

Between Trust, Risk, And Innovation: Managing Artificial Intelligence Narratives on The Digital Platforms of Georgian Traditional Media

Mariam Keadze

<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-0678-4882>

Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

artificial intelligence; digital communication; media narratives; trust; risk.

ABSTRACT

Artificial intelligence has become a visible issue of public communication, raising questions not only about technological progress, but also about trust, risk, responsibility and innovation. This article examines how artificial intelligence narratives are organized on the digital platforms of Georgian traditional media. It focuses on three interrelated narrative dimensions: trust, risk and innovation, and approaches AI-related coverage as a public communication management issue rather than merely as a topic of media representation.

The study is based on a mixed content analysis of 195 valid AI-related publications selected from an initial audit of 230 coding cards. The corpus includes materials published on the digital platforms of four Georgian traditional media outlets: 1TV.ge, Euronews Georgia, Imedi News and Rustavi 2. Each publication was coded according to its dominant content category, while additional analytical attention was given to technological objects, functional emphases, risk elements, trust-related issues and media literacy components.

The findings show that AI-related coverage is dominated by technological and business-oriented news, which accounts for 93 publications, or 47.7% of the analyzed corpus. However, the coverage is not uniformly optimistic. Risk-oriented and verification-related narratives are also visible: the “myth-nightmare” category includes 36 publications, global political competition and information war accounts for 24 publications, and media literacy or fact-checking appears as the dominant category in 26 publications. The “myth-idyll” category, which presents AI through strongly positive or idealized expectations, accounts for 16 publications.

The article argues that Georgian traditional media’s digital platforms organize AI narratives through an uneven but significant interaction of innovation, risk and trust. In a small-language media environment, this narrative structure matters because traditional media platforms remain important intermediaries through which global AI developments are translated into local public communication. Responsible AI communication therefore requires not only frequent coverage, but also balanced explanation of technological opportunities, limitations, risks and accountability mechanisms.

JEL classification:

Received: 01.07.2026

Revised: 03.08.2026

Accepted: 31.08.2026

O33; O32; D83; O35

<https://doi.org/10.46361/2449-2604.13.2.2026.87-106>

ნდობას, რისკსა და ინოვაციას შორის: ხელოვნური ინტელექტის შესახებ
ნარატივების მართვა ქართული ტრადიციული მედიის ციფრული პლატფორმების
მაგალითზე

მარიამ კეძაძე

<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-0678-4882>

Corresponding author. Mariam.kebadzee@gmail.com



© Copyright, 2026 by the author(s)

ივანე ჯავახიშვილის სახელობის თბილისის სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტი, თბილისი, საქართველო

ინფორმაცია

სტატიის შესახებ

საკვანძო სიტყვები:

ხელოვნური

ინტელექტი,

ციფრული

კომუნიკაცია, მედია

ნარატივები, ნდობა,

რისკი.

აბსტრაქტი

სტატია შეისწავლის, როგორ არის წარმოდგენილი ხელოვნური ინტელექტის შესახებ ნარატივები ქართული ტრადიციული მედიის ციფრულ პლატფორმებზე. კვლევის მთავარი ანალიტიკური ღერძებია ნდობა, რისკი და ინოვაცია. ამ მიდგომით, AI-ის გაშუქება განიხილება არა მხოლოდ როგორც მედიური რეპრეზენტაცია, არამედ როგორც საჯარო კომუნიკაციის მართვის საკითხი, სადაც მნიშვნელოვანია ტექნოლოგიური შესაძლებლობების, საფრთხეების, პასუხისმგებლობისა და ინფორმაციის გადამოწმების საჭიროების მკაფიო ახსნა.

კვლევა ეფუძნება შერეულ კონტენტ-ანალიზს. საწყისი აუდიტის 230 კოდირების ბარათიდან ძირითად ანალიტიკურ კორპუსში შევიდა 195 ვალიდური პუბლიკაცია. კორპუსი მოიცავს ITV.ge-ის, Euronews Georgia-ს, Imedi News-ისა და Rustavi 2-ის ციფრულ პლატფორმებზე გამოქვეყნებულ მასალებს. თითოეული პუბლიკაცია კოდირებული იყო დომინანტური შინაარსობრივი კატეგორიის მიხედვით. დამატებით შეფასდა ტექნოლოგიური ობიექტები, ფუნქციური აქცენტები, რისკის ელემენტები, ნდობასთან დაკავშირებული საკითხები და მედიაწიგნიერების კომპონენტები.

შედეგები აჩვენებს, რომ კორპუსში ყველაზე მეტად ჩანს ტექნოლოგიური და ბიზნესზე ორიენტირებული გაშუქება: ეს კატეგორია მოიცავს 93 პუბლიკაციას, ანუ ანალიტიკური კორპუსის 47.7%-ს. თუმცა გაშუქება მხოლოდ ოპტიმისტური არ არის. „მითი-კომშარის“ კატეგორია მოიცავს 36 პუბლიკაციას, გლობალური პოლიტიკური კონკურენცია/საინფორმაციო ომი - 24 პუბლიკაციას, ხოლო მედიაწიგნიერება/ფაქტჩეკი დომინანტურ კატეგორიად გვხვდება 26 პუბლიკაციაში. სტატიის მთავარი არგუმენტია, რომ განხილულ კორპუსში AI-ის ნარატივი ძირითადად ინოვაციაზეა ორიენტირებული, თუმცა რისკებსაც წარმოაჩენს და ნდობის საკითხებზეა დამოკიდებული. მცირე ენობრივი მედიის გარემოში ეს განსაკუთრებით მნიშვნელოვანია, რადგან ტრადიციული მედიის ციფრული პლატფორმები გლობალურ ტექნოლოგიურ ცვლილებებს ადგილობრივ საჯარო კომუნიკაციად გარდაქმნიან.

O33; O32; D83; O35

<https://doi.org/10.46361/2449-2604.13.2.2026.87-106>

JEL კლასიფიკაცია:

მიღებულია:

01.07.2026

რეცენზირებულია:

03.08.2026

დამტკიცებულია:

31.08.2026

Corresponding author. Mariam.kebadzee@gmail.com



© Copyright, 2026 by the author(s)

1. Introduction and Review of Literature

Artificial intelligence has moved from being a specialized technological topic to becoming a visible issue of public communication. Generative AI systems, chatbots, synthetic content, automated decision-support tools and AI-assisted services are increasingly discussed not only in relation to technological progress, but also in relation to trust, risk, regulation, professional responsibility and social change. As a result, public understanding of artificial intelligence is shaped not only by technical experts, developers or policymakers, but also by media organizations that select, interpret and circulate AI-related information.

Traditional media remain important actors in this process, even when their content is distributed through digital platforms. In small-language media environments, this role becomes especially significant. Global technological developments often enter local public discourse through translated, adapted or selectively interpreted media narratives. Therefore, the way traditional media's digital platforms present artificial intelligence can influence which aspects of technological change become visible: innovation and opportunity, risk and uncertainty, or trust and responsible use. This does not mean that media coverage directly determines public opinion. However, it does mean that media narratives participate in organizing the communicative environment in which AI is understood, discussed and evaluated.

