

Merging or plagiarizing? The role of originality and derivative works in AI-aimed news production

Javier Díaz Noci

Universitat Pompeu Fabra

javier.diaz@upf.edu

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9559-4283>

¿Fusión o plagio? La importancia de la originalidad y el derecho de transformación de la obra en la producción informativa mediante IA

ABSTRACT RESUMEN

The emergence of artificial intelligence systems applied to news production raises a series of legal questions that we examine in this short article. The central concept is, in our opinion, that of originality and creativity, legal requirements for attributing authorship and setting in motion the mechanisms of legal protection for a work, be it simple or collaborative, or even composite. The type of work that raises most questions is the derivative work, obtained from the transformation of pre-existing work(s), whose rights of authorship and economic exploitation must be respected at all times. The practices of learning systems based on artificial intelligence, which explicitly recognise that they rely on a wide variety of works protected by copyright, pose many doubts, and are not clearly able to benefit from the fair use exception, which, moreover, is only applicable to works produced in Common law jurisdictions, but not in other countries with an authorial system of intellectual property protection.

La irrupción de los sistemas de inteligencia artificial aplicados a la producción de noticias plantea una serie de cuestiones legales que examinamos en este breve artículo. El concepto central es, a nuestro entender, el de originalidad y creatividad, requisitos legales para poder atribuir la autoría y poner en marcha los mecanismos de protección jurídica sobre una obra, sea esta simple o en colaboración, e incluso compuesta. El tipo de obra que plantea más interrogantes es la obra derivada, obtenida a partir de la transformación de obra u obras preexistentes, cuyos derechos de paternidad de los autores y de explotación económica de los derechos habientes hay que respetar en todo momento. Las prácticas de los sistemas de aprendizaje basados en inteligencia artificial, que reconocen explícitamente que se basan en una gran variedad de obras protegidas por el derecho de autor, crean numerosos interrogantes, sin que puedan acogerse a la excepción del fair use, por otra parte, únicamente aplicable a obras que han sido producidas en las jurisdicciones de la tradición jurídica de Common law, pero no en el resto de países con un sistema autoral de protección de la propiedad intelectual.

KEYWORDS PALABRAS CLAVE

Copyright; Intellectual property; Originality; Creativity; Derivative works; News production; Artificial intelligence.

Derecho de autor; Propiedad intelectual; Originalidad; Creatividad; Derecho de transformación de la obra; Obra derivada; Inteligencia artificial; Producción informativa.

Fusió o plagi? La importància de l'originalitat i el dret de transformació de l'obra en la producció informativa mitjançant IA

RESUM

La irrupció dels sistemes d'intel·ligència artificial aplicats a la producció de notícies planteja una sèrie de qüestions legals que examinem en aquest article breu. Els conceptes centrals són, al nostre parer, el d'originalitat i el de creativitat, doncs ambdós són requisits legals per atribuir autoria a una peça i engegar els mecanismes de protecció jurídica que li corresponen, sigui aquesta simple o en col·laboració, i fins i tot composta. El tipus d'obra que planteja més interrogants és l'obra derivada, obtinguda a partir de la transformació d'una obra o varies obres preexistents, els drets de paternitat dels autors i d'explotació econòmica de dret-havent s'han de respectar en tot moment. Les pràctiques dels sistemes d'aprenentatge basats en intel·ligència artificial, que reconeixen explícitament que es basen en una gran varietat d'obres protegides pel dret d'autor, creen nombrosos interrogants, doncs no sembla que es puguin acollir a l'excepció del *fair use*, doncs és, únicament aplicable a obres que han estat produïdes a les jurisdiccions de la tradició jurídica de *Common law*, però no a la resta de països amb un sistema de protecció de la propietat intel·lectual dels autors.

PARAULES CLAU

Dret d'autor; Propietat intel·lectual; Originalitat; Creativitat; Dret de transformació de l'obra; Obra derivada; Intel·ligència artificial; Producció informativa.

