the strategies and interventions they proposed to address the challenges posed by AI integration in campus journalism while upholding journalistic integrity.

A. Description of the Challenges of AI Integration in Campus Journalism

Table 13 presents the qualitative description of challenges of AI integration

Table 13. Qualitative Description of Challenges of AI Integration

Themes	Qualitative Description of Challenges
Theme 1	AI Dependence and Loss of Student Ownership/Critical Thinking
Theme 2	Misinformation, Accuracy, Credibility, and Journalism Integrity
Theme 3	Accountability, Ethics, and Shared Responsibility
Theme 4	Policy Gaps

B. Strategies and Interventions of School Paper Advisers to Address the Challenges Posed by AI

Table 14 presents the strategies and interventions of SPAs to address AI-related challenges.

Table 14. Strategies and Interventions to Address AI-related Challenges

Themes	Qualitative Description of Challenges
Theme 1	Promoting Responsible AI Use
Theme 2	Ensuring Accuracy and Integrity
Theme 3	Strengthening Accountability Systems
Theme 4	Policy, Training, Capacity Building and ICT Support

III. Integrated Summary of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings on AI Challenges

This part presents the findings from the quantitative and qualitative phases of the study using a convergent parallel mixed-methods design. It provides an integrated analysis of the challenges faced by school paper advisers in upholding journalistic integrity amid the integration of Artificial Intelligence in campus journalism

Table 15 presents the integrated summary of quantitative and qualitative findings on challenges to journalistic integrity of AI integration in campus journalism.

Table 15. Integrated Summary of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings on Challenges to Journalistic Integrity of AI Integration in Campus Journalism

Domains	Quantitative Findings (Mean/Level)	Qualitative Insights	Integrated Interpretation
Truthfulness	M = 3.27 (Extensively Experienced)	AI outputs contain misleading or inaccurate information	SPAs must do fact-checking and source verification
Fairness	M = 3.18 (Moderately Experienced)	AI outputs contain biased information and perspectives	Bias is present but manageable through human oversight and critical evaluation
Originality	M = 3.20 (Extensively Experienced)	AI overreliance weakens creativity and ownership; outputs become generic	AI threatens originality but can be mitigated through guided use
Ethical Reporting	M = 3.31 (Extensively Experienced)	Plagiarism, intellectual property issues, irresponsible reporting	AI complicates ethical standards and increases risk of misinformation and misuse
Writers' Credibility	M = 3.19 (Moderately Experienced)	AI blurs authorship and affects journalists' engagement and accountability	AI affects ownership and accountability, requiring AI use disclosure
Overall Journalistic Integrity	M = 3.23 (Extensively Experienced)	Advisers express concerns on integrity, authenticity, and standards	AI poses systemic risks to core journalism values

Demographic Variables	No significant difference (age, sex, education, seminars)	Advisers share similar concerns on AI use	AI challenges are universal and not dependent on profile
Experience (Years as SPA)	Significant difference in fairness & originality	Experienced advisers may be more meticulous in journalists' writing	Experience shapes perception and management of AI challenges
Key Emerging Themes	High ratings on ethical, truthfulness, originality issues	AI dependence, loss of ownership, misinformation, accountability issues, policy gaps	Overreliance on AI weakens creativity, accountability, and authenticity
Strategies/ Interventions	Challenges are universal to the advisers	Promoting responsible AI use to ensure accuracy and integrity; accountability system; policy, training, ICT support	AI use needs guidelines to uphold journalistic integrity and writers' credibility

DISCUSSION

This part discusses the tabular data of the quantitative and qualitative findings.

1. Secondary School Paper Advisers Profile

Table 1 reveals that, of the 38 respondents, 18 (47.37%) are aged 31 to 40 years, 14 (36.84%) are aged 20 to 30 years, and 6 (15.79%) are aged 41 to 50 years. It can also be gleaned that 27 (71.05%) are female, while 11 (28.95%) are male. The data also show that in terms of educational attainment, 27 (71.05%) have acquired units in a Master's Degree, 4 (10.53%) have a Bachelor's degree, 4 (10.53%) have a Master's degree, while 2 (5.26%) have their units in a Doctorate Degree, and 1 (2.63%) finished a Doctorate Degree. Regarding length of service/experience as a school paper adviser, 22 (57.89%) have 1 to 5 years, 11 (28.95%) have 6 to 10 years, and 5 (13.16%) have 11 to 15 years. As to the number of seminars and training attended in campus journalism, data show that 23 (60.53%) have between 1 and 5 seminars, 6 (15.79%) have 6 to 10 seminars, while 3 (7.89%) have 11 to 15 seminars, and 6 (15.79%) have none.

The profile of the respondents shows that most secondary school paper advisers are relatively young and primarily female. The majority of the respondents belonging to the 20-40 age group are in the early stages of their professional development. In terms of educational attainment, a large number have already earned units in a master's degree. At the same time, only a few are master's and doctorate degree holders, reflecting a strong commitment to continuous learning and professional growth. Meanwhile, most advisers are new, having only 1-5 years of service, indicating that many are still developing their expertise in campus journalism. Lastly, a large number of advisers have attended only a few seminars, indicating that participation in training is generally limited. These findings imply that while advisers are motivated and open to personal growth, there is a need for sustained professional development to enhance digital competence in addressing emerging challenges such as integrating AI into student publications.

2.1 Challenges to Journalistic Integrity in terms of Truthfulness

Table 2 shows that the secondary school paper advisers extensively experienced challenges in maintaining truthfulness (Mean=3.27, SD=0.40) amid AI use in campus journalism. The findings reveal that school paper advisers extensively experienced challenges in preserving truthfulness, indicating that advisers emphasize the importance of sustaining factual accuracy, verified sources, and responsible editorial judgment when student journalists integrate AI tools in their writing practice.

School paper advisers strongly agree that extra time is needed to fact-check articles influenced by AI tools. This implies that it may give additional editorial tasks to advisers as they need more time to ensure factual accuracy is maintained in the submitted articles. The use of AI tools reduces the adviser's workload and responsibility because they need to verify AI-generated outputs, countercheck the sources, and ensure that no misleading information appears in the student publications. This finding is supported by Johnson (2023), who found that issues of attribution, accuracy, and professional responsibility still need human judgment despite the use of automated fact-checking that may support journalism. Thus, school paper advisers must still conduct thorough factchecking when AI tools are integrated into student publications.

2.2. Challenges to Journalistic Integrity in terms of Fairness

Table 3 shows that the secondary school paper advisers moderately experienced challenges in preserving fairness (Mean=3.18, SD=0.52) amid AI integration in Campus Journalism. The findings reveal that school paper advisers moderately experienced challenges in preserving fairness as a component of journalistic integrity, indicating that they identify the problem of ensuring that generated outputs need to be balanced, impartial, and neutral even when student journalists integrate AI tools in the school publication.