The rapid public visibility of generative AI has intensified this issue. On the one hand, AI is frequently associated with innovation, productivity, creativity, education, business transformation and new forms of service delivery. On the other hand, it is linked to risks such as misinformation, deepfakes, privacy concerns, algorithmic opacity, factual inaccuracy and the possible weakening of human accountability. Between these two poles, trust becomes a central communicative problem. Public communication about AI must not simply promote technological optimism or amplify technological fear. It must explain what AI systems can do, where their limitations lie, who is responsible for their use and how users can evaluate their outputs.

This article examines how artificial intelligence narratives are organized on the digital platforms of Georgian traditional media. It focuses on three interrelated narrative dimensions: trust, risk and innovation. The article does not treat AI-related coverage only as a matter of media representation. Instead, it approaches such coverage as a public communication management issue. From this perspective, media narratives help define how technological change is made understandable, what risks are prioritized, what opportunities are emphasized and how responsibility is communicated.

The empirical focus of the article is the digital platforms of selected Georgian traditional media outlets. The study draws on a mixed content analysis of AI-related materials and examines how these platforms present artificial intelligence, bots, chatbots, generative AI and related technological developments. The aim is not to measure audience attitudes or to claim direct media effects. Rather, the article analyzes the structure of media narratives and asks how AI is communicatively positioned between trust, risk and innovation.

The article is guided by the following research question: How do the digital platforms of Georgian traditional media organize artificial intelligence narratives across trust, risk and innovation, and why does this matter for managing public communication in a small-language digital environment?

By addressing this question, the article contributes to interdisciplinary discussions on digital communication management, innovation communication and media narratives. Its contribution is threefold. First, it shifts attention from AI as a purely technological object to AI as a public communication issue. Second, it examines how traditional media's digital platforms translate global AI developments into a local media environment. Third, it proposes that trust, risk and innovation should be analyzed together, because public communication about AI becomes incomplete when one of these dimensions dominates at the expense of the others.

The article proceeds as follows. The remainder of this section reviews literature on AI communication, trust, risk and innovation narratives. The methodology section explains the research design, corpus and analytical categories. The results and discussion section presents the distribution of AI-related narratives across the selected media platforms and interprets these findings through the lens of public communication management. The

Corresponding author: Mariam.kebadzee@gmail.com



conclusion then summarizes the implications for responsible AI communication in small-language digital media environments.

1.1. Artificial Intelligence as a Public Communication Issue

Artificial intelligence is no longer only a technical domain. In contemporary digital communication, AI systems increasingly participate in text generation, information processing, user interaction, content personalization and decision-support practices (Bender et al., 2021; OpenAI, 2023). This shift makes AI not only a technological development, but also a public communication issue. The question is no longer limited to what AI systems can do technically. It also concerns how these systems are explained, evaluated, trusted, regulated and socially interpreted.

This article approaches AI communication through the digital platforms of traditional media. Traditional media organizations remain important intermediaries even when they operate in platformized digital environments (Gillespie, 2014). Their role is not limited to publishing information. They select technological events, translate them into publicly understandable narratives, connect them with risks or opportunities and make certain actors, systems and concerns more visible than others.

This role is especially important in a small-language media environment. Global AI developments often emerge in larger technological, political and linguistic contexts. When these developments enter Georgian public communication, they are mediated through translation, adaptation, selection and contextualization. Therefore, the study of AI-related media coverage is also a study of how global technological change becomes locally meaningful.

1.2. Human-Machine Communication and AI-Mediated Communication

Human-Machine Communication provides an important theoretical basis for understanding AI as more than a passive tool. Guzman and Lewis (2020) argue that communicative AI challenges the traditional view of technology as merely a channel of communication. In many cases, users interact with AI systems as if they were communicative partners: they ask questions, receive answers, evaluate responses and form expectations about the system's reliability.

This perspective does not mean that AI systems should be treated as human beings or as conscious agents. In this article, the notion of AI as a communicative actor is used analytically. It refers to the observable role of AI systems in communication processes, not to human-like intention or awareness. This distinction is important because media narratives may sometimes anthropomorphize AI systems or present them as autonomous agents without sufficiently explaining their technical and institutional limits; experimental research on chatbots also shows that anthropomorphic design cues can influence perceptions of conversational agents (Araujo, 2018).

AI-mediated communication further expands this framework. Hancock, Naaman and Levy (2020) define AI-mediated communication as interpersonal communication in which an intelligent agent operates on behalf of a communicator by modifying, augmenting or generating messages. This is relevant for generative AI because AI systems may not only communicate with users directly, but also help humans produce messages for other humans. In such cases, AI becomes a mediator of communication, shaping the form, tone, structure and sometimes the content of messages.

For media analysis, these approaches help explain why AI-related coverage should not be reduced to technology reporting. AI systems are represented as tools, assistants, generators, intermediaries, sources of uncertainty and potential communicative actors. The public meaning of AI is therefore constructed at the intersection of technological capacity, media representation and social interpretation.

1.3. Framing, Visibility and Narrative Organization

Framing theory is central to this article because it explains how media texts organize the meaning of complex issues. Entman (1993) defines framing as the selection of certain aspects of perceived reality and making them more salient in a communicative text, while D'Angelo (2002) emphasizes that framing research operates as a multiparadigmatic research program. This approach is useful for AI coverage because the same technological

Corresponding author. Mariam.kebadzee@gmail.com



© Copyright, 2026 by the author(s)

development may be presented through different interpretive frames: innovation, risk, economic opportunity, public threat, regulatory challenge or media literacy issue.

Framing does not imply that audiences automatically adopt the media's interpretation. Scheufele (1999) distinguishes between media frames and individual frames, which means that media content analysis can identify patterns of representation but cannot directly measure audience perception. This article follows that limitation. It analyzes media narratives and does not claim to measure public attitudes toward AI.

Agenda-setting is also relevant, but it is used in a limited and precise way. McCombs and Shaw's agenda-setting tradition highlights the importance of issue visibility in media communication (McCombs & Shaw, 1972; McCombs, 2005). In this article, visibility is examined through the frequency and distribution of AI-related materials across the selected platforms. However, media visibility is not treated as direct evidence of public opinion. It shows how much attention the analyzed platforms gave to AI-related topics within the selected corpus. The article also draws on the logic of second-level agenda-setting, which focuses not only on whether an issue is visible, but also on which attributes are attached to it (McCombs et al., 2000; Scheufele & Tewksbury, 2007). AI may be visible as a business tool, a creative resource, a geopolitical issue, a source of disinformation, a risk to privacy or a subject of verification. These attributes are important because they shape the narrative environment in which AI becomes publicly understandable.

1.4. Trust, Risk and Innovation as Interrelated Narrative Axes

The article's conceptual framework is built around three interrelated narrative axes: trust, risk and innovation. These are not treated as separate empirical coding categories. Instead, they function as broader interpretive dimensions through which the coded media categories are analyzed.

Innovation narratives present AI as a source of technological progress, business transformation, educational opportunity, creative experimentation, public-sector modernization or everyday practical use. Such narratives are important because they make AI visible as part of digital transformation. However, innovation narratives can become limited if they focus mainly on products, brands or novelty while underexplaining limitations, risks and accountability.

