

---

| RESEARCH ARTICLE

## Analysis of User Preference Algorithm Recommendation Mechanism in News Communication

Shang Cao

*East China University of Political Science and Law, Shanghai, China*

**Corresponding Author:** Shang Cao, **E-mail:** [shangkingup@163.com](mailto:shangkingup@163.com)

---

| ABSTRACT

With the continuous improvement of algorithm technology, the field of news communication has also ushered in a transformation from traditional media to self-media, from self-media to algorithmic media, and from the center of the transmitter to the center of the recipient. The news algorithm recommendation mechanism can effectively meet the preferences and needs of users, maximize the cohesion between media and users, and ensure that the number of customers will not be lost in business operations. However, the news algorithm recommendation mechanism also has many problems of its own. This article analyzes it from the following multiple angles. First of all, starting from the theory of agenda setting in the field of news communication, it can be concluded that agenda setting under the news algorithm recommendation mechanism is partially invalid, but the mainstream media can still take on the role of replacement. Secondly, it analyzes the two aspects of information rights and privacy rights from the perspective of law and interprets the legal effect of news algorithm recommendation from two different normative paths. Finally, through sociological discussion of technology ethics, it is necessary to establish a more unified social norm to deal with various ethical crises that technology may bring.

| KEYWORDS

Algorithm controversy, news communication, user preference.

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

**ACCEPTED:** 04 February 2023

**PUBLISHED:** 27 February 2023

**DOI:** 10.32996/jcsts.2023.5.1.5

---

### 1. Introduction

#### 1.1 Background Elaboration

With the rapid development of basic science and technology such as artificial intelligence, the Internet, and big data, the rapid development of emerging technologies such as VR&AR and blockchain is drastically changing the existing structure of society, which has also triggered many new trends in news communication. The traditional news model is turning to the Internet era, and the media of the digital age is more interactive and experiential. As a technology, artificial intelligence algorithm has shown their strong vitality and influence in the process of news production and push. In the foreseeable future, it has become an indisputable fact that the traditional artificial news model is bound to transition to the algorithmic news model. However, there are unresolved pains in the process of technological development, which have gradually become prominent with the rapid development of science and technology and have become the focus of public attention. The news algorithm push mechanism uses the user preference matching mechanism to meet the needs of users with the highest efficiency and, at the same time, pushes the new news dissemination mode of the recipient center to the extreme. Although the above-mentioned behaviors can meet the market demand for commercial news media to the greatest extent, they have caused many legal, ethical and professional disadvantages. The development trend of algorithmic news has become unstoppable. How the news media can take advantage of the dividends brought by this technological revolution and endow news production with new value and meaning is a question that all news industries must face.

## 1.2 Research Methods

This paper is a desktop research result, so it did not obtain information through a large number of experimental analyses or social questionnaires, but more accurate and detailed information was searched through magazines, books, papers and the Internet as the basis of the research. Therefore, on the basis of sufficient research materials, it is very necessary to analyze a certain problem in various aspects. Specifically, it can be carried out from the perspectives of industry analysis, competitive product analysis, legal policy, cultural environment, user demand, technological change, etc. Excellent papers have systematic research methods through the scientific analysis of theoretical knowledge and practical points to draw conclusions with guiding significance and scientific research value. Among them, the selection of research methods is particularly important. The research methods used in this paper include the literature research method, comparative analysis method and interest measurement method, which constitute the backbone of the excellent quality of this paper.

The first analysis method is literature research. The literature research method is a method to obtain data through literature investigation according to the selected research topic so as to comprehensively and systematically understand and master the problem to be studied. Based on the extensive collection and fine sorting of Chinese and foreign literature, the author of this paper interprets the institutional system from a macro perspective and makes an in-depth analysis of the essential principles under the phenomena on the basis of rich and detailed materials and a solid and extensive theoretical basis.