1. Introduction

On February 21, 2023, the US Copyright Office (Lindbergh, 2023) partially reverted a previous decision on to whether some images generated by artificial intelligence were copyrightable and could be registered -as it is compulsory in that country- in the name of an author, in this case a woman, Kristina Kashtanova, under whose orders those new pictures were created. The Office concluded that just a part of the original work is protectable under copyright laws, namely "the selection, coordination, and arrangement of the work's written and visual elements", which is, by the way, no small thing. The images contained in the comic book, titled *Zarya of the Dawn*, are considered not authored by Ms Kashtanova, since they were produced using Midjourney software, but the comic book itself -a question that the social networks have not echoed in the first place- is still considered a person's creation and protected as such by the law. The US Copyright Office's decision does not make clear, however, who is to be considered the author of such pictures, or whether they are authorless. The US Copyright Office does not explain either who -person or company- is entitled to economically exploit the work. It is not a pedestrian discussion, since the application of artificial intelligence has an undeniable economic importance.

This case, and many others that might follow in the next future -Kristina Kashtanova has announced her intention of going to court in appeal, since this is just an administrative decision - poses some interesting issues regarding the intervention of artificial intelligence systems to help human creation of artistic, literary or any other kind of works.

The decision might well seem revolutionary, but when closely examined, it is not. It is, precisely, the situation described by Daniel J. Gervais some few years before: "Copyright doctrine is similarly refractory to the protection of nonhuman productions. First among the doctrinal arguments is that machines cannot make the creative choices that are required to generate originality, and originality is a *sine qua non* of copyright. In short, current law does not protect machine productions" (Gervais, 2019, p. 2106, and Gervais, 2020a).

Also in 2020, another significant decision was held in China. A company named Tencent created in 2015 an automated newswriting program, Dreamwriter, capable of producing financial news. Shanghai Yingxun Technology Company reproduced without authorization a text produced using Dreamwriter, and was successfully sued by Tencent. The Shenzhen Nahan District People's court decided that the defendant was liable for copyright infringement. One of the plaintiff's legal counsellors, Wang Guohua, put his finger on the sore point, saying that "according to our copyright law as well as some international conventions, the definition of a work first emphasizes that the creation is original, reproducible

and produced based on human intellectual activity, so human intelligence is the core and premise" (mentioned in Yan, 2020).

We will focus on news production, in the first place, and on a legal concept we believe is central in the present and future discussion on who is to be considered the author of AI-helped news. Besides, it is important to elucidate to whom should be attributed the right of economic exploitation of the work. A second concern, if we accept, at least, that AI does not really create works *ex novo*, but relying on pre-existing –and probably, if they are not in the public domain authored and copyrightable works–, is how to manage such derivative works. Related to this, according to copyright laws it is necessary to respect –also compensate– the pre-existing works' authors and right-holders. A third emerging issue, in our humble opinion, is how to guarantee that those works produced –or merged, or derived, more properly speaking– using artificial intelligence systems can be protected if a new derivative work is produced upon them. Kristina Kashtanova's comic book is an original work and, as such, it is protectable in each and every legal way. The images on the comic strips and vignettes are not, so anyone, in principle –at least: whilst Midjourney's owner do not claim for copyright or for other intellectual property related rights–, could create a derivative work using them. Beyond the undeniable philosophical and even moral issues around this topic, there are economic interests to be covered, because, this is for sure, AI is capable –when so required and guided by humans– of producing market-valuable goods.

2. AI as author

Whether a computer or a software –in an advanced sense, an AI-system– can be considered an author is not a brand-new question. It is not an irrelevant one, either. If the answer is that an AI-system cannot be considered an author, because it is not human, then a work created using such a system can only be authored by the human who writes the prompt. It has been refused, at least until the *Copyright Act* is reformed or further lead cases are held, in the United States in the case of Kristina Kashtanova. It is not unreasonable, though, that a general legal solution can come from this assumption. If not, then another possibility is to accept that the company who owns the software has intellectual property rights on any subsequent output. This is not, in our opinion, an acceptable solution, since that company has not provided any creativity in that particular work, though. A further way to attribute intellectual property rights on the outputs is to assign them to the programmer, at least if he or she has not assigned all rights on the outputs produced by the software to the company that hires them, which is often the case. Finally, a solution suggested by the administrative American authorities is to accept that there may be authorless works. This is unthinkable in the Civil Law legal culture. But, if only because there is a need to look for the

ultimately responsible for a possible copyright infringement, some authorship is required.