School paper advisers strongly agree that challenges arise in ensuring AI-supported articles remain impartial. This implies that maintaining fairness remains a major problem in the school publication amidst the use of AI tools. This suggests that school paper advisers need careful evaluation of the submitted output, whether it presents balanced perspectives, prevents one-sided framing, or maintains fairness in reporting. This finding is supported by Ferrara (2024), who explained that generative AI systems often reproduce and intensify existing societal biases embedded in their training data. Because of these AI tools, they make fairness and inclusivity difficult to achieve. The study further emphasized that these subtle and complex biases are difficult to identify and rectify. It suggests that while awareness helps, critical skills and editorial oversight must be applied to the nuanced aspects of AI-generated bias to ensure fairness and uphold journalistic integrity in school publications that integrate AI. Thus, school paper advisers need to examine carefully whether information is presented fairly and remain impartial to uphold journalistic integrity in student publications.

2.3. Challenges to Journalistic Integrity in terms of Originality

Table 4 shows that the secondary school paper advisers extensively experienced challenges in preserving originality (Mean=3.20, SD=0.58) amid AI integration in Campus Journalism. The finding that school paper advisers extensively experienced challenges in preserving originality indicates that the authentic voice, writing style, and creativity may be influenced by the integration of AI in campus journalism. This suggests that an AI-assisted tool may affect the authenticity of the submitted outputs of the student journalists, raising concerns about the journalistic integrity of the student publications.

The school paper advisers strongly agree that overreliance on AI affects the development of students' authentic writing voice. This implies that excessive reliance by student journalists on AI tools may limit their ability to develop creativity and an authentic voice in writing. This finding is substantiated by Amirjalili et al. (2024), who compared AI-generated and human-authored academic writing. The study revealed that AI is deficient in the complexities of human authorship, authorial presence, specificity, and accurate source referencing, despite its ability to produce contextually relevant texts. This suggests it may reduce their opportunities to practice personal expression and independent writing. Furthermore, they may fail to enhance authentic writing style and journalistic identity.

2.4. Challenges to Journalistic Integrity in terms of Ethical Reporting

Table 5 shows that the secondary school paper advisers extensively experienced challenges in preserving ethical reporting (Mean=3.31, SD=0.62) amid AI integration in Campus Journalism. The finding that the school paper advisers extensively experienced challenges in preserving ethical reporting as a component of journalistic integrity reveals concerns about synthetic, misleading, biased, and unverified outputs. This suggests that while AI is used in content generation, it eliminates the boundaries between factual reporting and artificial enhancement, thereby threatening the credibility of submitted articles.

The school paper advisers strongly agree that AI-generated images and content raise concerns about authenticity and ethics, indicating that AI-produced content raises ethical concerns in campus journalism. This poses a serious concern for student journalists who unintentionally generate or use AI-created images and content without proper disclosure or ethical consideration. This finding is supported by Raemy et al. (2025), who explored that the use of deepfake and synthetic media technologies in journalism impacts journalistic norms, authenticity, manipulation, and the relationship between media content and reality, thereby requiring careful ethical deliberation. Thus, their study highlighted that maintaining foundational ethical standards must still be observed in journalism.

2.5. Challenges to Journalistic Integrity in terms of Writers' Credibility

Table 6 shows that the secondary school paper advisers moderately experienced challenges in preserving writers' credibility (Mean=3.19, SD=0.57) amid AI integration in

Campus Journalism. These collective findings moderately challenge the writers' credibility, raising concerns about accuracy, authorship, professional reliability, and accountability, which are required to be addressed.

These findings are supported by Slimi (2026), who found that generative AI is reconfiguring traditional understandings of authorship and attribution. The study further highlighted that reconfiguration occurred because AI-assisted writing raises concerns about originality, integrity, trust, and detection. With the integration of campus journalism, excessive use of it may blur the line between authorship recognition and machine-generated information. Thus, to address this issue, school paper advisers must establish clear policies on disclosure and attribution to maintain the credibility of published articles.

Summary of Challenges to Journalistic Integrity

In summary, Table 7 indicates that secondary school paper advisers extensively experienced challenges in upholding journalistic integrity (Mean=3.23, SD=0.45) amid the integration of AI in Campus Journalism. Among the domains, ethical reporting obtained the highest mean (Mean=3.31, SD=0.62), indicating that the respondents extensively experienced challenges in this area. This was followed by truthfulness (Mean=3.27, SD=0.40), which is likewise extensively experienced. Similarly, originality (Mean=3.20, SD=0.58) is extensively experienced. In contrast, writers' credibility (Mean=3.19, SD=0.57) and fairness (Mean=3.18, SD=0.52) are moderately experienced as challenges.

The data summary shows that secondary school paper advisers extensively experienced challenges in upholding journalistic integrity when AI is integrated into campus journalism. This indicates that, with the efficiency that AI offers in the writing process, it also threatens the truthfulness, fairness, originality, ethical reporting, and writers' credibility. This suggests that AI integration requires advisers' strong ethical guidance and training workshops anchored in clear guidelines to maintain journalistic integrity and uphold writers' credibility.

The findings that the school paper advisers extensively experienced challenges in preserving ethical reporting, truthfulness, and originality indicate that articles containing AI-generated output must be ethical, factual, and authentic. This implies that while AI offers writing efficiency, it may also multiply advisers' responsibilities for evaluating content authenticity, factual accuracy and source verification, ethical use, and originality in writing. This is supported by Gutiérrez-Caneda et al. (2024), who found that the integration of AI into journalism raises ethical concerns regarding transparency, algorithmic bias, professional responsibility, and the need for media guidelines and regulation. Therefore, program initiatives for campus journalism should focus on strengthening fact-checking procedures, disclosure of AI use, responsible AI-assisted writing practices, and clear guidelines on the integration of AI.

3.1. Challenges to Journalistic Integrity vis-à-vis Age

Table 8 presents the result of the analysis using the Kruskal-Wallis H-test, a non-parametric test, which was appropriately used since the data do not meet the assumptions for a one-way ANOVA, indicating that there is not enough evidence to claim that there exists a significant difference in the challenges faced by the secondary school paper advisers in the AI integration in campus journalism with respect to journalistic integrity. Specifically, no significant differences were found in terms of truthfulness (H=3.92, df=2, p=0.14), fairness (H=1.41, df=2, p=0.49), originality (H=1.24, df=2, p=0.54), ethical reporting (H=0.39, df=2, p=0.82), and writers' credibility (H=2.30, df=2, p=0.32), when they are grouped according to age. This is further proven by the overall H-value of 2.27 (df=2), significant at 0.32, which is statistically greater than the alpha of .05, thereby failing to reject the null hypothesis.