The second method is comparative analysis. Through the analysis of the current theories of Germany and America with more advanced theoretical development, the development status of Chinese algorithm recommendation technology and judicial practice status are compared, and the theoretical basis of this research is built in comparison. EU laws have a great influence on the development of the current laws in mainland China, and EU data protection laws are also the leading benchmark in the world. The interpretation of a specific legal system needs the help of legal skills. The interpretation methods of articles include textual interpretation, objective interpretation (Liu, 2013), system interpretation, historical interpretation, comparative interpretation and so on (Larenz, 2020). The theoretical development of European law and American law has accumulated a solid foundation, and the analysis and research of various legal issues belong to the forefront and leading position, which has a strong reference and guiding significance for the theoretical development of mainland China.

The third analysis method is the benefit measure method. The essence of law is the written norm for the protection of interests, and the promulgation and reform of laws mark the change of interests at the bottom. Therefore, comparing the actual effect of the application of laws and the actual impact on various interests can effectively guide judicial personnel to make reasonable discretion and is also the value guidance for relevant researchers to carry out theoretical research.

## 2. Analysis of the Current Situation

The emergence of the algorithmic news recommendation mechanism is gradually advancing. Professionally-generated content is the mainstream production mode in the traditional media era, and the coexistence of professionally-generated content and user-generated content is the main feature of entering the new media era. The major change in news communication is the transformation from communicator-centered to audience-centered. The traditional media era upholds communicator-centrism; that is, the audience only chooses to watch the content within a limited range and transforms it into self-media where users participate in the news generation era (Yu et al., 2018). However, with the advent of the era of big data, major media organizations make full use of algorithm technology to achieve news writing and hotspot push, so Automatic Generation Content has become the new mainstream (Guan, 2017). The gradual reduction or even replacement of artificial news editors by algorithms is a further subversion of the traditional user information acceptance behavior model. The emerging push model based on algorithm recommendation has replaced the unified push channel of traditional official media. Traditional “confirmative journalism” emphasizes factual accuracy and context but is gradually being replaced by non-professional forms of journalism (Kovach & Rosenstiel, 2007). “Assertive news” refers to an information channel that tends to be passive and emphasizes immediacy and has become the main news production mode in the world today (Debatin, 2015). “Aggregated news” introduces algorithms into the journalism industry. Factors such as difficult-to-prove data sources, the objectivity of the algorithm itself, and inherent bias in values have intensified this contradiction, which has impacted the original ethical norms of the journalism industry and is an opportunity where challenges and benefits coexist (Chen & Xie, 2019).

The essence of algorithmic news is to strive to achieve the matching of “information and people” (Wang, 2019). It just changes the traditional model; that is, people no longer get information based on news push, but the news is pushed according to people's needs. The principle of the algorithm recommendation mechanism includes User-Based Collaborative Filtering based on user prediction of similar preferences, Item-based Collaborative Filtering based on user evaluation of information and similarity between information, and User-based browsing behaviors. Machine learning prediction models, correlation rules based on big data association analysis of similar user preferences and similar recommendations, and reasonable prediction and recommendation based on existing knowledge structures such as user profiles (Liu & Xu, 2018).

The news dissemination channel of the algorithmic push mechanism has become an irreversible trend. As early as August 2017, the United States released the “2017 U.S. Social Media Platform News Usage Report,” showing that the proportion of American adults who read news on social media has reached 67%. For the first time, the proportion of news users exceeded half, reaching 55%, while the proportion of people aged 18-49 who read news on social platforms was 78% (Liu, 2019). In 2022, the Reuters Institute of Oxford University released the “2021 Digital News Report” . This report covers a total of 46 countries and regions in Europe, Latin America and other countries and explains how journalism works in these countries and regions are represented today. The report takes platforms such as Facebook and Twitter as the main research objects and horizontally compares the differences in news channels for different groups of people in different countries. The results show that a large number of groups of users favor other diverse viewpoints and that diverse sources of information also play a huge role.

While seeing the impact and value of algorithmic news recommendation differentiation, we must also consider the impact and consequences after the theory is confirmed. The most direct impact of the preference recommendation mechanism is the disappearance of attention rankings that represent the core values of society. It is impossible for people to form a unified cognition based on their age, identity, experience, and preferences at different times. They lack a common social system, deepening the phenomenon of information islands. After the lack of common recognition, people will desperately desire general recognition from society, so people with similar ideas will gather together to form an organization that excludes other groups. The concept of common protection of similar closed and extreme people will not lead to the openness and sharing of ideas but will further aggravate the solidification of self-concept and the existence of social isolation.