At this point of artificial intelligence, it is more than dubious that hardware or software were capable of thinking, at least in legal terms. This means that before any intellectual work is created in any way, an intention and a planning are needed. This is what the afore mentioned administrative decision recognizes: there was a previous human intervention indispensable for some images included in a comic book to be generated. Even though the US Copyright Office clearly states that "the images generated by Midjourney contained within the Work are not original works of authorship protected by copyright", still the work in which those images are included is copyrightable. Up to this point, many creations done with the help of AI are of this type. In this case, "Kashtanova used the Midjourney service to *assist* her in creating some of the images in the Work" (underlining of the word *assist* is ours), but nevertheless "the use of that tool does not diminish that the human mind that conceived, created, selected, refined, cropped, positioned, framed, and arranged all the different elements of the Work into a story that reflects Kashtanova's personal experience and artistic vision." Legally speaking, it is a work in which human originality was required.

Assisted is a word and a concept used by many relevant scholars of the field (see, for instance, Hugenholtz and Quintais, 2021). Most, if not all, works created using AI are "assisted outputs", not works spontaneously conceived and executed exclusively by machines. This is, so far, to dream impossible things. If we accept that, then we need to agree with P. Bernt Hugenholtz and João Pedro Quintais, and assume that "[the] conclusion is that current EU copyright rules are generally suitable and sufficiently flexible to deal with the challenges posed by AI-assisted output."

Another very different approach is that, actually, AI-systems do not produce derivative works, a perspective defended by, for instance, Pamela Samuelson in 1986. This is no longer in vogue these days. Up to this point, it is hardly accepted that AI itself can take the initiative to create anything. It is true that, ultimately, all culture is based to some extent on previous creations, but, once again, discerning what is to be considered originality in legal terms is crucial. There are contrary opinions, however, for instance, Carys Craig and Ian Kerr assure that authorship relies on an out-of-fashion romantic concept of authorship (an *oeuvre de l'esprit*, the most personal and sacred creation of men and woman, as Le Chapelier once said at the end of the eighteenth century), and that in modern times any (re)creation should be embraced as authorship as well (Craig and Kerr, 2019).

A final situation: If the user pretends to be the author of works that are in reality an output created by AI-systems such as ChatGPT –for instance, a student which submits a paper for qualification produced exclusively by AI, without further

revision- it could easily fall under the canonical definition of plagiarism: pretending to be the author of a work produced by others and, in this case, derived from some other people's works.

3. Originality (and creativity)

Originality is, in most countries and in both main legal traditions (Common law and Civil law), a *sine qua non* requisite for any work of any type to be protected under copyright laws. Likewise, the concept of originality is linked to creativity -attributed in many legal traditions, especially in Civil law's authorial tradition, so far at least, exclusively to humans- and sufficient application of someone's intellectual skills. Works do not need to be excellent in artistic terms (for a comparison of originality in both legal systems, Gervais, 2002). They just need to have been created applying sufficient intellectual work and skills.

This does not mean that some problems may not arise. They have already done, as a matter of fact. The most presumed creative or generative artificial intelligence systems pose major legal problems, much more than the other types of AI applied to, for instance, the business of news: assistive and distributive (Trapova and Mezei, 2021). Let us consider the case of generative music, not really a newcomer though: such tools, just to mention a couple, Wotja or Nodal, are well-known and used by musicians some time ago. At the beginning of 2023, a new artificial intelligence service to compose music was announced. MusicLM was designed to create music from text description (Agostinelli et al., 2023), in the vogue some other popular AI services, such as ChatGPT, work to create other outputs. It is sufficient to indicate the software the style, genre, structure or length of the desired piece and in seconds it will be generated. Since the generative model bases its outputs on already existing music -with an author- the risk of MusicLM's owner of being sued for plagiarism (jurisprudence on the topic is abundant and solid) was considered high. MusicLM is owned by Google. The giant company decided just to make some examples available¹ but not to publicly offer the software online. This can be extended to some other AI systems, as Peter Kafka explains in *Vox* magazine. Since ChatGPT or Stable Diffusion, just to mention a couple, learn from pre-existing (and not infrequently proprietary) datasets and use some other people's texts, images, videos or even code, lawsuits will become more and more frequent. For instance, Getty Images announced in January 2023 that they will sue Stable Diffusion for using their images and infringing copyright (Kafka, 2023). It is a simple matter of time before court decisions or out-of-court settlements happen. Only at the light of this and further court decisions some more research on this crucial aspect can possibly be developed. For the time being, it suffices to highlight the importance of wondering to which extent, considering that all the aforementioned artificial intelligence

systems are based on Large Language Models (LLM) which need to extract information from previously existent works and so propose a new predictable output, are respecting all intellectual property rights. It is more than deep learning: it is using larger and larger datasets, not always requiring and obtaining, as it is mandatory under European laws, a license upon, private data or copyrighted works.