Risk narratives present AI through uncertainty, misuse, manipulation, information disorder, deepfakes, cybersecurity, privacy, labor displacement, copyright or geopolitical competition. These narratives are important because AI-related public communication cannot responsibly ignore possible harms. Studies of social bots and low-credibility content show why automated or AI-supported communication can become relevant to information disorder, while recent regulatory frameworks also treat synthetic content and deepfakes as transparency challenges (Assenmacher et al., 2020; European Parliament and Council of the European Union, 2024; Gorwa & Guilbeault, 2020; Shao et al., 2018; Yang & Menczer, 2024). At the same time, risk narratives require balance. If AI is communicated only through threat, public understanding may become dominated by fear rather than informed evaluation.

Trust narratives connect AI coverage to verification, media literacy, factual accuracy, transparency, human oversight and responsible use. Trust is not understood here as unconditional confidence in AI systems. Rather, it refers to calibrated trust: the ability to evaluate when AI can be useful, when its output requires verification and where human responsibility remains necessary. This is especially important in relation to generative AI, where fluent language can create an impression of reliability even when factual accuracy is uncertain (Bender et al., 2021; OpenAI, 2023).

The three axes are analytically connected. Innovation without trust may become promotional. Risk without trust may become fear-based. Trust without awareness of both opportunities and risks may remain abstract. Therefore, responsible public communication about AI requires the simultaneous explanation of technological potential, social risks and verification practices.

1.5. Media Narratives in Small-Language Digital Environments

The small-language context is an important part of this article's contribution. AI systems, products and policy debates are often developed in global technological centers and larger linguistic environments. Georgian

Corresponding author: Mariam.kebadzee@gmail.com



media platforms mediate these developments for local audiences by translating, summarizing and contextualizing global AI-related news. In platformized media environments, this mediation is also shaped by visibility mechanisms and algorithmic forms of selection (Gillespie, 2014).

This mediation creates both opportunities and risks. On the one hand, traditional media platforms can make AI more understandable by connecting it to local education, business, public services, culture and language-related issues. On the other hand, if coverage depends too heavily on international product news or global competition narratives, local public communication may underrepresent questions of Georgian-language accessibility, local digital capacity and public media literacy.

In this sense, the study of Georgian AI-related media coverage is not only a national case study. It also contributes to broader discussions about how small-language media environments absorb and reinterpret global technological change. The article therefore treats Georgian traditional media's digital platforms as spaces where AI is translated into local public meaning through the interaction of innovation, risk and trust narratives.

1.6. Conceptual Model of the Article

Based on the literature reviewed above, the article uses the following conceptual model. AI-related media coverage is understood as public communication about technological change. Dominant media categories are identified through content analysis. These categories are interpreted through three broader narrative axes: innovation, risk and trust. The interaction among these axes is used to evaluate how selected Georgian traditional media platforms organize AI-related narratives. The analysis remains limited to media texts and does not make claims about audience effects, editorial intention or the technical performance of AI systems.

This model allows the article to remain empirically grounded and theoretically focused. It connects media representation, digital communication management and innovation-related public discourse without turning the article into a compressed version of the dissertation.

2. Methodology

2.1. Research Design

This article is based on a mixed content analysis of artificial intelligence-related materials published on the digital platforms of selected Georgian traditional media outlets. The research design combines quantitative mapping with qualitative interpretation. The quantitative component identifies the distribution of AI-related coverage across platforms and dominant content categories. The qualitative component interprets these categories through three broader narrative axes: trust, risk and innovation. This design follows the logic of systematic content analysis, where quantitative description and qualitative interpretation are used together to identify recurring patterns in media texts (Krippendorff, 2019; Neuendorf, 2017; Schreier, 2012).

The purpose of the study is not to measure audience attitudes or to evaluate the technical performance of AI systems. Instead, the article examines how AI is made visible and meaningful through media narratives. This approach is appropriate for the article's central question: how do the digital platforms of Georgian traditional media organize artificial intelligence narratives across trust, risk and innovation, and why does this matter for managing public communication in a small-language digital environment?

2.2. Corpus and Media Selection

The empirical corpus consists of materials published on the digital platforms of four Georgian traditional media outlets: 1TV.ge, Euronews Georgia, Imedi News and Rustavi 2. These platforms were selected because they represent different institutional and editorial profiles within Georgia's traditional media environment while also operating as digital news platforms.

The initial audit included 230 individual coding cards. After applying inclusion and exclusion criteria, 195 valid publications remained in the main analytical corpus. The remaining 35 records were retained for audit purposes but were excluded from the main analysis because artificial intelligence, bots or related technologies were mentioned only marginally, or because the publication did not fully meet the predefined criteria.

The final corpus is distributed across the four platforms as follows: 36 publications from 1TV.ge, 57 from Euronews Georgia, 60 from Imedi News and 42 from Rustavi 2.

Corresponding author: Mariam.kebadzee@gmail.com



2.3. Unit of Analysis and Inclusion Criteria

The unit of analysis is an individual news item or media material published on the selected digital platforms. A publication was included in the main corpus if artificial intelligence, bots, chatbots, generative AI, deepfakes or closely related technological issues constituted a central or substantially relevant topic of the material.

Materials were excluded from the main analytical corpus when AI or bots were mentioned only incidentally, when the publication lacked sufficient textual content for coding, when the material was duplicated, or when the main topic did not correspond to the research focus. This procedure was used to ensure that the analysis reflects substantive AI-related coverage rather than passing references to technology.

2.4. Coding Logic and Analytical Categories

Each publication was coded according to a dominant content category. The dominant category was determined on the basis of the title, lead, central topic and overall emphasis of the publication. This principle allowed each item to be assigned to one primary category for quantitative comparison, while additional analytical fields made it possible to capture functional, risk-related and trust-related elements. The coding logic follows the general principles of qualitative content analysis, in which categories are used to structure textual material while preserving interpretive transparency (Schreier, 2012).

The five dominant content categories used in the analysis are: technological / business news; global political competition / information war; “myth-idyll”; “myth-nightmare”; and media literacy / fact-checking. For the purposes of this article, these categories are interpreted through three broader narrative axes. Innovation narratives include coverage that presents AI as a technological, business, educational, creative or service-related opportunity. Risk narratives include coverage that emphasizes security, misinformation, deepfakes, political competition, information disorder, privacy concerns or regulatory uncertainty. Trust narratives include coverage related to verification, media literacy, factual accuracy, source transparency, human oversight and responsible use.

The three narrative axes are not treated as mutually exclusive coding categories. Rather, they function as an interpretive framework for understanding how the dominant empirical categories contribute to broader public communication patterns. This distinction is important because a single publication may contain elements of innovation, risk and trust, even when one dominant content category is assigned for analytical consistency.

2.5. Data Analysis

The analysis proceeded in three stages. First, the corpus was mapped quantitatively by platform and dominant content category. This stage made it possible to identify the relative visibility of AI-related materials across the selected platforms and to determine which content categories were most frequent in the corpus. Second, the dominant categories were interpreted in relation to the article’s three narrative axes: trust, risk and innovation. This stage examined how technological and business-oriented news, risk-oriented narratives, idealized or fear-based representations, and media literacy or fact-checking materials contribute to the public communication of AI.