### **3. Theoretical Analysis of News Algorithm Recommendation**

#### ***3.1 Analysis of Agenda Setting Theory from the Perspective of Journalism***

Agenda-setting theory is a theory proposed by Maxwell McCombs and Donald Shaw, communication scholars at the University of North Carolina in the United States, in 1972. It was initially investigated in the US general election to investigate the influence of the salience of mass media issues on public attention (Shi & Wang, 2017). This theory holds that the ranking of social issues by the public media can guide the public's attention to public events. The top-ranked news disseminated by the media is easy to be regarded as important events by the public, which show a strong positive correlation. However, the American historian of science Bernard Cohen summarized the relationship between mass media and public perception as “news media cannot tell people what to think, but they can tell people what to think” (Cohen, 1963). Although the agenda-setting theory cannot directly conceive the public's values, it can change the public's attention to different times to a certain extent. In 1997, McCombs and Shaw proposed attribute agenda setting, which is the second level of agenda setting theory (McCombs et al., 1997). Attribute agenda setting studies the influence of news tags on agenda setting, and the research on the influence of topic attributes further expands the application scope of agenda setting theory.

In the era of traditional media, public communication media can greatly influence public perception through agenda setting, but this structure is being weakened in the era of self-media. In the past, the dissemination of news was in the hands of the official media, and the editing of content and the promotion of news would go through layers of review. In the self-media society, each individual is an independent source of information, and the dissemination of mutual information has greatly enriched the social cognitive system. At the same time, it will inevitably impact the unified cognitive system. Market-led news media are also changing from editor-led to user-led, and only news media that meet user needs can gain an advantage in the increasingly fierce competition. The user recommendation algorithm mechanism based on big data technology is helping the media to realize this attempt and promote greater satisfaction of user needs, but it has also caused the reality that the news media is kidnapped by market demand. Under the influence of big data, everyone is exposed to different news content, and its agenda-setting theory has gradually become invalid. Individuals often have a wrong perception of self-worth social concepts, in the sorting of recommended content based on their personal preferences continues to deepen the phenomenon of information islands in the era of big data and promotes people's more extreme self-cognition and sociality.

According to "Reuters Institute Digital News Report 2021" from the Reuters Institute of Oxford University, although the algorithm mechanism has greatly enriched the diversity of news feeds and most social media news users, the most interesting thing is the news content provided by the mainstream media and journalists. The mainstream media still shows a strong vitality. For emerging media whose commercial nature is based on the pursuit of interests, there is nothing wrong with their value orientation to meet customer needs. But mainstream media organizations must undertake the public obligation of social value guidance. The mainstream media will not completely withdraw from the stage because of the lack of efforts to meet the needs of users. On the contrary, its own authority that is not compromised by all parties is one of the important needs of users. Thus, although algorithmic journalism partially impedes the implementation of agenda-setting theory, it can still be remedied by mainstream media.

### **3.2 Analysis of Agenda Setting Theory from the Perspective of Journalism**

In the algorithmic news recommendation process, the realization of algorithmic technology seems to be objective and neutral, but the understanding of the problem, the selection of data, the selection of variables, and the evaluation of the algorithm all run through the human factors behind it, reflecting the designer's value concept and way of thinking. To standardize the news algorithm recommendation of user preferences, from the perspective of law, it is necessary to regulate from the following aspects, such as the right to know about algorithm decision-making, the right to choose information, and the right to protect privacy. As the legal motto says, the right of the claimant is the obligation of the actor. The public's claim to the transparency of the algorithm is the source of the obligation of the data processor, and it is also the most important tool to protect the interests of the data owner.