News, as an individual work, is protected. Its originality can be traced back to an ultimate author, who feeds the system and indicates, if she or he uses AI, which kind of output is desired. One challenge for artificial intelligence is, precisely, to develop tools to find out the ultimate authors behind the works used by other artificial intelligence systems to make derivative works. It is not science fiction in any way. Researchers from Chicago University in the United States have created such an app, called Glaze (Mitchum, 2023).

The collective work is also protected by copyright. In this case companies or legal entities are entitled as copyright holders. At least in Common law countries, where copyright law is much more entrepreneurial than in the Civil law tradition, where the author is placed amid the legal coverage, the work-made-for-hire legal figure can be easily used to attribute economic rights to companies which actually pay human workers to produce news. Those companies may perfectly argue that now they are in condition of paying for artificial workers -actually, and this makes the difference in our opinion: for artificial tools to help their human workers in all cases. As Annemarie Bridy reminds, work for hire is just "a mechanism for vesting copyright directly in a legal person who is acknowledged *not* to be the author-in-fact of the work in question", a "legal fiction" (Bridy, 2012, p. 27). Since automated journalism (also called "robot journalism") is becoming more and more frequent in newsrooms all over the world, it is not surprising that new jobs related to it emerge. In February 2023, the *Financial Times* appointed journalist Madhumita Murgia as AI editor, thus, specialized in searching for stories about how AI is changing the industry. Equally, many media are commissioning journalists to supervise automated creation of news, and to verify their consistency. Like it or not, AI systems never create nothing -we insist- out of the blue, but following a prompt introduced by humans. With very different results, though: as an annex, we present here the results on what was produced by ChatGPT on our request around a very fashionable topic these days in Spain, namely how a soccer team, FC Barcelona, paid during many years great amounts of money to a former referee, (supposedly) to have an influence on the results. A presumed case of bribery was, in exchange, treated by ChatGPT as the hiring of a new coach (the referee, Enríquez Negreira) for FC Barcelona, in the Spanish-language automatically produced news item, and as the death of a former president of the club, supposedly the referee himself, in Catalan language. The accuracy of such AI systems -at least,

the publicly accessible version of it- is, though, far from the journalistic standards today.

Let us remember that some rights attributed by the *European Directive on Copyright in the Single Digital Market*, 2019, or also those of the *News Media Bargaining Code* in Australia, 2021, to press publishers are unwaivable rights, even if they are not moral rights, but compensation ancillary rights. These legal acts were ultimately enacted to force Google and Facebook to negotiate with newspaper publishers so they can offset supposed losses caused by the emergence of search engines. Related to this is one of the great legal questions, albeit one that has not been too loudly announced: the fact that companies should be really interested in being attributed all the economic exploitation rights on the works created by a software they acquire or hold a licence upon. In doing so, copyright is not in the spotlight as much as competition law is. Companies could show an interest in preventing further unlicensed uses of the works produced by their organizations, or preventing even -as they have traditionally did on the Internet using legal notices with reference to all contents to be found in their websites, including user-generated content in so many cases-any derivative work originated in their own contents.

The situation is perfectly possible, and it has been described by one of the sharpest copyright scholars in the world, Jane Ginsburg, alongside with Luke Ali Budiardjo, in 2019: a media company which pays for an AI-system to derive more "journalistic" articles or features out of simple agency press releases. The more the software works producing such more and more elaborate pieces of news, the more trained the system (owned ultimately by the programming company) will be, the best outputs it will offer. This can be done to the extent that no one could recognize traces of pre-existing works in those outputs, so they will simply become part of a style, which is not that of the programmer or that of journalists. Many media companies have complained about it: ChatGPT should be learning from the news items they publish, and whose economic exploitation right they hold. Moreover, those works have been produced by authors those companies hire and who, at least in the Civil law countries, have to be credited as such every time, since this is one of their unwaivable moral rights. Companies such as *Wall Street Journal* or CNN, and their journalists, have raised their voices against the misuse of their intellectual work. For instance, Francesco Maroni, in a tweet published on the 15th of February, 2023 clearly stated that "ChatGPT is trained on a large amount of news data from top sources that fuel its AI. It's unclear whether OpenAI has agreements with all of these publishers. Scraping data without permission would break the publishers' terms of service." He reproduced OpenAI's, the company behind ChatGPT, own confession that the system, "as an AI language model" was "trained on a very large and diverse set of sources", including Reuters news agency, *The New York Times*, *The Guardian*, *BBC*