Third, cross-platform differences were examined in order to identify whether selected media outlets emphasized AI-related issues differently. The analysis considered not only the number of publications, but also the thematic orientation of coverage, the visibility of specific AI systems and the presence of risk, trust and innovation-related elements.

2.6. Scope and Limitations

The findings describe the analyzed corpus of selected Georgian traditional media platforms and should not be generalized to the entire Georgian media system. The study does not measure audience perception, public opinion or behavioral effects. Therefore, the article does not claim that media coverage directly shapes public attitudes toward AI. It examines how AI-related narratives are organized within media texts.

The study also does not conduct a technical evaluation of AI systems, bots or chatbots. Named AI systems are analyzed only in terms of their visibility and narrative function in media coverage. Similarly, the



article does not identify social media bot activity or coordinated inauthentic behavior. Its focus is limited to media narratives and their relevance for managing public communication about AI.

The corpus was coded by a single researcher. While formal intercoder reliability testing was not conducted, the coding categories were operationally defined prior to data collection and applied consistently across all 195 units. This is acknowledged as a limitation of the study.

These limitations are intentional. They allow the article to remain analytically precise and empirically grounded. Within these boundaries, the study offers evidence on how selected Georgian traditional media platforms translate global AI-related developments into local digital public communication.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Corpus Distribution and General Structure of AI-Related Coverage

The final analytical corpus consists of 195 valid AI-related publications selected from an initial audit of 230 coding cards. The excluded 35 records were retained for audit purposes but were not included in the main analysis because they did not fully meet the inclusion criteria. The corpus covers four digital platforms of Georgian traditional media: 1TV.ge, Euronews Georgia, Imedi News and Rustavi 2.

The distribution of the final corpus by platform shows that AI-related coverage was not evenly represented across the selected outlets. Imedi News accounted for the largest number of valid publications, followed by Euronews Georgia, Rustavi 2 and 1TV.ge.

Table 1. Distribution of valid publications by platform

Platform	Valid publications included in the analysis
1TV.ge	36
Euronews Georgia	57
Imedi News	60
Rustavi 2	42
Total	195

This distribution indicates that AI-related topics were visible across all four selected platforms, but with different levels of intensity. Imedi News and Euronews Georgia together accounted for more than half of the analyzed corpus, while Rustavi 2 and 1TV.ge contributed smaller but still analytically meaningful segments. Since the purpose of this article is not to measure the entire Georgian media system, these figures should be understood as describing the selected corpus rather than the full national media landscape.

The dominant content categories reveal a clear imbalance in the narrative structure of AI-related coverage. The most frequent category was technological and business news, which included 93 publications and represented 47.7% of the corpus. This means that nearly half of the analyzed materials presented AI primarily through technological development, product news, business application, market competition or digital transformation.

At the same time, the corpus does not support the conclusion that AI was covered only through an optimistic innovation narrative. Risk-oriented, verification-oriented and geopolitical narratives were also visible. The “myth-nightmare” category included 36 publications, while global political competition and information war accounted for 24 publications. Media literacy and fact-checking formed the dominant category in 26 publications. The “myth-idyll” category, which captures strongly positive or idealized expectations toward AI, was less frequent, with 16 publications.

Table 2. Dominant content categories in AI-related coverage

Dominant content category	N	%
Technological / business news	93	47.7

Corresponding author. Mariam.kebadzee@gmail.com



© Copyright, 2026 by the author(s)

Dominant content category	N	%
Global political competition / information war	24	12.3
“Myth-idyll” / idealized expectation	16	8.2
“Myth-nightmare” / threat-oriented expectation	36	18.5
Media literacy / fact-checking	26	13.3
Total	195	100.0

For the purposes of this article, these five empirical categories are interpreted through three broader narrative axes: innovation, risk and trust. The innovation axis is most clearly visible in technological and business news, as well as in materials that present AI through positive expectations. The risk axis is reflected in threat-oriented coverage, geopolitical competition, information war, deepfakes, cybersecurity and data-related concerns. The trust axis is most clearly visible in media literacy, fact-checking, verification and responsible-use narratives. This structure is important because it shows that AI-related public communication on the selected platforms is not organized around a single narrative. Instead, AI appears as a technological opportunity, a source of uncertainty, a field of geopolitical and informational competition, and an object requiring verification and public explanation. The interaction among these dimensions forms the core empirical basis of this article.

3.2. Innovation Narratives: AI as Technological and Business Transformation

Innovation-oriented coverage forms the most visible part of the analyzed corpus. The technological and business news category includes 93 publications, representing 47.7% of all valid materials. This makes it the largest dominant category in the study and indicates that the selected Georgian traditional media platforms frequently presented AI as a field of technological development, product innovation, business transformation and practical application.

This innovation narrative appears in several thematic contexts. Business and labor-related uses of AI were mentioned in 49 cases, while education appeared in 38 cases and creative industries in 26 cases. These figures show that AI was not framed only as an abstract technology. It was also connected to concrete areas of social and organizational life, including work, learning, creativity, services and digital transformation.

Table 3. Innovation-related thematic contexts

Innovation-related thematic context	Mentions
Business and labor	49
Education	38
Creative industries	26
Media and journalism	25
Public administration and politics	30
Everyday use	9

The visibility of business and labor-related contexts suggests that AI was frequently connected to productivity, organizational change, market competition and the future of work. Such coverage contributes to an innovation narrative in which AI is presented as a tool that may transform professional routines, business models and service delivery. However, the presence of business and labor themes does not automatically imply a purely positive interpretation. In some cases, AI-related labor narratives may also contain uncertainty about automation, professional adaptation or changing human roles.

Education is another important area within the innovation narrative. Its presence in 38 cases suggests that the selected media platforms linked AI to learning, digital skills, educational tools or institutional adaptation. In the context of public communication management, this is significant because education-oriented coverage may help translate complex technological change into more socially understandable and practically relevant terms. At the same time, educational narratives require careful communication: AI should not be presented only as a universal solution, but as a tool whose usefulness depends on accuracy, responsible use and human guidance.

Creative industries also appear as a visible area of AI-related communication. With 26 mentions, this context includes materials related to visual generation, synthetic media, creativity, cultural production or AI-assisted content creation. These topics contribute to the innovation narrative by showing AI as a creative resource. However, they also create a bridge between innovation and risk, especially when synthetic content, authenticity, copyright, deepfakes or audience deception become relevant.

The innovation narrative is further reinforced by the visibility of named AI systems. ChatGPT was the most frequently named system in the corpus, appearing in 21 publications. DeepSeek appeared in 8 publications, while other systems such as Grok, Sora, Gemini, KAI, Apple Intelligence, Meta AI and Ai-Da appeared less frequently. The presence of named systems indicates that AI coverage is not only conceptual; it is also organized around recognizable technological actors and products.

From the perspective of managing AI narratives, the dominance of technological and business news is a double-edged finding. On the one hand, it shows that AI is communicated as a relevant part of innovation, digital transformation and practical application. On the other hand, if innovation narratives are not accompanied by sufficient explanation of limits, risks and accountability, public communication may become overly product-centered or promotional. Therefore, the importance of innovation coverage lies not only in its frequency, but also in how it is balanced with trust and risk narratives.