The findings indicate that there is no statistically significant difference in the challenges to journalistic integrity in terms of truthfulness, fairness, originality, ethical reporting, and writers' credibility when secondary school paper advisers are grouped according to their age. This suggests that both younger and experienced school paper advisers share similar concerns about integrating AI into student publications. They all face issues in verifying facts, ensuring fairness, protecting originality, and upholding writers' credibility regardless of age group.

This finding is supported by Lucas et. al (2024), who examined the relationship among K-12 teachers' trust, knowledge, and digital competence in artificial intelligence. Their findings showed that age, as part of the teachers' demographic profile, showed no significant difference in teachers' trust in AI. The study further emphasized that teachers' knowledge of AI influenced their trust and confidence in using AI tools. These findings suggest that younger and older advisers may face similar challenges in campus journalism when AI is integrated.

3.2. Challenges to Journalistic Integrity vis-à-vis Sex

Table 9 presents the result of the analysis using the Mann-Whitney U test, a non-parametric test, which was appropriately used since the data do not meet the assumptions for an Independent Sample t-test, indicating that there is not enough evidence to claim that there exists a significant difference in the challenges faced by the secondary school paper advisers in the AI integration in campus journalism with respect to journalistic integrity. Specifically, no significant differences were found in terms of truthfulness (U=124.00, p=0.42), fairness (U=132.00, p=0.59), originality (U=134.00, p=0.64), ethical reporting (U=113.00, p=0.24), and writers' credibility (U=133.00, p=0.62), when they are grouped according to sex. This is further proven by the overall U-value of 117.50, significant at 0.32 which is statistically greater than the alpha of .05, thus failing to reject the null hypothesis.

The findings indicate that there is no statistically significant difference in the challenges to journalistic integrity in terms of truthfulness, fairness, originality, ethical

reporting, and writers' credibility when secondary school paper advisers are grouped according to their sex. This suggests that both male and female advisers encounter the same challenges when AI is integrated into campus journalism. This implies that issues on AI-assisted writing, such as verifying facts, preserving originality, detecting bias, ensuring ethical reporting, and recognizing student authorship, are not solely observed whether the adviser is male or female. These are considered shared professional concerns, requiring common training, guidelines, policies, and institutional support.

Kalniņa et al. (2024) revealed that age, gender, and study level did not differ significantly when examining preservice teachers' perceptions of AI benefits and challenges. This supports the findings that maintaining journalistic standards in student publications is considered a challenge experienced not only by male but also by female advisers. Therefore, the proposed guidelines for the integration of AI in campus journalism may be used by all school paper advisers, regardless of demographic profile, to ensure journalistic integrity is maintained and upheld.

3.3. Challenges to Journalistic Integrity vis-à-vis Educational Attainment

Table 10 presents the result of the analysis using the Kruskal Wallis H-test, a non-parametric test, which was appropriately used since the data do not meet the assumptions for a one-way ANOVA, indicating that there is not enough evidence to claim that there exists a significant difference in the challenges faced by the secondary school paper advisers with respect to journalistic integrity. Specifically, no significant difference were in terms of truthfulness ($H=1.99$, $df=3$, $p=0.57$), fairness ($H=1.38$, $df=3$, $p=0.71$), originality ($H=1.88$, $df=3$, $p=0.60$), ethical reporting ($H=1.19$, $df=3$, $p=0.76$), and writers' credibility ($H=3.62$, $df=3$, $p=0.31$), when they are grouped according to education. This is further proven by the overall H-value of 2.27 ($df=3$), significant at 0.52, which is statistically greater than the alpha of .05, thereby failing to reject the null hypothesis.

The findings indicate that there is no statistically significant difference in the challenges to journalistic integrity in terms of truthfulness, fairness, originality, ethical reporting, and writers' credibility when secondary school paper advisers are grouped according to their educational attainment. This suggests that the academic qualifications of the advisers do not affect the challenges they experience when integrating AI into student publications. They face similar challenges in fact and source verification, bias detection, originality identification, and student accountability in AI-generated articles.

Aravantinos et al. (2026) emphasized the importance of professional development among teachers. Their study revealed that for AI integration to be effective, K-12 educators should be required to participate in continuous professional development and possess AI literacy, ethical awareness, pedagogical knowledge, and institutional support. Despite the contribution of postgraduate studies to professional development, they may not prepare the advisers for the rising challenges of AI in campus journalism. Therefore, professional growth must be complemented by specialized training anchored in the guidelines on AI use to effectively address AI-related challenges in maintaining journalistic integrity.

3.4. Challenges to Journalistic Integrity vis-à-vis Length of Experience/Service as SPA

Table 11 illustrates the result of the analysis using the Kruskal Wallis H-test, a non-parametric test, which was appropriately used since the data do not meet the assumptions for a one-way ANOVA, indicating that there is enough evidence to claim that there exists a significant difference in the challenges faced by the secondary school paper advisers in the AI integration in campus journalism with respect to journalistic integrity. Specifically, data reveal that significant differences exist in terms of fairness (H=8.01, df=2, p=0.02), and originality (H=6.23, df=2, p=0.04). This is further proven by the overall H-value of 7.65 (df=2), significant at 0.02, which is statistically less than the alpha of .05, thereby, rejecting the null hypothesis.

Further analysis using Dunn's post hoc comparison test, shows that the responses of the school paper advisers with 11 to 15 years of experience (mean=2.77, Mean Rank=7.00) are significantly lower than the other groups.

However, no significant differences were found in terms of truthfulness (H=3.30, df=2, p=0.19), ethical reporting (H=5.61, df=2, p=0.06), and writers' credibility (H=4.49, df=2, p=0.11), when they are grouped according to length of service/experience as a school paper adviser provided by the p-value which is greater than the alpha of .05.

The findings indicate that there is no statistically significant difference in the challenges to journalistic integrity in terms of truthfulness, ethical reporting, and writers' credibility when grouped according to length of experience as a school paper adviser. This suggests that whether the adviser is new or experienced, they all share challenges in verifying AI-assisted written outputs, ensuring ethical practices, and preserving writers' credibility. Advisers with longer or shorter experience may already have gained familiarity with student publications, editorial supervision, and student writing styles. However, their exposure to various digital tools for addressing AI-related challenges in journalism remains insufficient, despite their varying experience levels.

However, the results also show that fairness and originality have significant differences when they are grouped according to their length of experience. This implies that their length of experience may influence how they perceive challenges associated with impartial reporting and authentic student writing. Advisers with more years of experience may be more meticulous about subtle issues of biased reporting and the loss of authenticity in student writing. In contrast, those with fewer years of experience may have different perceptions of these issues due to their limited exposure to traditional practices of campus journalism. Therefore, in terms of length of experience, fairness and originality significantly differ compared to truthfulness, ethical reporting, and writers' credibility.