News and many more. Not to mention, as ChatGPT and OpenAI do, that they are using "a wide range of academic journals and other written materials" the software scarcely mentions or whose authorship recognises. Those works "recreated", thus, derived in fact, by such AI-systems will be finally and hypothetically not authored by anyone – they will be authorless (Ginsburg and Ali Budiardjo, 2019, p. 441). Eventually, Ginsburg and Ali Budiardjo propose a new category of works: noncollaborative joint works, created by both human and machines but whose authorship, not even partially, can be attributed to the first ones.

A possible way to be followed is to produce fair use guidelines for media and journalists. OpenAI allegedly follows fair use when training its software upon such a great amount and variety of copyrighted sources, but is very doubtful that this practice could, actually, be protected under such legal umbrella. Using such fair use guidelines can help media and practitioners be sure about how to proceed when, for instance, copyright is supposedly infringed or, otherwise, how not to infringe some other authors' copyright when asking their own AI tools to produce news or images. By the way, we have to remind that fair use, or fair dealing, as it is named in the United Kingdom, is an exception system not applicable in many other countries, for instance, the European Union explicitly prefers and only tolerates a list of qualified exceptions, contrary to many legal scholars' belief. Data are not copyrightable, as ideas are not, but pre-existing works fall under copyright law's protection. How to be sure that the fantastic output our AI-system has produced once we have correctly introduced a prompt is not searching, mining and merging authored works? This is a concern showed by the European institutions, for instance in article 15 of the aforementioned *Directive on Copyright in the Digital Single Market* of 2019 -in this case, trying to assure that users are not infringing copyright when creating derivative works, a job AI-systems can do much more quickly and efficiently, by the way. In the forthcoming regulation of artificial intelligence, the European Commission has tentatively defined it in the sense we have underlined before: a system designed to operate with some autonomy from data provided by both human and machines.

4. As a way of conclusion. AI as a disruptive technology in newsrooms

As it happened with the World Wide Web, artificial intelligence is here to stay. It can and needs to be regulated and be placed at the service of humans -final users, media and practitioners. Whilst it still is an assistance to journalists' everyday job, one could only see more pros than cons in an early adoption and experimentation. Anyway, journalists would do well to watch their back: artificial intelligence cannot be capable of autonomously produce anything by its own with no human intervention, but it is for sure that it can decrease production

costs, if not substituting employees. Alina Trapova believes that this is not, so far at least, a real danger since copyright law only covers human intervention in intellectual products, and it cannot be extended to works produced by AI-systems (Trapova, 2023). This is good news for media companies, relatively good news for journalists. There can be shady areas, but in Trapova's opinion, "being the first one to utilise generative techniques that are trustworthy, transparent, accurate and zeroing discrimination brings enough benefits to companies resorting to NLG techniques, even in the lack of intellectual property, especially copyright protection." (Trapova, 2023).

Since machines can create, or at least help creating intellectual works with certain economic value, competition will arise, between them and humans, and between companies. Traceability is one of the keys of legal protection: any traceable pre-existing work -that, in an imagined but maybe not so distant future, can be diluted into just style traits, not easily covered by copyright laws when it does not reproduce recognizable parts of some other people's works- should be detected by another AI-systems, competing between them. Today the situation is the one described by Daniel J. Gervais: "Because many current productions of AI machines are relatively low on the creativity ladder, a plaintiff would likely begin by arguing that the creativity threshold is low" (Gervais, 2019, p. 2103).