3.3. Risk Narratives: Deepfakes, Security and Information Disorder

Risk-oriented narratives form an important part of AI-related coverage in the analyzed corpus. Although technological and business news is the largest dominant category, the data show that AI is not represented only through innovation and progress. Risk, uncertainty, misuse, information disorder and security-related concerns are also visible across the selected Georgian traditional media platforms.

At the level of dominant content categories, risk is most clearly reflected in two categories: “myth-nightmare” and global political competition / information war. The “myth-nightmare” category includes 36 publications, representing 18.5% of the corpus. Global political competition and information war account for 24 publications, or 12.3%. Together, these categories show that AI-related risk is communicated not only as a technological problem, but also as a geopolitical, informational and social issue.

Table 4. Risk-related dominant categories

Risk-related dominant category	N	%
“Myth-nightmare” / threat-oriented expectation	36	18.5
Global political competition / information war	24	12.3

The risk dimension becomes clearer when additional thematic directions are considered. The most frequently mentioned risk direction is disinformation and deepfakes, with 24 mentions. This indicates that synthetic content and manipulated information are among the most visible concerns in the corpus. Such coverage links AI to the broader problem of information disorder and highlights the difficulty of distinguishing authentic content from artificially generated or manipulated material.

Table 5. Risk directions in the analyzed corpus

Risk direction	Mentions	Share of the main corpus (%)
Disinformation and deepfakes	24	12.3
Security misuse	6	3.1
Psychological and social dependency	6	3.1
Factual accuracy and hallucination	6	3.1
Labor replacement	5	2.6
Personal data and privacy	4	2.1
Copyright	3	1.5
Energy consumption and environment	1	0.5

The prominence of disinformation and deepfakes suggests that AI-related risk is often communicated through the lens of trust in information. In this sense, risk narratives are not isolated from trust narratives. When media materials discuss deepfakes, manipulated images, synthetic video or AI-generated false information, they also raise the question of how audiences, journalists and institutions can verify information and maintain credibility in a changing digital environment.

Security and data-related contexts also play an important role. In the broader thematic mapping, security and data appear in 51 mentions, representing 26.2% of the main corpus. This makes security and data the most frequently mentioned thematic context. The result indicates that AI is often connected to concerns about digital security, data protection, technological misuse and the vulnerability of users or institutions.

The platform-level distribution shows that risk-oriented coverage varies across outlets. The “myth-nightmare” category is most visible within Euronews Georgia’s internal corpus, where it accounts for 28.1% of the platform’s analyzed publications. It is also present in 1TV.ge at 19.4% and in Imedi News at 16.7%, while it is considerably less visible in Rustavi 2 at 7.1%. This suggests that threat-oriented AI narratives are not evenly distributed across the selected platforms.

This finding should be interpreted carefully. It does not mean that one platform is “more negative” toward AI in a general sense. Rather, it shows that within the analyzed corpus, some platforms gave comparatively more space to threat-oriented AI representations. These differences may reflect the types of international stories selected, the thematic orientation of coverage or the specific events that became newsworthy during the study period.

Risk narratives also show that AI is not communicated only as a future-oriented technology. It is presented as a present communicative challenge: a technology already connected to misinformation, political competition, data concerns, security misuse and uncertainty about human roles. From the perspective of public communication management, this is significant because responsible AI communication must explain not only what AI can enable, but also what conditions, safeguards and verification practices are required for its responsible use.

3.4. Trust Narratives: Verification, Media Literacy and Responsible Use

Trust is the third major narrative axis of the article. In the analyzed corpus, trust-oriented communication is most clearly visible through the media literacy / fact-checking category and through risk-related themes such as factual accuracy, hallucination, source reliability, disinformation and deepfakes. Trust does not appear as a

single isolated topic. Rather, it emerges where media coverage addresses the reliability of AI-generated information, the need for verification and the public ability to recognize manipulated or synthetic content.

At the level of dominant content categories, media literacy / fact-checking accounts for 26 publications, representing 13.3% of the main corpus. This category is especially important because it connects AI coverage to public explanation, verification practices and user awareness. Unlike purely technological news, media literacy and fact-checking materials do not simply introduce AI as a product or innovation. They address the conditions under which AI-related content can be trusted, questioned or verified.

Table 6. Media literacy / fact-checking as a trust-related dominant category

Trust-related dominant category	N	%
Media literacy / fact-checking	26	13.3

The trust dimension is also visible in the risk table. Factual accuracy and hallucination appear in 6 mentions, while personal data and privacy appear in 4 mentions. Although these numbers are smaller than the disinformation and deepfake category, they are analytically important. They show that the trust problem is not limited to intentionally manipulated content. It also includes uncertainty about AI-generated answers, factual reliability, data protection and the boundaries of responsible use.

The platform-level distribution shows that media literacy / fact-checking is not equally present across the selected outlets. It accounts for 19.0% of Rustavi 2's internal corpus and 18.3% of Imedi News's internal corpus. The same category is lower in Euronews Georgia at 10.5% and especially low in 1TV.ge at 2.8%. These differences suggest that some platforms more frequently framed AI-related issues through verification, public awareness and explanatory content, while others placed greater emphasis on technological, political or risk-oriented narratives.

Table 7. Platform distribution of media literacy and fact-checking

Platform	Media literacy / fact-checking as share of platform corpus (%)
1TV.ge	2.8
Euronews Georgia	10.5
Imedi News	18.3
Rustavi 2	19.0

Trust narratives are closely connected to the problem of synthetic content. When coverage discusses deepfakes, manipulated media or AI-generated misinformation, the underlying issue is not only technological risk but also the public credibility of information. In this sense, trust narratives serve a corrective function. They help explain how AI-generated or AI-manipulated content can be recognized, questioned and contextualized.

However, the data also suggest that trust-oriented coverage is less frequent than innovation-oriented coverage. Technological and business news accounts for 47.7% of the corpus, while media literacy / fact-checking accounts for 13.3%. This imbalance is important for the article's argument. It indicates that AI is more often presented as a technological and practical development than as a topic requiring systematic public verification and trust-building.

This does not mean that trust is absent from the corpus. Rather, it appears in a more distributed form: through media literacy, fact-checking, deepfake-related coverage, factual accuracy, privacy and responsible-use concerns. From the perspective of managing AI narratives, this distributed structure matters because public trust in AI cannot be built only through positive stories about innovation. It also depends on whether media communication explains limits, risks, human oversight and verification practices.

Therefore, trust narratives should be understood as a necessary balancing mechanism between innovation and risk. If innovation narratives dominate without trust-related explanation, AI may be represented as a product-centered or solutionist technology. If risk narratives dominate without trust-building elements, AI may be

Corresponding author: Mariam.kebadzee@gmail.com



represented mainly through fear and uncertainty. A balanced public communication strategy requires the simultaneous presence of technological explanation, risk clarification and verification-oriented media literacy.

3.5. Platform Differences: Uneven Narrative Profiles Across the Selected Media Outlets

The platform-level comparison shows that AI-related narratives were not distributed uniformly across the selected Georgian traditional media platforms. Although technological and business news was the most frequent category across all four outlets, each platform displayed a different internal balance between innovation, risk and trust-related content.