This is supported by Fleckenstein et al. (2024), who reported that both beginner and veteran teachers experience difficulty in detecting AI-created texts within student essays. Their study revealed that although experienced teachers made use of

differentiated judgments, AI-generated writing can still be difficult to identify, as it may closely resemble human-written output. This suggests that determining whether articles are human-authored or machine-generated is a common challenge for both novice and experienced advisers. This affects the credibility of writers, the recognition of authorship, and accountability, as advisers are responsible for ensuring that students remain truthful, transparent, and accountable for their published articles.

3.5. Challenges to Journalistic Integrity vis-à-vis Number of Seminars Attended related to Campus Journalism

Table 12 shows the result of the analysis using the Kruskal Wallis H-test, a non-parametric test, which was appropriately used since the data do not meet the assumptions for a one-way ANOVA, indicating that there is not enough evidence to claim that there exists a significant difference in the challenges faced by the secondary school paper adviser in AI integration in campus journalism with respect to journalistic integrity. Specifically, no significant difference were found in terms of truthfulness (H=6.10, df=3, p=0.11), fairness (H=0.22, df=3, p=0.97), originality (H=0.11, df=3, p=0.99), ethical reporting (H=7.22, df=3, p=0.07), and writers' credibility (H=3.56, df=3, p=0.31), when they are grouped according to the number of seminars attended related to campus journalism. This is further proven by the overall H-value of 2.48 (df=3), significant at 0.48 which is statistically greater than the alpha of .05, thereby failing to reject the null hypothesis.

The findings indicate no statistically significant differences in challenges related to truthfulness, fairness, originality, ethical reporting, and writers' credibility when secondary school paper advisers are grouped by the number of campus journalism seminars attended. This suggests that advisers who may or may not have attended seminars to enhance their journalism skills may still encounter common problems in verifying AI-generated content, preserving students' authentic writing, identifying bias, ensuring ethical reporting, and maintaining writers' credibility.

This result is supported by Amemasor et al. (2025), who conducted a study on the impact of teacher professional development on digital instructional integration and teaching practices. The study found that effective professional development must incorporate quality, continuity, relevance, and practical application of the training provided. Their study further highlighted that practical digital training, collaborative learning environments, sustained mentoring, and institutional support contribute to effective teacher professional development programs. In connection with the present finding, advisers must participate in seminars that integrate AI into campus journalism to address emerging concerns regarding machine-generated outputs. Therefore, future training programs, which are aligned with the guidelines in the use of AI, should equip school paper advisers with competencies necessary to preserve journalistic integrity in campus journalism.

4. Qualitative Description of Challenges of AI Integration

Table 13 presents the four themes that emerged from the qualitative descriptions of the challenges experienced by the secondary school paper advisers amid AI integration in campus journalism.

Theme 1: AI Dependence and Loss of Student Ownership/Critical Thinking

This theme reflects the growing concern of secondary SPAs about AI's influence on student publications. It shows that student journalists rely too much on AI-generated information. Journalists are expected to gather facts, interview sources, validate claims, and ensure their articles reflect the truth. With the emergence of AI, they use its efficiency in writing because they accept its content as accurate without verification. This also affects the authenticity of student writing. While they depend heavily on AI, this may lead to reduced critical thinking, underdeveloped writing skills, and unrecognized authorship.

A participant said, *"The biggest challenge is when they become used to AI and fully dependent on it. Their originality and critical thinking gradually disappear."*

This is supported by Gonsalves (2024), who examined the effects of generative AI on students' critical thinking by revisiting Bloom's Taxonomy in the context of AI-assisted learning. The study revealed that the use of AI tools like ChatGPT may encourage students to become reliant on solutions provided by AI, resulting in weak development of critical thinking. This further emphasized that as they exposed themselves to AI content, they needed to develop ethical reasoning, reflective thinking, collaboration, and critical evaluation so that they would not become passive users. Therefore, with the emergence of AI, it should function as a support tool and not as a replacement for students' creativity, independent decision-making, and authentic writing style to maintain the core journalistic values of student publications.

Theme 2: Misinformation, Accuracy, Credibility, and Journalism Integrity

This theme reflects the risks that AI can pose to its users. This is considered a critical concern for secondary school paper advisers because the core foundation of campus journalism is maintaining integrity by reporting factual events and referencing reliable sources. The student journalists are expected to uphold these core values amid AI integration. However, heavy reliance on AI compromises the integrity of publications by including AI-generated content with factual inaccuracies and unverified sources. Therefore, this underscores the challenge of ensuring that students critically evaluate and verify information before using AI tools.

A participant said, "*One of the challenges is that we are not always sure whether the information provided by AI is legitimate. We do not know where its resources or research come from, so misinformation is possible."*

This is supported by Bontridder and Poullet (2021), who examined the roles of

artificial intelligence in disinformation. Their study emphasized that AI can intensify misinformation issues by enabling the production and circulation of convincing yet misleading content. This further highlighted that AI raises ethical concerns that may influence public trust, democratic communication, and access to reliable information. This is relevant to the study as young journalists excessively rely on AI-generated content and accept it as truthful and reliable. This may lead to the publication of misleading news without verifying information and reliable sources. Therefore, school paper advisers need to conduct fact-checking and editorial review to uphold the integrity of student publications.

Theme 3: Accountability, Ethics, and Shared Responsibility

This heme highlights the concerns of secondary school paper advisers regarding the integration of AI into campus journalism. Student journalists may normalize or conceal the use of AI tools in their writing practices because these tools improve efficiency. Incorporating it in their writing task may show signs of technological skills and creativity, which makes them proud of themselves because it makes their lives easier. As a result, this reflects a change in perception of whether the practice of integrating AI is acceptable or questionable.

A participant said, *"Students may become dishonest about their work. Some may deny using AI or make excuses about how much they used it."*

This is supported by Ramos (2025), who used an AI-disclosure form requiring students to document the tool used, the purpose and context of its use, and its perceived outcomes. The study demonstrated that reflective disclosure could reveal different reasons for AI use, including verification, immediate academic assistance, procrastination, and material barriers. In campus journalism, requiring students to justify their AI use may strengthen transparency, self-regulation, and accountability for the final published output. Therefore, school paper advisers need to implement AI use disclosure, grounded in ethical guidelines, in the integration of AI in campus journalism.

Theme 4: Policy Gaps

This theme reveals the absence of clear guidelines on the responsible and ethical integration of AI in campus journalism. This major concern makes it difficult for the secondary school paper adviser to manage AI-assisted writing because there are no established rules for disclosure, authorship, factchecking, plagiarism, and the ethical use of AI. With this lack of direction, student journalists may over-rely on AI, which could threaten the integrity and credibility of student publications.