#### *3.2.1 Algorithm right to know*

The right to know is a prerequisite for all rights claims. Only when the public is affected by how the automated decision-making of their rights operates can they make targeted and legitimate claims for rights protection. However, informed algorithm decision-making requires the algorithm maker to be able to disclose its algorithm design, which involves the commercial secrets and commercial interests of each subject, and most developers take the practice of ignoring this obligation. Therefore, from the legal norms, developers are forced to disclose the algorithm mechanism. It is necessary to protect the user's right to know about the algorithm. However, when the developer chooses to disclose its algorithm mechanism, the law should also protect the security of the developer's business transactions and avoid undue damage to its business interests.

From the perspective of comparative law, the disclosure of algorithmic decision-making has become the mainstream concept in the world. The U.S. Senate proposed the "Filter Bubble Transparency Act" in October 2019. This bill requires large Internet platforms to provide consumers with greater transparency. When using "opaque" algorithms to produce personalized recommendation content, it must be clear to inform the user and give the user the right to opt out. The Research Service of the European Parliament released the "Regulatory Framework for Algorithmic Accountability and Transparency" in April 2019. The European Commission announced the entry into force of the "Digital Services Act" on November 16, 2022, to ensure the transparency of algorithms in display transactions is realized. The UK's Central Digital and Data Office (CDDO) and Central Data Ethics and Innovation (CDEI) jointly released the "the Algorithmic Transparency Recording Standard Hub" on January 5, 2023, which will help to formulate inter-governmental standards for algorithm transparency. From the perspective of China's current norms, a series of legislation and government normative documents for algorithm governance have been promulgated one after another, which is of great significance for accelerating the improvement of laws and regulations on algorithm identification and algorithm transparency. Article 33 of the E-Commerce Law enhances the transparency of transaction rules on e-commerce platforms. Article 24 of the Personal Information Protection Law further emphasizes personal information processors' Algorithm transparency in the application of automated decision-making technology. "Guiding Opinions on Strengthening the Comprehensive Governance of Internet Information Service Algorithms" regulates enterprise algorithm application behavior (The Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, 2021). "Internet Information Service Algorithm Recommendation Management Regulations" strengthens the transparency and interpretation ability of algorithms' institutional guarantees (The Cyberspace Administration of China, 2021).

From China's legislation, it can be seen that the Chinese government has made efforts to strengthen the transparency of algorithms. Among them, the third paragraph of Article 24 of the "Personal Information Protection Law" is the most milestone. This regulation stipulates that individuals have the right to request personal information processors to explain that decisions that have a significant impact on individual rights and interests are made through automated decision-making. This regulation can be regarded as the most specific source of rights for the right to know about algorithms. It stipulates the user's right to know the application and the right to refuse decisions with significant impact and also limits the applicable premise of this right to automatic decision-making methods that are harmful to personal rights and interests. However, it should be noted that "automated decision-making methods make decisions that have a major impact on individual rights and interests" is a very broad and abstract conceptual expression. How to define a major impact on individuals and how to determine its scope and boundaries are questionable. Whether the interpreter of the above-mentioned definition is the user or the developer, either of the two can make a fair and objective evaluation, and the intervention of the judiciary with public power is the only solution. Therefore, the specific implementation of this article requires further detailed implementation specifications.

#### *3.2.2 Right to choose the information*

From the perspective of Chinese law, users have the right to make independent decisions on information selection. Article 44 of the "Personal Information Protection Law" states that individuals have the right to decide on the processing of their personal information and have the right to restrict or refuse others to process their personal information. At the same time, the third paragraph of Article 24 of the law stipulates the right to make decisions in automated decision-making, and users have the right to refuse personal information processors to make decisions only through automated decision-making.

Who owns the information rights generated by the user's information traces on the Internet is an important basis for who owns the user's right to choose information (Wang, 2019). However, the definition of property rights is difficult to explain because although the generation of information is the result of the behavior of the information subject, the process of collecting and processing cannot be separated from the behavior of the information processor. And the simple definition of property rights lacks practical significance. The Ministry of Commerce (2022) stipulates that the data source and data generation characteristics, respectively, define the process of data production, circulation, and use. The legal rights enjoyed by each participant establish a separate property rights operation mechanism, such as the right to hold data resources, the right to use data processing, and the right to operate data products. Specifically, according to the actor's contribution to the data generation, processing and circulation process as the standard, the assessment of the contribution and the sharing of the results are comprehensively carried out. Therefore, instead of simply defining the ownership of information, it is necessary to separately regulate the right to hold, use and operate. In the rights distribution of information traces, users who generate information traces enjoy rights such as privacy protection in the process of generation, but the simple generation of information does not lead to the utilization of information. Therefore, when information traces are transformed into the results of the user preference algorithm recommendation mechanism, it is still necessary to recognize the contribution of the data processor in the processing, affirm its right to data processing, and distribute the results according to its contribution.