Table 8. Dominant content categories by platform

Dominant content category	1TV.ge (%)	Euronews Georgia (%)	Imedi News (%)	Rustavi 2 (%)	Total (%)
Technological / business news	52.8	42.1	45.0	54.8	47.7
Global political competition / information war	13.9	12.3	11.7	11.9	12.3
“Myth-idyll” / idealized expectation	11.1	7.0	8.3	7.1	8.2
“Myth-nightmare” / threat-oriented expectation	19.4	28.1	16.7	7.1	18.5
Media literacy / fact-checking	2.8	10.5	18.3	19.0	13.3

The technological and business news category was the most visible category on all four platforms. Its share was highest on Rustavi 2, where it accounted for 54.8% of the platform’s internal corpus, followed by 1TV.ge with 52.8%. Imedi News also showed a strong technological and business orientation, with 45.0%, while Euronews Georgia had the lowest share in this category, with 42.1%. This indicates that innovation-oriented coverage was present across the entire corpus, but its relative dominance was particularly strong on Rustavi 2 and 1TV.ge.

Euronews Georgia displayed the strongest risk-oriented profile. The “myth-nightmare” category accounted for 28.1% of its internal corpus, which is considerably higher than the total corpus average of 18.5%. This suggests that, within the analyzed materials, Euronews Georgia more frequently linked AI to threat-oriented expectations, uncertainty, geopolitical competition, technological disruption or security-related concerns. This pattern should not be interpreted as a general editorial attitude toward AI. It only describes the internal structure of the selected AI-related corpus.

1TV.ge also showed a notable presence of risk-oriented content, with the “myth-nightmare” category accounting for 19.4% of its internal corpus. At the same time, 1TV.ge had the lowest share of media literacy / fact-checking materials, with only 2.8%. This creates a specific profile: AI was relatively visible as a technological and business topic, and risk-oriented elements were present, but verification-oriented or media literacy content was less prominent in comparison with the other platforms.

Imedi News displayed a more balanced distribution between innovation, risk and trust-related content. Technological and business news accounted for 45.0% of its internal corpus, while “myth-nightmare” accounted for 16.7% and media literacy / fact-checking accounted for 18.3%. This suggests that Imedi News combined

Corresponding author. Mariam.kebadzee@gmail.com



© Copyright, 2026 by the author(s)

practical and technology-oriented coverage with a relatively visible trust-related dimension, especially through materials connected to public awareness, verification and everyday risks.

Rustavi 2 showed the strongest combination of innovation and trust-oriented coverage. It had the highest share of technological and business news, with 54.8%, and the highest share of media literacy / fact-checking, with 19.0%. At the same time, it had the lowest share of “myth-nightmare” coverage, with 7.1%. This indicates that, within the analyzed corpus, Rustavi 2 more often presented AI as a practical, educational, business-related or media-related issue, while threat-oriented narratives were comparatively less visible.

The share of global political competition / information war was relatively stable across all platforms, ranging from 11.7% to 13.9%. This suggests that geopolitical and information-war-related interpretations were present across the selected media environment, but did not strongly differentiate one platform from another. In contrast, the largest differences appeared in the “myth-nightmare” and media literacy / fact-checking categories, which are directly relevant to the article’s risk and trust dimensions.

These platform differences are important for understanding AI narrative management. The analyzed platforms do not simply reproduce one shared AI narrative. Rather, they organize AI-related communication through different internal balances. Some platforms emphasize technological and business transformation more strongly, others give more space to threat-oriented coverage, and others make verification or media literacy more visible. Therefore, the public communication of AI in the selected Georgian media corpus should be understood as plural and uneven rather than homogeneous.

3.6. Visibility of Named AI Systems and Technological Actors

The corpus also shows that AI-related coverage is organized not only around abstract technological concepts, but also around named systems, products and technological actors. The most visible named system in the analyzed corpus is ChatGPT, which appears in 21 publications. DeepSeek appears in 8 publications and is especially connected to international technological competition and data security issues. Other named systems appear less frequently, including Grok, Sora, Gemini, the Georgian-speaking AI system “KAI,” Apple Intelligence, ChatGPT Atlas, Meta AI, Ai-Da and Agentic AI.

The visibility of ChatGPT is analytically important because it suggests that public communication about AI is often anchored in recognizable and widely discussed systems. Instead of discussing artificial intelligence only as a general technological field, media coverage frequently translates AI into specific names, products and examples. This makes AI more concrete for audiences, but it can also narrow public understanding if one system becomes a symbolic substitute for the broader and more diverse field of artificial intelligence.

DeepSeek’s visibility has a different narrative function. Its appearance in 8 publications is connected particularly to international technological competition and data security. This positions DeepSeek not only as a product or system, but also as part of a broader geopolitical and innovation-related narrative. In this case, AI is communicated through the language of competition, technological capacity, national or corporate rivalry and possible data-related concerns.

The Georgian-speaking AI system “KAI” has a distinct local significance. Its appearance on 1TV.ge and Rustavi 2 indicates that AI coverage in the corpus does not only depend on global systems. Local AI-related initiatives also become visible, especially when they are connected to language, public communication, education or national technological adaptation. This is particularly relevant in a small-language media environment, where the availability and quality of Georgian-language AI systems may become an important issue of digital inclusion and technological localization.

The platform distribution of named systems also shows different emphases. ChatGPT appears across Euronews Georgia, Imedi News and Rustavi 2. DeepSeek is especially visible within Euronews Georgia’s international technological coverage. Grok and Sora also appear mainly in Euronews Georgia’s international technology-related materials. Gemini and Apple Intelligence are visible in Rustavi 2’s technology product coverage. These differences reinforce the previous finding that platforms do not organize AI narratives in exactly the same way.

Corresponding author. Mariam.kebadzee@gmail.com



In addition to named systems, the corpus identifies several broader types of AI-related systems. Generative chatbots or conversational systems are the most visible type, with 30 cases. Large language models or AI models appear in 20 cases. Synthetic media and deepfake-related systems appear in 11 cases. Robotic and autonomous systems, AI assistants and integrated products, virtual presenters or AI characters, and analytical or diagnostic systems appear with lower frequency.

Table 9. Types of AI-related systems visible in the corpus

Type of AI-related system	Total cases
Generative chatbot / conversational system	30
Large language model / AI model	20
Synthetic media / deepfake	11
Robotic and autonomous system	7
AI assistant and integrated product	7
Virtual presenter / AI character	6
Analytical / diagnostic system	5

This distribution supports one of the article's central arguments: AI is not represented as a single technological object. In the analyzed corpus, it appears as a conversational system, a language model, a synthetic media tool, an integrated product, an autonomous or robotic system, a virtual character and an analytical tool. Therefore, public communication about AI is not only about one technology, but about a cluster of systems with different functions, risks and public meanings.

From the perspective of managing AI narratives, the visibility of named systems and system types has two implications. First, it helps make AI understandable by connecting abstract technological change to concrete examples. Second, it may also simplify the public meaning of AI if coverage focuses mainly on well-known brands while giving less attention to underlying mechanisms, limitations, accountability and social implications. For this reason, named-system visibility should be interpreted together with the article's three broader axes: innovation, risk and trust.