A participant said, *"At present, we still do not have formal guidelines regarding the use of AI in campus journalism. It would probably be better if such policies came from a higher authority, such as the Department of Education, so they could be standardized."*

This is supported by de-Lima-Santos et al. (2024), who examined AI guidelines

across global media and analyzed news organizations' responses to the growing use of AI in journalism. Their study showed that AI policies commonly emphasize transparency, accountability, fairness, privacy, explainability, human oversight, and protection of journalistic values. This is relevant to the study because student publications likewise need clear guidelines on AI use to determine the extent of assistance AI can provide to student journalists and school paper advisers. Therefore, campus journalism should establish formal guidelines on the integration of AI to maintain journalistic integrity and uphold writers' credibility.

5. Strategies and Interventions to Address AI-related Challenges

Table 14 shows that the secondary SPAs employed strategies and interventions to address challenges posed by the integration of AI in campus journalism.

Theme 1: Promoting Responsible AI Use

This theme emphasizes the role of AI in campus journalism. AI must be used only as a supplementary tool, not as a replacement for student journalists' thinking, writing, and journalistic responsibility. They must still be the primary authors of their articles, reflecting personal observations, source verification, and authentic writing. AI may assist in refining and improving their work through revision, but the entire composition must originate with the journalists. Therefore, this highlights a balanced approach to AI integration in the writing process that does not replace journalists' creativity, ownership, or critical engagement.

A participant said, *"Students should first create their own drafts and ideas. After that, they may use AI for revisions or sentence construction."*

This is supported by Sanz-Tejeda et al. (2026), who explored the risks and benefits of generative AI. Their study found that AI may help enhance the technical aspects of student texts, including coherence, organization, vocabulary, argumentation, and revision. However, this may also lead to overdependence on AI and reduced independent thinking and writing. This is connected to the study because journalists may benefit from AI-assisted revision, but they must still be responsible for maintaining factual accuracy, originality, and authentic authorship. Therefore, campus journalism must establish clear guidelines for AI use to preserve not only the publication's integrity but also writers' skills.

Theme 2: Ensuring Accuracy and Integrity

This theme emphasizes that supervision, guidance, and evaluation by school paper advisers are important now that student journalists are overusing AI. Despite the assistance they receive from AI tools, advisers cannot delegate responsibility for checking accuracy, originality, journalistic standards, and ethics. Thus, the presence of the advisers remains essential to prevent the writers from depending on AI-generated information that is often misleading, biased, or inaccurate.

A participant said, *"Human supervision is very important. We compare the student's original draft with the AI-assisted revision to determine whether their original thoughts and ideas are still present."*

This is supported by Cools and Diakopoulos (2026), who examined journalists' perceptions of the risks and opportunities of generative AI in newsroom practice. Their study found that generative AI may be effective for improving efficiency, assisting with data handling, and supporting some stages of news production. However, these AI tools also raise concerns about accuracy, credibility, bias, and ethical responsibility. The authors further emphasized that AI integration in journalism requires education, algorithmic literacy, monitoring, and human oversight. This relates to the study because supervision by school paper advisers is needed to evaluate AI-assisted outputs before publication. Therefore, through their supervision, journalists can benefit from AI while still preserving journalistic integrity, student accountability, and writers' credibility.

Theme 3: Strengthening Accountability Systems

This theme highlights the core principle of campus journalism: shared accountability. This underscores that responsibility is distributed among student journalists, school paper advisers, and the institution. They all have roles in ensuring that articles remain truthful, ethical, original, and credible. This responsibility should not fall solely on the student-writers, indicating a collaborative approach in which guidance, supervision, and institutional support work together to uphold integrity and accountability in the writing process.

A participant said, *"Everyone should be accountable—the student journalist, the adviser, and even the school administration. You can't just blame the student because you're also an adviser and you're the one guiding them."*

This finding is supported by Morosoli et al. (2025), who examined public accountability and regulatory expectations for AI in journalism. This study emphasized the rising concerns about transparency, accountability, disclosure, and responsibility. The study further highlighted the need for clear transparency mechanisms regarding whether AI-generated content is used and disclosing sources, which make AI users accountable if AI-related rules are violated. This is connected to the study because it shows that AI passive users should be held accountable for the articles they submit. To uphold journalistic integrity in campus journalism while AI is in use, a shared accountability system must be practiced. Therefore, human supervision is reinforced to evaluate students' outputs before publication critically.

Theme 4: Policy, Training, Capacity Building and ICT Support

This theme stresses the need for secondary school paper advisers for clearer institutional guidelines on AI use, which may be implemented by the DepEd. This emphasizes that they encounter AI-related challenges such as plagiarism, unverified sources, authorship, fact-checking, and ethical reporting. Having well-defined policies

and ethical frameworks may guide both advisers and students in the responsible use of AI

A participant said, *"So it's really a big deal to actually have a clear policy about this. There should be ethical guidelines for using it."*

This finding is supported by Ghimire and Edwards (2024), who found that many educational institutions lack specialized guidelines for the ethical use of generative AI tools, particularly regarding plagiarism, transparency, privacy, and responsible implementation. The study emphasized the need for flexible, updated, and institution-based AI governance to address issues such as student privacy, plagiarism, transparency, and responsible AI use. This is relevant to the study, as school paper advisers also express the need for a clearer policy defining acceptable and ethical AI use.

Integrated Summary of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings on Challenges to Journalistic Integrity of AI Integration in Campus Journalism

Consistent with the convergent parallel mixed-methods research design, table 15 presents the quantitative and qualitative findings that were merged to capture the depth and breadth of the study.

Quantitative data reveal that secondary school paper advisers extensively experienced challenges in upholding journalistic integrity (M = 3.23) when AI is integrated into campus journalism. They strongly agree that they extensively experienced challenges in preserving ethical reporting, truthfulness, and originality, while fairness and writers' credibility are moderately experienced. These numerical results are supported by the qualitative interviews, which reveal that advisers consistently express concerns about overdependence on AI, misinformation, plagiarism, bias, unclear authorship, weak accountability, and the absence of clear policy in AI use. Both quantitative and qualitative data imply that AI does not merely function as a technological tool; it also raises ethical challenges that may compromise journalistic integrity, thereby requiring adviser supervision, student accountability, and clear institutional guidelines in the integration of AI in campus journalism.