It can be seen from the above that user do not have the right to independently decide how to use their data, nor can they directly determine the content recommended by users. But Article 24, paragraph 3 of the "Personal Information Protection Law" gives them the right to reject the content of automated decision-making by algorithms, to exercise its decision-making power by rejecting user preference algorithm recommendations, which is also in line with the user's subject identity in the link of information generation. There are similar provisions in the "Filter Bubble Transparency Act" proposed by the U.S. Senate in October 2019. Really transfer the right to choose information to users, let users understand their needs and choices, and enhance the transparency of algorithms instead of letting users be fed by algorithms (Qiu & Chen, 2018).

### *3.2.3 Privacy protection*

Articles 1032 and 1033 of the "Civil Code of the People's Republic of China" stipulate the path of privacy regulation. From Article 1034 to Article 1039, Article 1 stipulates the regulation path of personal information rights and interests. The two systems seem to go their own way, but there is a certain intersection between the two systems. There is a certain similarity between the private information in Article 1033 Item 5 of the Civil Code of the People's Republic of China and the sensitive personal information in Article 28 of the Personal Information Protection Law. The sensitive personal information in Article 28 of the "Personal Information Protection Law" refers to the part of personal information that, once leaked or illegally used, will cause the personal dignity of natural persons to be violated or the personal and property safety to be endangered. Add a specific statement of the bottom line, including specific personal information, biometrics, religious beliefs, medical health, financial accounts, whereabouts, and minors under the age of 14. The key is the user portrait that can identify individuals or indirectly identify individuals based on the above information, and this part of information belongs to the part that has a greater impact on individuals. The right to privacy has different operating mechanisms. The objects of the right to privacy cover private life, private activities, private space, private parts, and private information. The most important feature of the right to privacy is its privacy. Therefore, what satisfies identification belongs to personal information, and what satisfies privacy belongs to privacy. A kind of information can satisfy both identification and privacy, and at this time, this kind of information is protected by two kinds of regulations. The distinction between privacy rights and personal information protection rules is not clear, which can easily lead to overlapping protections (Wang, 2021). The prohibition of overlapping protection was a fundamental legal principle (Ren, 2022). Therefore, when some information is subject to privacy regulation and personal information regulation at the same time, in order to avoid the phenomenon of repeated protection, it is reasonable to allow the parties to independently choose one of the systems for self-relief of rights.

The regulations on personal information have been explained above from the two aspects of the right to know about algorithms and the right to choose information. The protection of privacy in the data age should also receive special attention. The "14th Five-Year Plan for National Economic and Social Development of the People's Republic of China and 2035 Long-term Goal Outline" adopted in 2021 also emphasizes the need to "create new advantages in the digital economy" and "coordinate data development and utilization, privacy protection, and public security." Whether browsing information belongs to the right to privacy is a specific issue that needs to be judged specifically, and this issue cannot be generalized. The concept of "privacy" is also divided into two types of information regulation. The first is normative appropriateness, and the second is normative transmission principles (Nissenbaum, 2010). The appropriateness of norms has been clearly defined in the Civil Code, and the principle of norm transmission needs to be discussed. The user's personal preferences formed by searching information are recorded by the system through machine learning, and the system makes a delivery principle of whether similar pushes belong to the standard. The choices displayed by users when watching news belong to their personal preferences in the private area, and

the records in their personal software are not simply stored in the user's mobile phone but will be uploaded to the developer's system. In the collection of this part of the information, the developer has an obligation to protect the user's privacy from being leaked. American information privacy protection researcher Helen Nissenbaum put forward the theory of "context integrity" in 1998; that is, the context of the initial collection of information is related to the context of message exchange. Inseparable from specific scene propagation (Cai & Chen, 2021). The customer agrees to the developer's information collection and uses in the case of use, but it breaks through the "scenario integrity" theory in more than this situation, so the developer must not arbitrarily transmit user preference information related to customer privacy, regardless of whether the information can be identified with the customer.