The findings show that AI-related coverage on the selected Georgian traditional media platforms is organized through an uneven interaction of innovation, risk and trust. Technological and business news forms the largest part of the corpus, which indicates that artificial intelligence is most often made visible as a field of innovation, product development, business application and digital transformation. However, the corpus also contains substantial risk-oriented and verification-oriented content. This means that AI is not presented only as technological progress. It is also communicated as a source of uncertainty, information disorder, security concern and public trust challenge.

3.7. AI Narratives as Public Communication Management

The results support the article's main argument that AI-related media coverage should be understood not only as representation, but also as a form of public communication management. The selected media platforms do not simply report isolated technological events. They organize AI-related developments into recognizable narrative patterns: innovation, threat, competition, verification and public explanation.

This is especially important because artificial intelligence is a complex and rapidly changing field. For non-specialist audiences, media coverage may become one of the main ways through which AI is interpreted as socially meaningful. In this context, the management of AI narratives does not imply deliberate control of public opinion. Rather, it refers to the communicative organization of technological change: which aspects are made visible, which risks are emphasized, which opportunities are highlighted and which forms of responsibility are explained.

Corresponding author. Mariam.kebadzee@gmail.com



© Copyright, 2026 by the author(s)

The analyzed corpus shows that this organization is not homogeneous. The same broad topic, artificial intelligence, appears through different communicative roles. It is presented as a business tool, a technological product, a creative resource, a geopolitical issue, a source of disinformation risk and a subject of verification. This confirms that AI is not represented as a single technological object, but as a cluster of systems, meanings and social concerns.

3.8. Innovation Dominance and the Risk of Product-Centered Communication

The dominance of technological and business news suggests that innovation is the most visible narrative axis in the analyzed corpus. This finding is significant for the article's focus on digital communication and innovation management. AI is frequently connected to business, labor, education, creative industries, public administration, media and everyday use. Such coverage can help normalize AI as part of digital transformation and may make technological change more understandable through concrete examples.

At the same time, innovation-oriented coverage may become limited if it remains mainly product-centered. When AI is communicated primarily through new systems, brand names, product launches or business applications, public understanding may focus on novelty and functionality while paying less attention to limitations, accountability, reliability and social consequences. The visibility of named systems such as ChatGPT and DeepSeek shows that media coverage often makes AI concrete through recognizable technological actors. This can support public understanding, but it may also narrow the meaning of AI if the broader context is not explained.

Therefore, the key issue is not whether innovation coverage is present, but how it is balanced. Innovation narratives are important because they show the practical relevance of AI. However, they become more responsible when they are accompanied by explanations of what AI systems can and cannot do, how their outputs should be verified and where human oversight remains necessary.

3.9. Risk Narratives Beyond Technological Fear

Risk-oriented narratives in the corpus are not limited to general fear of technology. They are connected to several specific issues: disinformation, deepfakes, information war, security misuse, factual accuracy, privacy, labor replacement and copyright. This indicates that the risk dimension of AI coverage is multidimensional. AI is not only framed as a possible threat to individual users, but also as a challenge for information integrity, institutional trust and digital security.

The prominence of disinformation and deepfakes is particularly important. These issues connect AI risk directly to the credibility of public communication. When synthetic content becomes more difficult to distinguish from authentic content, the problem is not only technical. It becomes communicative and institutional: who verifies information, how audiences recognize manipulation and what role media organizations play in explaining these risks.

The category of global political competition and information war further expands the risk dimension. In these materials, AI is positioned not only as a tool or product, but also as part of international technological rivalry and information conflict. This suggests that Georgian traditional media's digital platforms also translate global AI developments through geopolitical and security-oriented narratives. Such coverage may be especially relevant for small-language media environments, where international technological competition is often mediated through translated and adapted news content.

However, the article does not interpret risk-oriented coverage as evidence of general technological pessimism. The data show a more nuanced picture. Risk narratives coexist with innovation narratives. AI is represented both as opportunity and as uncertainty. This coexistence is one of the most important findings of the study.

3.10. Trust as the Balancing Dimension

Trust appears as a necessary balancing dimension between innovation and risk. In the analyzed corpus, trust is most clearly visible through media literacy, fact-checking, verification, factual accuracy, privacy and responsible-use concerns. These themes do not dominate the corpus, but they are analytically important because

Corresponding author: Mariam.kebadzee@gmail.com



they show where media coverage moves from describing AI to explaining how AI-related information should be evaluated.

The relatively smaller share of media literacy and fact-checking compared with technological and business news suggests a potential imbalance. AI is more frequently presented as a field of innovation than as a subject requiring systematic public verification. This does not mean that trust-related coverage is absent. Rather, trust is distributed across several types of materials: fact-checking, deepfake-related warnings, explanations of misinformation, privacy concerns and discussions of factual reliability.

This distributed presence of trust is important. Public trust in AI cannot be built through positive narratives alone. It also depends on the visibility of limits, safeguards, human responsibility and verification practices. If innovation narratives dominate without trust-oriented explanation, AI may appear as a solutionist technology. If risk narratives dominate without trust-building elements, AI may appear mainly as a source of fear. Balanced AI communication requires both: explanation of opportunity and clarification of uncertainty.

3.11. Platform Differences and Narrative Plurality

The platform-level analysis shows that the selected outlets do not organize AI narratives in the same way. Technological and business news is the most visible category across all four platforms, but the internal balance of other categories differs. Euronews Georgia shows a stronger presence of threat-oriented coverage, while Rustavi 2 and Imedi News show comparatively higher shares of media literacy and fact-checking. 1TV.ge combines a strong technological and business orientation with a lower share of trust-oriented materials.

These differences should not be interpreted as direct evidence of editorial intention or institutional strategy. The study does not examine newsroom decision-making, editorial policy or audience reception. The results show only the internal structure of the analyzed corpus. Nevertheless, the differences are meaningful because they demonstrate that AI-related public communication is plural and uneven even within a relatively small selected media sample.

This plurality matters for narrative management. If different platforms emphasize different aspects of AI, audiences may encounter AI through different communicative pathways: product innovation, global competition, technological threat, media literacy or public service relevance. Such variation can enrich public communication when different dimensions complement one another. However, it can also create fragmented understanding if innovation, risk and trust remain disconnected.

3.12. Implications for a Small-Language Digital Media Environment

The Georgian case is important because it shows how global technological change is translated into a small-language digital media environment. AI systems, products and risks are often developed and debated in larger technological and linguistic contexts. Georgian traditional media platforms mediate these developments for local audiences by selecting, translating, summarizing and contextualizing them.

This creates a specific communication responsibility. In small-language contexts, public understanding of AI may depend heavily on how international developments are adapted into local media discourse. When coverage focuses on global systems such as ChatGPT, DeepSeek, Gemini, Sora or other named technologies, Georgian audiences encounter AI through externally developed products and international narratives. At the same time, the visibility of Georgian-language AI initiatives indicates the importance of localization, language accessibility and local technological adaptation.

For this reason, AI communication in Georgia should not be reduced to technology news. It is also a question of language, public explanation, media literacy, trust and digital inclusion. Traditional media platforms remain important intermediaries because they can connect global AI developments to local social, educational, business and institutional contexts.