Quantitatively, school paper advisers strongly agree that they extensively experienced challenges in preserving ethical reporting (M = 3.31). This indicates that it also raises concerns in terms of synthetic, misleading, biased, and unverified outputs. This suggests that while AI is used in content generation, it eliminates the boundaries between factual reporting and artificial enhancement, thereby threatening the credibility of submitted articles. The qualitative finding supports this as school paper advisers emphasize concerns about plagiarism, intellectual property issues, responsible reporting, ethical reminders, and the need for clear AI policies. This finding is substantiated by Gutiérrez-Caneda et al. (2024), who found that the integration of AI in journalism also raises ethical concerns connected to transparency, algorithmic bias, professional roles, media guidelines, and responsible journalistic practice. Raemy et al. (2025) also supported this as they explored the use of deepfake and synthetic media technologies in

journalism impacts journalistic norms, authenticity, manipulation, and the relationship between media content and reality, thereby requiring careful ethical deliberation. As a result, the integration of AI in campus journalism requires clear ethical standards, advisers' critical evaluation, and student accountability, which may be supported by AI policy guidelines to uphold journalistic integrity in ethical reporting.

In terms of quantitative findings on truthfulness, school paper advisers likewise strongly agree that they extensively experienced challenges in preserving it (M = 3.27), indicating that advisers emphasize the importance of maintaining factual accuracy, using verified sources, and practicing responsible, truthful reporting when student journalists integrate AI tools into their writing practice. This finding is supported by qualitative findings revealing that, because of students' overdependence on AI, they may accept AI-generated information that is misleading or inaccurate without verifying sources. This integration suggests that advisers are concerned with their writers, treating AI-generated outputs as reliable even when they contain unsupported claims, factual inaccuracies, and fabricated details. This finding is consistent with Johnson (2023), who found that AI cannot replace human judgment in ensuring accuracy, attribution, and professional responsibility despite AI assistance in fact-checking journalistic work. Similarly, Bontridder and Poullet (2021) explained that AI can intensify disinformation by generating misleading content. Therefore, these findings require that school paper advisers conduct fact-checking and source verification to uphold the integrity of student publications.

The quantitative findings also show that school paper advisers strongly agree that they extensively experienced challenges in preserving originality (M = 3.20), indicating that the authentic voice, writing style, and creativity of the student journalists may be influenced by the integration of AI in campus journalism. This is supported by qualitative findings: AI-assisted outputs may not match students' writing styles, exhibit lack of creativity, and show reduced originality and ownership. This finding is substantiated by Amirjalili et al. (2024), who revealed that AI is deficient in terms of complexity of human authorship, authorial presence, specificity, and correct source referencing despite its ability to produce contextually relevant texts. Likewise, Slimi (2026) found that AI diminishes the sense of ownership, making it difficult for journalists to take full responsibility for their work. Thus, when they originate their own journalistic outputs, it protects originality, ownership, and accountability.

Meanwhile, the quantitative finding shows that school paper advisers agree that they moderately experienced challenges in preserving writers' credibility (M = 3.19), raising concerns about accuracy, authorship recognition, professional reliability, and student accountability. This is supported by qualitative findings, which reveal that advisers struggle to detect AI-generated content, unclear ownership, unclear byline accountability, and the need for shared accountability. These findings imply that AI can blur authorship, whether the output is machine-generated or student-authored, making it difficult for advisers to determine whether the output reflects the writers' genuine effort. This is supported by Cools and Diakopoulos (2026), who found that generative AI may be effective for improving efficiency, assisting with data handling, and supporting some stages of news production. However, these AI tools also raise concerns about accuracy,

credibility, bias, and ethical responsibility. Similarly, Sanz-Tejeda et al. (2026), who reviewed the impact of generative AI on academic reading and writing, found that despite the help of generative AI to improve writing through feedback, idea generation, and paraphrasing, it also raises issues associated with plagiarism, authorship, overreliance, and reduced metacognitive engagement. Therefore, these findings may require school paper advisers to implement AI use disclosure, grounded in ethical guidelines to maintain writers' credibility amid the integration of AI in campus journalism

In relation to quantitative findings of fairness, school paper advisers agree that they moderately experienced challenges in preserving it (Mean=3.18), indicating that they encounter issues in ensuring that generated outputs are balanced, impartial, and neutral even when student journalists integrate AI tools in the school publication. This is supported by qualitative findings in which advisers report that bias is present in AI-generated outputs. Ferrara (2024) supports this, as the study found that because of data bias, algorithmic bias, and decision-making bias, AI bias emerged. Likewise, de-Lima-Santos et al. (2024) found that media guidelines commonly emphasize transparency, accountability, fairness, privacy, human oversight, disclosure of automated content, and preservation of journalistic values. Thus, these findings require school paper advisers to carefully examine whether information is presented fairly and remains impartial to uphold journalistic integrity in student publications.

The integration of quantitative and qualitative findings on the profile of secondary school paper advisers reveals that they face universal challenges posed by the use of AI in campus journalism. Quantitative analysis shows no significant differences in challenges to journalistic integrity when advisers were grouped according to age, sex, educational attainment, and number of seminars attended, implying that concerns associated with truthfulness, fairness, originality, ethical reporting, and writers' credibility are generally common across advisers with different backgrounds. This is supported by qualitative findings where advisers express common concerns regarding AI overdependence, misinformation, plagiarism, unclear authorship, weak accountability, and lack of clear AI policies. These results are parallel with the studies of Kalniņa et al. (2024), who revealed that age, gender, and study level showed no significant difference in AI perceptions, and Aravantinos et al. (2026), who found that continuous professional development, AI literacy, ethical and responsible use, pedagogical knowledge, organizational support, and sustained training are required for AI integration in K-12 education to be effective.

However, quantitative analysis shows significant differences in challenges to fairness and originality when advisers were grouped according to length of experience/service, implying that advisers with longer years of experience may be more meticulous about subtle issues of biased reporting and the loss of student writing authenticity. In contrast, those with shorter length of experience may have different perceptions of these issues because of their limited exposure to traditional practices of campus journalism. This is supported by qualitative findings when advisers reveal shared challenges to loss of originality, limitation to creativity, bias in AI-generated content, and difficulty evaluating true skills. These results are connected to the studies of Fleckenstein et al. (2024), who found that both novice and experienced teachers find it hard to detect

texts produced by AI tools such as ChatGPT, but experienced teachers showed signs of making differentiated judgments, and Sanz-Tejeda et al. (2026), who reviewed the impact of generative AI on academic reading and writing. Their study found that despite the help of generative AI to improve writing through feedback, idea generation, and paraphrasing, it also raises issues associated with plagiarism, authorship, overreliance, and reduced metacognitive engagement. Therefore, campus journalism must establish clear guidelines that define the extent of AI use to preserve not only the publication's integrity but also writers' skills.