### **3.3 Analysis of Sci-Tech Ethics from the Perspective of Sociology**

Science and technology ethics is a hot topic at present, and it is a widely discussed issue in today's rapid development of science and technology. The concept of "ethics" is suitable for theoretical categories such as abstraction, rationality, rules, and public will. Ethics is different from morality. The mainstream cognition is that "ethics" is a primary concept of ethics, while "morality" is a subordinate concept of "ethics". Ethics embodies rationality, norms, public will, and science in Western culture, while "morality" embodies Eastern humanities, individual cultivation, and life perception and is suitable for practical categories such as concreteness, emotion, action, and personal cultivation (Yao, 2006). Therefore, the discussion of science and technology ethics is more extensive and normative than the discussion of general morality. At the same time, there is a certain relationship between the two and the collection of individual moral requirements into a shared social and ethical norm, so individual moral appeal should also become an important consideration factor in social and ethical norms. In order to cater to the curiosity-seeking psychology in human nature, algorithm push will inevitably lead to vulgarization, and a large amount of vulgar and vulgar content floods the network platform (Ren & Tian, 2018). Human society, like nature, has a natural entropy increase process; that is, under the action of non-external forces, molecules have an irreversible tendency to develop into a chaotic and disordered state. Therefore, the algorithm recommendation that allows users to like is to indulge people's desires and magnify the shortcomings of human nature. Without restraint, it will inevitably lead to vulgarity and inferiority of the network environment.

While technology ethics has many advantages that cannot be ignored in news feeds, it also inevitably brings some controversy. First, the anonymity of the Internet makes it difficult to distinguish between true and false news. Compared with traditional media's way of pushing corroborative news, the assertive news mode is carried out between independent individual users, and the content of the news disseminated between each other is not verified, and it is only followed up and released according to the timeliness and profit-seeking of the flow. At the same time, the anonymity and untraceability of the online world have created a situation where there is a lot of false confidence, and no one is responsible. Unidentified data sources have become the first issue in the ethical controversy of algorithmic journalism (Bao, 2022). Second, algorithmic bias leads to the formation of extreme thinking among audiences. The news itself will have certain values attached to it, but based on the objective requirements of news ethics, traditional media will maintain a state of extreme restraint. Algorithmic media is different from artificial media. Algorithmic news based on algorithm technology and big data collection seems to have a fair appearance, but in fact comes from prejudice and discrimination that exist throughout the life cycle of the algorithm (Wu, 2018). Because during the algorithm design phase, the engineer's personal bias will be consciously or unconsciously injected into the system (Jaume-Palasi & Spielkamp, 2017). Third, information isolation is gradually deepening. Due to the impact of information isolation (Zhang & Zhou, 2017), people step into what Lippmann calls a unique mimetic environment and then step into the cage of individual algorithms. The pseudo-environment refers to when people are submerged in the massive information of the mass media, lose the opportunity to directly contact the objective world, and cannot judge whether the information is true and objectively reflects the objective world that exists in reality. They can only understand the world from the pseudo-environment created by the media., so it is inevitable to produce a large number of deviations in understanding the world. At the same time, the mimetic environment will react on the real social environment, making the objective environment more and more likely to evolve into a mimetic environment.