3.13. Main Interpretive Argument

The central interpretive finding of the article is that AI-related coverage in the analyzed corpus is innovation-led, risk-aware and trust-dependent. Innovation is the most visible dimension, but it does not fully define the corpus. Risk narratives introduce concerns about disinformation, deepfakes, security, privacy and

Corresponding author: Mariam.kebadzee@gmail.com



geopolitical competition. Trust narratives, although less frequent, provide the communicative mechanism through which audiences may be encouraged to verify, question and responsibly interpret AI-related information.

This interaction among innovation, risk and trust is the main contribution of the article. It shows that managing AI narratives requires more than increasing the volume of AI coverage. It requires a balanced communicative structure in which technological opportunities are explained together with risks, limitations and accountability mechanisms. Within the selected Georgian traditional media corpus, this balance is present but uneven.

The findings therefore suggest that responsible public communication about AI should avoid two extremes. It should not present AI only as a symbol of progress, efficiency and innovation. It should also avoid reducing AI to threat, manipulation and uncertainty. A more responsible approach is to communicate AI as a complex technological and social development whose public meaning depends on the interaction of innovation, risk and trust.

4. Conclusions

This article examined how artificial intelligence narratives are organized on the digital platforms of selected Georgian traditional media outlets. Based on a mixed content analysis of 195 valid publications from 1TV.ge, Euronews Georgia, Imedi News and Rustavi 2, the study interpreted AI-related coverage through three broader narrative axes: trust, risk and innovation.

The findings show that innovation is the most visible narrative dimension in the analyzed corpus. Technological and business news accounts for the largest share of AI-related coverage, indicating that AI is frequently presented as a field of technological development, business application, educational opportunity, creative experimentation and digital transformation. This confirms that Georgian traditional media's digital platforms often translate AI into practical and recognizable contexts, rather than presenting it only as an abstract technological concept.

At the same time, the corpus shows that AI coverage is not uniformly optimistic. Risk-oriented narratives are also visible, particularly in relation to disinformation, deepfakes, information war, security misuse, privacy, factual accuracy and uncertainty about human roles. These themes demonstrate that AI is also communicated as a source of vulnerability and public concern. Therefore, the analyzed media coverage presents AI not only as a tool of progress, but also as a technology that requires critical explanation and institutional responsibility.

Trust emerges as the balancing dimension between innovation and risk. Media literacy, fact-checking, verification, factual accuracy and responsible-use narratives are less frequent than technological and business news, but they are analytically significant. They show that public communication about AI cannot rely only on product-centered or opportunity-oriented narratives. It must also explain how AI-generated information can be verified, where its limitations lie and why human oversight remains necessary.

The article's main argument is that AI-related coverage in the analyzed Georgian media corpus is innovation-led, risk-aware and trust-dependent. Innovation gives AI public visibility, risk introduces uncertainty and social relevance, while trust provides the communicative condition under which AI can be responsibly understood. The interaction of these three dimensions is especially important in a small-language digital media environment, where global technological developments are mediated for local audiences through selected platforms, translated narratives and locally relevant examples.

The study contributes to discussions on digital communication management, innovation communication and media narratives by showing that AI coverage should not be analyzed only as technology reporting. It should also be understood as a process of organizing public meaning around technological change. From this perspective, traditional media's digital platforms remain important intermediaries: they help define whether AI appears mainly as an opportunity, a threat, a product, a public risk or a subject of verification.

The study has several limitations. It examines only selected Georgian traditional media platforms and does not represent the entire Georgian media system. It does not measure audience reception, public opinion or

behavioral effects. It also does not evaluate the technical performance of AI systems or identify social media bot activity. The findings should therefore be interpreted within the limits of the analyzed corpus.

Future research could expand the corpus to include other Georgian media platforms, social media channels and longer time periods. It could also compare Georgian AI-related coverage with media coverage in other small-language environments. Audience research would be especially useful for understanding how different groups interpret AI narratives and whether innovation, risk and trust-oriented coverage influences public understanding. Further research could also examine how Georgian-language AI systems and local technological initiatives are represented in public communication.

Overall, the article shows that responsible AI communication requires more than frequent coverage. It requires a balanced narrative structure that connects technological opportunities with risk clarification, verification practices and accountability mechanisms. In the Georgian traditional media corpus analyzed in this study, such a balance is present but uneven. This unevenness makes the management of AI narratives an important issue for media, public communication and digital innovation.

Reference

- Araujo, T. (2018). Living up to the chatbot hype: The influence of anthropomorphic design cues and communicative agency framing on conversational agent and company perceptions. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 85, 183-189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.03.051>
- Assenmacher, D., Clever, L., Frischlich, L., Quandt, T., Trautmann, H., & Grimme, C. (2020). Demystifying social bots: On the intelligence of automated social media actors. *Social Media + Society*, 6(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120939264>
- Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 610-623). Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922>
- D'Angelo, P. (2002). News framing as a multiparadigmatic research program: A response to Entman. *Journal of Communication*, 52(4), 870-888. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2002.tb02578.x>
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51-58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x>
- European Parliament and Council of the European Union. (2024). Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). *Official Journal of the European Union*, L 2024/1689. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj>
- Gillespie, T. (2014). The relevance of algorithms. In T. Gillespie, P. J. Boczkowski, & K. A. Foot (Eds.), *Media technologies: Essays on communication, materiality, and society* (pp. 167-194). MIT Press.
- Gorwa, R., & Guilbeault, D. (2020). Unpacking the social media bot: A typology to guide research and policy. *Policy & Internet*, 12(2), 225-248. <https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.184>
- Guzman, A. L., & Lewis, S. C. (2020). Artificial intelligence and communication: A human-machine communication research agenda. *New Media & Society*, 22(1), 70-86.
- Hancock, J. T., Naaman, M., & Levy, K. (2020). AI-mediated communication: Definition, research agenda, and ethical considerations. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 25(1), 89-100.
- Krippendorff, K. (2019). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- McCombs, M. (2005). A look at agenda-setting: Past, present and future. *Journalism Studies*, 6(4), 543-557.
- McCombs, M. E., Llamas, J. P., Lopez-Escobar, E., & Rey, F. (2000). Candidate images in Spanish elections: Second-level agenda-setting effects. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 77(4), 703-717.
- McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176-187.
- Neuendorf, K. A. (2017). *The content analysis guidebook* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Corresponding author: Mariam.kebadzee@gmail.com



© Copyright, 2026 by the author(s)

- OpenAI. (2023). GPT-4 technical report [Preprint]. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.08774>
- Scheufele, D. A. (1999). Framing as a theory of media effects. *Journal of Communication*, 49(1), 103-122. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1999.tb02784.x>
- Scheufele, D. A., & Tewksbury, D. (2007). Framing, agenda setting, and priming: The evolution of three media effects models. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), 9-20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-9916.2007.00326.x>
- Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. SAGE Publications.
- Shao, C., Ciampaglia, G. L., Varol, O., Yang, K.-C., Flammini, A., & Menczer, F. (2018). The spread of low-credibility content by social bots. *Nature Communications*, 9, Article 4787. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-06930-7>
- Yang, K.-C., & Menczer, F. (2024). Anatomy of an AI-powered malicious social botnet. *Journal of Quantitative Description: Digital Media*, 4. <https://doi.org/10.51685/jqd.2024.icwsm.7>