In conclusion, the combined findings of quantitative and qualitative data reveal that while AI integration may be beneficial to campus journalism, it also presents broad and complex challenges to school paper advisers. Quantitatively, advisers strongly agree that they extensively experienced challenges to journalistic integrity in terms of truthfulness, fairness, originality, ethical reporting, and writers' credibility, which are parallel with the qualitative findings where advisers express shared concerns about AI overdependence, misinformation, plagiarism, loss of originality and critical thinking, weak accountability, bias, and policy gaps. Therefore, these findings require strategies and interventions, including continuous training for advisers and students, editorial mentoring, strengthening accountability systems, sustained institutional support, and clear guidelines for AI integration in campus journalism, to uphold journalistic integrity in student publications.

Conclusions

Research Question 1:

The profile of the respondents indicates that most secondary school paper advisers are relatively young and predominantly female. Most belong to the 20–40 age group and are still in the early stages of their professional development. In terms of educational attainment, many have earned units toward a master's degree, while only a few hold master's or doctoral degrees, indicating continued interest in professional and academic growth. Most respondents have served as school paper advisers for only one to five years, suggesting that many are still developing their expertise in campus journalism. Additionally, many have attended only a limited number of seminars, reflecting relatively low participation in relevant training activities. Therefore, these findings suggest the need for sustained professional development to strengthen advisers' digital competence and prepare them to address emerging challenges, particularly the integration of AI into student publications.

Research Question 2:

The study found that secondary school paper advisers strongly agree that they extensively experienced challenges in preserving journalistic integrity, particularly in terms of truthfulness, originality, and ethical reporting. At the same time, fairness and writers' credibility were moderately experienced. Advisers reported that AI-generated output or AI-assisted writing increases the risk of misinformation, contains bias, reduces the development of journalists' authentic writing voice or style, and compromises

authenticity and ethics. Regarding the writers' credibility, advisers also observed that journalists tend to exhibit reduced accountability, unclear authorship, and weak adherence to journalistic standards. These findings suggest that AI integration may make it difficult to maintain journalistic integrity, which is a core value of student publications.

Research Question 3:

The results show that there are no significant differences in the challenges to journalistic integrity in terms of truthfulness, ethical reporting, and writers' credibility faced by the secondary school paper advisers when grouped according to age, gender, educational attainment, and number of seminars attended, indicating that AI-related challenges are universally experienced regardless of advisers' background and context. However, the results show significant differences in the challenges to fairness and originality when advisers were grouped by length of experience/service, implying that advisers with longer years of experience may be more meticulous about subtle issues of biased reporting and the loss of student writing authenticity. In contrast, those with less experience may have different perceptions of these issues due to their limited exposure to traditional practices in campus journalism. This suggests that professional exposure and practical experience contribute to improved handling of AI-related challenges.

Research Question 4:

The qualitative findings result in the emergence of four major themes because of the AI-related challenges: AI dependence and loss of student ownership/critical thinking; misinformation, accuracy, credibility, and journalism integrity; accountability, ethics, and shared responsibility; and policy gaps. These themes indicate that the integration of AI in campus journalism presents challenges to journalistic integrity. Excessive use of AI leads to reduced originality in output, limitations on creativity and critical thinking, and an underdeveloped writing style. Moreover, it raises concerns about misinformation, unverified sources, bias in content, loss of credibility, plagiarism, and intellectual property concerns. Advisers also reported a lack of formal AI-specific policies. These increasing concerns about AI use can compromise journalistic integrity if clear AI policies do not guide the student publications.

Research Question 5:

In response to the identified AI-related challenges, the qualitative findings reveal four themes: promoting responsible AI use; ensuring accuracy and integrity; strengthening accountability systems; and policy training, capacity building, and ICT support. Secondary school paper advisers implement strategies and interventions in campus journalism that require journalists to do independent writing to enforce originality and accountability, use AI moderately as a support tool for grammar checking, and be transparent in their AI use, thereby necessitating advisers' supervision and ethical reminders. Both advisers and writers need institutional support through ICT infrastructure, sustained training workshops, and clear AI policy guidelines to ensure accuracy, ethical

writing practices, responsible AI use, and accountability, thereby upholding journalistic integrity in student publications.

Research Question 6:

Based on the study's integrated findings, the proposed guidelines were developed to promote responsible AI use. They aim to provide a clear framework to help the school paper advisers and student journalists effectively manage AI integration in campus journalism while preserving journalistic integrity. These guidelines emphasize that AI may be used only as a support tool for writing practices. AI may be used for grammar improvement, idea organization, structural clarity, and research assistance to ensure the originality, accuracy, and accountability of student journalists. They also promote key safeguards such as the use of an AI declaration, source verification, plagiarism prevention, bias detection, originality protection, human supervision, and byline accountability. Through these guidelines, student journalists will have constant ethical reminders as they remain responsible for the truthfulness, fairness, originality, and ethical quality of every article published under their name. Therefore, the proposed guidelines guarantee that technological support, together with student accountability, adviser monitoring, and institutional policy direction, can strengthen AI integration in campus journalism.

Recommendations

In light of the conclusions, the following are recommended:

1. For the Department of Education (DepEd), it is recommended to develop and institutionalize foundational guidelines on the ethical use of AI in campus journalism to ensure standardized practice across schools and to address the general challenges associated with AI integration.

2. For school administrators, it is recommended to provide sufficient resources and sustained training programs and ICT infrastructure to enhance the digital competence not only of the student-writers but also of the school paper advisers in dealing with AI-related challenges effectively.

3. For school paper advisers, it is recommended to constantly participate in professional development and training workshops to enhance digital competence, improve management strategies in strict monitoring, and strengthen the accountability system to protect journalistic integrity and writers' credibility amid AI integration.

4. For student journalists, it is recommended to adhere to ethical guidelines on AI use to maintain originality, verify information from credible sources, take full accountability for the content, and treat AI as a support tool.

5. For future researchers, it is recommended to expand the scope of the study on AI integration in campus journalism by exploring its long-term effects on student learning,

development of writing skills, and journalistic practices, as well as by investigating more effective interventions and policy frameworks.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

The researcher adhered to established ethical standards to protect the dignity, autonomy, and well-being of all participants throughout the research process. The researcher secured authorization to conduct the study, and informed consent form was obtained from the respondents before data collection. Participation was voluntary, and participants might refuse, skip questions, or withdraw at any time without negative consequences. Their anonymity, confidentiality, well-being, and data privacy were protected through coding, secure data storage, restricted access, and proper disposal of records after the approved retention period. The researcher declares that no conflict of interest existed, plagiarism was strictly avoided, all sources were properly acknowledged. The findings were analyzed and reported objectively without fabrication, falsification, misrepresentation, or deliberate bias. The study's findings were used solely for academic and research purposes, and any use of AI-assisted tools in preparing the manuscript was disclosed, verified by the researcher, and did not replace the researcher's judgment, analysis, interpretation, or responsibility for the final work.