A feasible solution in terms of technological ethics needs to be interpreted from both technological and ethical perspectives. On the one hand, from the technical level, first, it is necessary to realize the openness of the algorithm black box and the transparency of the algorithm technology. The "Algorithm Watch" adopted in Germany opened the black box of news algorithms, requiring media organizations to explain algorithms to society and understand the production process of algorithmic news without professional knowledge (Bao, 2022). Second, it is necessary to establish a visualization and multi-algorithm system. A diversified algorithm recommendation system can encourage users to understand various news content to a greater extent, and quantifiable news poll statistics can encourage users to understand the proportion of their positions and avoid their narrow thinking based on self-cognition. The news app developed by Nick Lamb in the United States selects 20 news sources from many news media and uses visual methods to help users escape their own reading bubbles, and at the same time, it can suggest users change sources to browse other factions. On the other hand, from an ethical point of view, it is necessary to strengthen the normative nature of news ethics and science and technology ethics, establish a unified social cognition and ethical norms for fair disputes, enhance the conceptual identity of social groups, establish a unified discourse system, and reduce Fragmentation of social concepts.

#### 4. Conclusion

The autonomy of algorithmic news makes the use of this technology full of uncertainty in the process of news communication, and there is also a crisis hidden in the opportunity. The proposition of how to correctly treat algorithmic news is closely related to the grand proposition of human beings' long-term technological development and social progress in the future. From the perspective of news communication, algorithmic news has directly changed the realization path of the traditional agenda setting theory. Through user personalized differential recommendations, agenda setting no longer has a unified value guiding role, but official media will still bear the corresponding value and function. From a legal perspective, user personalized recommendation involves many legal issues, such as the user's algorithmic right to know, information selection right, and privacy protection. Here, it is necessary to abandon the existing concept of information property rights definition and instead use the holder's contribution through a new type of distribution model based on size. On the basis of ensuring the protection of user privacy, a delicate balance between information protection and data circulation is achieved to maximize the protection of user rights and developers' commercial interests. In terms of science and technology ethics, in addition to establishing the basic technology itself on which science and technology ethics depends, it is the most important thing to maximize the unification of realistic social ethics cognition and build a harmonious public ethics. Under the overall industry trend, most people facing uncertainty choose to grope, but algorithm news has huge development prospects. The coexistence and coordinated development of humans and algorithms will be a mainstream development trend in the media industry. As far as the current level of artificial intelligence technology development and the application and practice of algorithmic news is concerned, embracing the algorithm, a news production imitator, can carry out efficient man-machine Interaction is one of the best solutions to enhance competitiveness.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

**Publisher's Note:** All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

#### References

- [1] Bao, Y. (2022). From technical myth to technological disenchantment: The ethical dilemma and normative path of algorithmic journalism. *New Media Research*, (4), 63–66. <https://doi.org/10.16604/j.cnki.issn2096-0360.2022.04.020>
- [2] Cai, S. M., & Chen, G. (2021). Research on the privacy protection dilemma and crack path under algorithmic news from the perspective of "contextual integrity" theory. *Journal of Social Science of Harbin Normal University*, (5), 144–147.
- [3] Chen, Y., & Xie, X. (2019). Journalism of assertion: An analysis of new news model driven by media technology. *Chinese Journal of Journalism & Communication*, (5), 80–92. <https://doi.org/10.13495/j.cnki.cjic.2019.05.005>
- [4] Cohen, B. C. (1963). *The press and foreign policy*. Princeton University Press.
- [5] Debatin, B. (2015). The end of ethics in journalism? In M. Prinzing, M. Rath, C. Schicha, & I. Stapf (Eds.), *Neuermessung der medienethik: Bilanz, themen und herausforderungen seit 2000* (56–73). Beltz Juventa.
- [6] Guan, Q. (2017). The current situation and trend of the news production of "robot reporter". *Media*, (3), 53–55.
- [7] Jaume-Palasi, L., & Spielkamp, M. (2017). *Ethics and algorithmic processes for decision making and decision support* (AlgorithmWatch Working Paper). <https://algorithmwatch.org/en/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/AlgorithmWatch-Working-Paper-No-2-Ethics-ADM.pdf>
- [8] Kovach, B., & Rosenstiel, T. (2007). *The elements of journalism: What newspeople should know and the public should expect*. Three Rivers Press.
- [9] Larenz, K. (2020). *Legal methodology* (6th ed.). Commercial Press.
- [10] Liu, C., & Xu, W. (2018). Can algorithms define society: news algorithm recommendation system from the perspective of media sociology. *Academic Forum*, (4), 28–37. <https://doi.org/10.16524/j.45-1002.2018.04.003>
- [11] Liu, J. (2013). Legal basis and expression techniques for legislative purpose clauses. *Journal of Law and Business*, (3), 48–57. <https://doi.org/10.16390/j.cnki.issn1672-0393.2013.03.005>
- [12] Liu, W. (2019). Legal perspective of algorithmic recommended news. *Shanghai Journalism Review*, (2), 22–29. <https://doi.org/10.16057/j.cnki.31-1171/g2.2019.02.004>
- [13] McCombs, M., Llamas, J. P., Lopez-Escobar, E., & Rey, F. (1997). Candidate images in Spanish elections: Second-level agenda-setting effects. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 74(4), 703–717. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107769909707400404>
- [14] Nissenbaum, H. (2010). *Privacy in context: Technology, policy, and the integrity of social life*. Stanford University Press.
- [15] Qiu, Y., & Chen, C. (2018). Black box: Artificial intelligence technology and news production pattern transmutation. *Journalism and Mass Communication Monthly*, (1), 28–34. <https://doi.org/10.15897/j.cnki.cn51-1046/g2.2018.01.005>
- [16] Ren, S., & Tian, J. (2018). The ethical dilemma of algorithmic journalism and its solutions: Take "Today's Headlines" as an example. *Media*, (6), 89–91.
- [17] Ren, Y. (2022). Legal structure and rule reconstruction of privacy protection in the digital age. *Oriental Law*, (2), 188–200. <https://doi.org/10.19404/j.cnki.dffx.20220225.002>
- [18] Shi, A., & Wang, P. (2017). 50 years of agenda setting theory and research: traceability, evolution and prospects. *Journalism and Communication Research*, (10), 13–28+127.