Be that as it may, the situation today is that "data collection and processing, news coverage could expand exponentially" (Trapova and Mezei, 2021). From an optimistic point of view, we wish to align with Daniel J. Gervais, when he says that "the presence of creative choices in the making of the work is the only adequate test to determine whether the work is worthy of copyright protection" (Gervais, 2002, p. 981). Artificial intelligence is posing many challenges to a declining media industry, and to an increasingly precarized profession, both of them, companies and journalists, finding more and more difficult to fight against misinformation, lack of interest, news avoidance and a weakening trust in news, issues we are currently doing some research on in our ongoing project.

Maybe artificial intelligence may help in this respect, for instance, helping to verify each and every line offered to users. Mere market decisions, adopted in terms of cutting costs, even if successful in the short term, could be turned against a social activity still necessary but in permanent crisis.

Endnotes

1. <https://google-research.github.io/seanet/musiclm/examples/>

Funding

This is one of the results of the ongoing project *Automated counter narratives against misinformation and hate speech for journalists and social media*, TED2021-130810B-C22, Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities, Spain.

References

- Agostinelli, A., Denk, T.I., Borsos, Z., Engel, J., Verzetti, M., Caillon, A., Huang, Q., Jansen, A., Roberts, A., Tagliasacchi, M., Sharifi, M., Zeghidour, N., & Frank, C. (2022). MusicLM: Generating Music From Text. *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.11325>
- Bridy, A. (2012). Coding Creativity: Copyright and the Artificially Intelligent Author. *Stanford Technology Law Review*, 5, 1-28.
- Gervais, D. J. (2002). Feist goes global: A comparative analysis of the notion of originality in copyright law. *Journal of the Copyright Society of the U.S.A.* 49, 949-981. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=733603>
- Gervais, D. J. (2019). The Machine as Author. *Iowa Law Review*, 105, 2053-2106. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3359524>
- Gervais, D. J. (2020a). The human case. In R. Abbott (Ed.), *Research Handbook on Intellectual Property and Artificial Intelligence* (pp. 22-39), Elgar. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800881907.00007>
- Ginsburg, J. C. and Budjardio, L. A. (2019). Authors and machines. *Berkeley Technology Law Journal*, 34, 343-456. <https://doi.org/10.15779/Z38SF2MC24>
- Hughenoltz, P. B. and Quintais, J. P. (2021). Copyright and Artificial Creation: Does EU Copyright Law Protect AI-Assisted Output? *IIC - International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law*, 52, 1190-1216. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40319-021-01115-0>
- Kafka, P. (2023, February 2). The AI boom is here, and so are the lawsuits. *Vox.com*. <https://www.vox.com/recode/23580554/generative-ai-chatgpt-openai-stable-diffusion-legal-battles-napster-copyright-peter-kafka-column>
- Lindbergh, V. (2023). *Zarya of the Dawn* (Registration # V Au001480196). United States Copyright Office. <https://www.copyright.gov/docs/zarya-of-the-dawn.pdf>
- Mitchum, R. (2023, February 17). UChicago scientists develop new tool to protect artists from AI mimicry. "Glaze" program makes miniscule changes to confound AI art generators. *UChicago News*. <https://news.uchicago.edu/story/uchicago-scientists-develop-new-tool-protect-artists-ai-mimicry>
- Samuelson, P. (1986). Allocating ownership rights in computer-generated works. *University of Pittsburgh Law Review*, 47, 1185-1228.
- Trapova, A. (2023). Copyright for AI-generated Works: a Task for the Internal Market? *European Law Review*, 48. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4418936>
- Trapova, A., & Mezei, P. (2021). *Robojournalism – A Copyright Study on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in the European News Industry*. *GRUR International*, 71(7), 589-602. <https://doi.org/10.1093/grurint/ikac038>
- Yan, L. (2020, January 9). Court rules AI-written article has copyright. *China Daily Global*. <http://www.ecns.cn/news/2020-01-09/detail-if-zsacrm6562963.shtml>

CV

Javier Díaz-Noci. He is full professor of Communication. Main researcher of the Newsnet project (News, Networks and Users in the Hybrid Media System. Transformation of the Media Industry and the News in the Post-Industrial Era, 2019-2022). Member of the DigiDoc research group and its coordinator (2020-2022). He studied Journalism at the University of the Basque Country (1982-1987), where he defended his PhD dissertation in History. He studied Law at the same University (1992-1996), and got also a Diploma in Advance Legal Studies (1996-1998), equal to a Master in Law. He holds a PhD in Law as well (UPF, 2016). After teaching as a lecturer and assistant professor at my alma mater, he moved to Barcelona in 2008, to the Pompeu Fabra University. He was visiting researcher at the universities of Reno, Nevada (USA, 1997), Oxford (Basque Visiting Scholar, 1998-1999), Federal University of Bahia (Brazil, 2005 and 2008) and the University of East Anglia (United