Acknowledgments

The researcher wholeheartedly acknowledges the unwavering support, untiring guidance, and invaluable words of encouragement he received throughout the journey of completing this study. He expresses his immense gratitude and appreciation for the contributions of all individuals for making this study possible. Special appreciation is extended to the research adviser, panel members, and validators for sharing their valuable insights, meaningful recommendations, and expertise throughout the research process. The researcher also acknowledges all the school paper advisers who generously shared their time, experiences, and perspectives. Sincere gratitude is likewise extended to the authors of the studies and research instruments that guided the development and contextualization of the survey questionnaire and interview guide questions. Lastly, the researcher genuinely appreciates the encouragement and support provided by family and friends throughout the completion of the study.

REFERENCES

Alonso-Muñoz, L., & Casero-Ripollés, A. (2026). Adoption of Generative AI in Higher Education: Perceptions of Journalism students. Information, 17(2), 189. https://doi.org/10.3390/info17020189

Amemasor, S. K., Oppong, S. O., Ghansah, B., Benuwa, B., & Essel, D. D. (2025). A systematic review on the impact of teacher professional development on digital instructional integration and teaching practices. Frontiers in Education, 10. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1541031

Amirjalili, F., Neysani, M., & Nikbakht, A. (2024). Exploring the boundaries of authorship: a comparative analysis of AI-generated text and human academic writing in English literature. Frontiers in Education, 9. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1347421

Aravantinos, S., Lavidas, K., Komis, V., Karalis, T., & Papadakis, S. (2026). Artificial intelligence in K–12 education: A systematic review of teachers' professional development needs for AI integration. Computers, 15(1), 49. https://doi.org/10.3390/computers15010049

Bontridder, N., & Poullet, Y. (2021). The role of artificial intelligence in disinformation. Data & Policy, 3. https://doi.org/10.1017/dap.2021.20

Cools, H., & Diakopoulos, N. (2024). Uses of Generative AI in the newsroom: Mapping journalists' perceptions of perils and possibilities. Journalism Practice, 20(3), 878–896. https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2024.2394558

Dalan, J. D. S., & Enciso, R. (2024). Exploring the Impact of Artificial intelligence on Campus journalism A literature review. Institutional Multidisciplinary Research and Development Journal, 1. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/378497964_Exploring_the_Impact_of_Artificial_Intelligence_on_Campus_Journalism_A_Literature_Review

De-Lima-Santos, M., Yeung, W. N., & Dodds, T. (2024). Guiding the way: a comprehensive examination of AI guidelines in global media. AI & Society, 40(4), 2585–2603. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-024-01973

Department of Education. (2026). DepEd Order No. 003, s. 2026: Foundational guidelines on artificial intelligence (AI) in basic education. Department of Education. https://www.deped.gov.ph/2026/02/20/february-20-2026-do-003-s-2026-foundational-guidelines-on-artificial-intelligence-ai-in-basic-education/

Dierickx, L., Opdahl, A. L., Khan, S. A., Lindén, C., & Rojas, D. C. G. (2024). A data-centric approach for ethical and trustworthy AI in journalism. Ethics and Information Technology, 26(4). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-024-09801-6

Ferrara, E. (2024). Fairness and bias in artificial intelligence: A brief survey of sources, impacts, and mitigation strategies. Sci, 6(1), 3. https://doi.org/10.3390/sci6010003

Fleckenstein, J., Meyer, J., Jansen, T., Keller, S. D., Köller, O., & Möller, J. (2024). Do teachers spot AI? Evaluating the detectability of AI-generated texts among student essays. Computers and Education Artificial Intelligence, 6, 100209. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100209

Florentino, B., Sestito, C., Cruz, W., André, D. C., & Bonidia, R. (2026). Artificial intelligence for all? Brazilian teachers on ethics, equity, and the everyday challenges of AI in education. arXiv.org. https://arxiv.org/abs/2512.23834

Ghimire, A., & Edwards, J. (2024). From Guidelines to Governance: A study of AI policies in education. arXiv (Cornell University). https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2403.15601

Gonsalves, C. (2024). Generative AI's impact on critical thinking: Revisiting Bloom's taxonomy. Journal of Marketing Education, 48(1), 4–19. https://doi.org/10.1177/02734753241305980

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. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2024.1465178

Johnson, P. R. (2023). A case of Claims and Facts: Automated Fact-Checking The future of Journalism's Authority. Digital Journalism, 12(10), 1461–1484. https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2023.2174564

Kalniņa, D., Nīmante, D., & Baranova, S. (2024). Artificial intelligence for higher education: benefits and challenges for pre-service teachers. Frontiers in Education, 9. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1501819

Lucas, M., Zhang, Y., Bem-Haja, P., & Vicente, P. N. (2024). The interplay between teachers' trust in artificial intelligence and digital competence. Education and Information Technologies, 29(17), 22991–23010. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12772-2

Morosoli, S., Naudts, L., Cools, H., Venkatraj, K., Helberger, N., & De Vreese, C. (2025b). Public accountability and regulatory expectations for AI in journalism: qualitative evidence from focus groups with Dutch citizens. AI & Society, 41(2), 1467–1479. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-025-02591-5

Peña-Alonso, U., Peña-Fernández, S., & Meso-Ayerdi, K. (2025). Journalists' Perceptions of Artificial Intelligence and Disinformation Risks. Journalism and Media, 6(3), 133. https://doi.org/10.3390/journalmedia6030133

Raemy, P., Bitton, D. B., Ötting, H., Hoffmann, C. P., Godulla, A., & Puppis, M. (2025). Deepfakes and Journalism: Normative considerations and implications. Journalism Studies, 26(14), 1724–1744. https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670x.2025.2547300

Ramos, J. G. (2025). Development and introduction of a document disclosing AI-use: exploring self-reported student rationales for artificial intelligence use in coursework: a brief research report. Frontiers in Education, 10. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1654805

Saatci, E. (2025). AI and Ethics: Scale Development for Measuring Ethical Perceptions of Artificial Intelligence Across Sectors and Countries. International Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization, 13(1), 35–50. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijebo.20251301.14

Sanz-Tejeda, A., Domínguez-Oller, J. C., Baldaquí-Escandell, J. M., Gómez-Díaz, R., & García-Rodríguez, A. (2026). The impact of generative AI on academic reading and writing: A synthesis of recent evidence (2023–2025). Frontiers in Education, 10. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1711718

Slimi, Z. (2026). A systematic critical review of generative AI's impact on authorship, pedagogy, and integrity (2023–2025). Frontiers in Education, 11. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2026.1769680

APA Citation:

Tapalgo Jr., R. L., & Canare, F. D. (2026). ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN CAMPUS JOURNALISM: SCHOOL PAPER ADVISERS' CHALLENGES TO JOURNALISTIC INTEGRITY. Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, 4(11), 523–559. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24138005

Corresponding author: *tapalgoromel@gmail.com*