- [19] The Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. (2021, September 30). *The guidelines on strengthening the comprehensive management of internet information service algorithm*, published on the official website of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China [http://www.gov.cn/zhengce/zhengceku/2021-09/30/content\\_5640398.html](http://www.gov.cn/zhengce/zhengceku/2021-09/30/content_5640398.html)
- [20] The Cyberspace Administration of China. (2021, September 29). *Internet information service algorithm recommendations and management regulations are listed on the official website of the Cyberspace Administration of China, PRC*. [http://www.cac.gov.cn/2021-09/29/c\\_1634507915623047.html](http://www.cac.gov.cn/2021-09/29/c_1634507915623047.html)
- [21] The Ministry of Commerce. (2022). *Opinions on building a database system to better play the role of data elements*. [https://zycpzs.mofcom.gov.cn/html/gwy/2022/12\\_1672128008887.html](https://zycpzs.mofcom.gov.cn/html/gwy/2022/12_1672128008887.html)
- [22] Wang, L. (2021). Harmony and difference: Demarcation and application of privacy and personal information rules. *Law Review*, (2), 15–24. <https://doi.org/10.13415/j.cnki.fxpl.2021.02.002>
- [23] Wang, S. (2019). Technical innovation and ethical predicament of algorithmic recommendation news: A summary. *Chongqing Social Sciences*, (9), 123–132. <https://doi.org/10.19631/j.cnki.css.2019.09.012>
- [24] Wu, F. (2018). The latest progress and influence of “algorithm news” in developed countries. *Editorial Friend*, (5), 48–54. <https://doi.org/10.13786/j.cnki.cn14-1066/g2.2018.5.009>
- [25] Yao, X. Y. (2006). Three dimensions of comparative meaning between concepts of “ethics” and “morality” *Studies in Ethics*, (4), 21–25. <https://doi.org/10.15995/j.cnki.llyj.2006.04.005>
- [26] Yu, G. M., Yang, Y. Y., & Yan, Q. M. (2018). The algorithm is power: The algorithmic paradigm revolution in news communication. *Editorial Friend*, (5), 5–12. <https://doi.org/10.13786/j.cnki.cn14-1066/g2.2018.5.001>
- [27] Zhang, Z., & Zhou, J. (2017). Research on news algorithm: Topic review and localization prospect. *News and Writing*, (11), 18–23.