Kingdom, 2021). His main research interests are: online journalism and online news, history of journalism (specially Basque-language press and Spanish-language networks on Early Modern history), and copyright and news reporting. He has added a fourth one: information equity and fighting against the digital news divide. Author of more than 260 publications in those areas. As a journalist, he worked in several newspapers and radio stations (1985-1992). Lately, he has collaborated with the Basque public broadcasting service (Euskadi Irratia).

Annexes

These are two examples of news items produced by OpenAI's ChatGPT, on request of such a journalistic piece on a case of presumed bribery in Spanish soccer. Both were produced on Saturday, February 25, 2023.

MA

write a news item on Enriquez Negreira and FC Barcelona, in Spanish, please



Barcelona, España - El famoso entrenador de fútbol, Enriquez Negreira, ha sido contratado por el FC Barcelona para liderar al equipo en la próxima temporada. Conocido por su estilo ofensivo y su habilidad para motivar a los jugadores, Negreira es una elección popular entre los aficionados del Barcelona.



Negreira, de 52 años, ha entrenado a varios equipos en España y en el extranjero, incluyendo al Sevilla FC, al Deportivo La Coruña y al Panathinaikos FC de Grecia. En una rueda de prensa celebrada hoy en el Camp Nou, Negreira expresó su entusiasmo por el nuevo desafío y prometió llevar al Barcelona a la cima del fútbol europeo.

"El FC Barcelona es un club legendario con una rica historia y una gran afición", dijo Negreira. "Mi objetivo es ayudar al equipo a alcanzar su máximo potencial y competir en la Liga de Campeones de la UEFA. Sé que será un desafío difícil, pero estoy seguro de que juntos podemos lograr grandes cosas".

El presidente del Barcelona, Joan Laporta, también estuvo presente en la conferencia de prensa y dio la bienvenida a Negreira al club. "Enriquez Negreira es un entrenador con mucha experiencia y una gran trayectoria", dijo Laporta. "Creemos que es el hombre adecuado para liderar al equipo en la próxima temporada y estamos emocionados de tenerlo a bordo".

El FC Barcelona ha tenido una temporada difícil este año, con resultados inconsistentes en la Liga española y una temprana eliminación en la Liga de Campeones de la UEFA. Los aficionados del Barcelona esperan que Negreira pueda infundir nueva energía y pasión en el equipo y llevarlo de vuelta a la cima del fútbol español y europeo.

MA

Podies redactar-me una notícia en català sobre Enríquez Negreira i el FC Barcelona, si us plau?



Sí, clar que sí. Aquí tens la notícia:



L'exdirectiu del FC Barcelona, Enríquez Negreira, ha mort avui als 99 anys d'edat a la seva residència a Barcelona. Negreira va ser una figura clau en la història del club, ja que va ser vicepresident durant el període en què Johan Cruyff va ser entrenador del Barça, als anys noranta.

Negreira va ser un dels artífexs del "Dream Team", el mític equip que va guanyar la primera Lliga de Campions del club l'any 1992, i que va marcar una època d'èxits per al Barça. També va ser un dels responsables de la remodelació del Camp Nou, que es va ampliar fins a convertir-se en l'estadi més gran d'Europa.

Des del FC Barcelona s'ha volgut destacar la seva dedicació al club i el seu compromís amb el futbol. "Avui és un dia trist per al Barça, perquè hem perdut una persona molt important per a la nostra història", ha declarat el president del club, Joan Laporta.

La mort d'Enríquez Negreira ha estat sentida per molts aficionats del Barça, que han volgut retre homenatge a la seva figura a través de les xarxes socials. "Gràcies per tot, Enríquez Negreira. Sempre estaràs en la nostra memòria", ha escrit un usuari a Twitter.

El funeral d'Enríquez Negreira tindrà lloc demà al matí a la catedral de Barcelona, on s'espera que hi assisteixin molts dels seus amics i companys del món del futbol. La seva mort deixa un gran buit en la història del FC Barcelona i del futbol català en general.