Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems
Issue 11, Vol. 8, 2025

Title of research article

The Mutual Influence of Digital Media and Local Communities in the Age of Automation

Lotfi Ali Guechi
Lecturer professor
UC3 University - Salah Boubnider
Algeria
Email: Lotfi.aliguechi@univ-constantine3.dz,
ORCID iD: 0009-0005-7260-7199

Issue web link https://imcra-az.org/archive/385-science-education-and-innovations-in-the-context-of-modern-problems-issue-11-vol-8-2025.html

Keywords Digital Media; Local Communities; Automation; Community Engagement ; Local Journalism.

Abstract
This article reports in detail on the in depth study we did of the very complex and reciprocal relationship between digital media and local communities as we see it in the present time of great automation. As digital media technologies which include players like AI and automated content generators grow to be an integral part of our social structure they in turn greatly transform the models of community interaction, local journalism, and the out reach of civic information. At the same time local communities which have their own unique requirements, cultural specifics and social dynamics play a great role in the development, roll out and growth of digital platforms and automated tools. We did a large scale review of the current and recent past inter disciplinary research from 2019 to 2025 which we used to report on main tech trends in local media ecosystems, we also looked at the double edge of what automation brings in terms of issues and opportunities for social cohesion and economic equity and we looked at the changing roles of human input in a world that is more and more run by algorithms. The results present a transformation which as automation grows so does content personalization, operational efficiency, and civic scalability; at the same time however we see large issues with algorithmic representation, participatory equity, and the digital literacy gap. We end by putting forth what we see as practical and policy issues for the health of local publics in digitalized systems which are also put forth as a call to the research community to develop cross disciplinary approaches which will in turn foster a more inclusive and community centered digital transition.

Citation. Guechi A.L. (2025). The Mutual Influence of Digital Media and Local Communities in the Age of Automation. *Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems*, 8(11), 734–743. https://doi.org/10.56352/sei/8.11.57

Received: 28.05.2025 | Accepted: 30.07.2025 | Published: 05.09.2025 (available online)

Introduction:

The community has for a very long time been the base of social organization, a which is a of geographically based proximity, shared identity, and personal relationships. For many generations the health of these communities was supported by what we today term traditional media outlets – local newspapers, radio stations, and community bulletin boards. These institutions served as very important channels for information, identity

reinforcement and public discussion which in turn created a platform for civic life. They did more than just report news they curated a shared story, fostered a great sense of belonging, reported on local power structures which in turn promoted civic accountability and thus wove the social fabric which held communities together. That which may have been imperfect did however provide a stable and recognized structure for local engagement and democracy (Nielsen, 2015).

In the second half of the 20th and the early years of the 21st centuries we saw the introduction of what would become digital media which in turn has very much disrupted what we had known before. The internet put forth new, decentralized, and global scales of communication and information exchange which in turn broke down geographical boundaries and gave way to what at times are interest based associations (Van Dijk, 2020). Social media networks, hyperlocal blogs, and community forums presented what seemed like unlimited chances for connection and information sharing. But also this shift broke up traditional audience groups, challenged the economic models of what was once local media, and also began to change the very nature of community which up until that point was very much place based into a more fluid and networked concept (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012).

At the same time we are seeing the emergence of a second, concurrent disruptive force which is the growth of automation technologies. Out of very fast advances in AI, machine learning, and complex algorithms we are past the stage of these techs being a far off concept and into a present which sees them very much a part of the make up of digital media systems (Susskind, 2020). This intro of automation is very much in the fabric of what runs digital media ecosystems which in turn is very much changing the base elements which support community info flow: in content production which we see in the use of auto journalists and data driven journalism (Carlson, 2015), in content delivery which is via algo based curation on social media and search engines (Gillespie, 2014), and in content which is put out there which we see in very personal info tailored to the individual user (Pariser, 2011). This dual shift – first through the process of digitization and now that of automation – which we see is a very different world for local communities. It calls for a critical study which looks past separate analysis of each of the forces at play to that of their interaction. We must look at the fine and dynamic relationship between digital media and local communities in this age of wide spread automation. Also we see that these techs are not just external instruments but in fact agents of social structure change, also at the same time it is important to note that communities are not passive to this change but rather players that adapt to, push back against, and in fact help to design these technologies (Zuboff, 2019).

This article puts forth to study what is at the heart of our research question: What role do digital media and automation play in the transformation of local communities and in what way do communities play a role in the design of these technologies? We look at this through two main lenses. First we look at how automation is a force which changes the fabric of community – it may bring about new social structures, change how info is shared around, and play a role in the economic growth or decline of a region. Also we look at how community traits, issues which are unique to a place, culture, and also issues of resistance from community members in fact inform the design of which digital tools are used and how they function in practice.

Understanding the complex and dynamic relationship between these issues is more than a theoretical pursuit. It is of great import to many groups which include policy makers that are putting forth AI and digital platform regulations, community leaders which are looking to use tech for social good, and the tech developers which are at work on the next frontiers of what is possible (Pickard, 2020). At great risk we play this out today which is which of these technologies will we see which build up strong, adaptive and inclusive communities or which will we see which put forward existing inequalities, weaken social structures, and break down democracy in our growing digital and automatic world. To in depth look at this complex issue we will present a structured analysis which is what this paper does. We begin by putting forth a wide ranging theoretical framework which includes media ecology, socio technical systems, and political economy perspectives. We then do a in depth review of the present literature to map out the current digital and automated environment. The paper goes on to report on our synthesis method before we present key results of the transformation we see between tech and community. At last we look at the what these results mean which we put out there for use in to shape a sustainable and human centered digital future for local communities.

Theoretical Foundations:

Lenses for Understanding Mutual Influence

To study the intricate relationships between digital media, automation and local communities we have developed a very broad and interdisciplinary theoretical framework. By bringing together these perspectives we are able to present a full picture of how tech systems transform social structures and behaviors and also how communities play a role in that which changes technology.

Media Ecology and Sociotechnical Systems Theory

In the present study we look to Media Ecology Theory which was developed by scholars like Marshall McLuhan and Neil Postman. This theory puts forth that media do not simply and transparently report information but are instead dynamic environments which greatly transform human perception, behavior, cognition and social structure (Couldry & Hepp, 2017). From this point of view digital media platforms (for instance Facebook groups, Nextdoor, local news apps) are not at all the same as tools but are in fact new digital habitats. These habitats change basic elements of community interaction – they shift the speed of communication (instantaneous as opposed to daily print), the scale of audience (global as opposed to local town), and the very make up of collective memory and identity (which is algorithmic as opposed to editorial). Also in to play here is the famous dictum that "the medium is the message" – it is the properties of digital, automated media which in turn shape community life regardless of the specific content they present.

Comprising this is Social Technical Systems Theory (STS) which puts forth the idea of social and technical elements in any complex system as inextricably linked. We see in STS a rejection of technological determinism which presents tech change and social change as a unitary whole. This is a key perspective for looking at the development of digital media and automation which we tend to think of as a pure technical bottom up process. Instead what we have is a dynamic process of negotiation. The design of a social media algorithm for local news for example is a product of social values, economic models and programmer bias (social shaping of tech) which in turn goes on to change social interaction, news consumption and community issues (tech shaping of society) (Bucher, 2018). For a full picture of what is going on we must look at the full human and machine elements.

Social Influence and Community Media Theories

At a detailed level Social Influence Theory (which includes Bandura's social cognitive theory and theories of diffusion of innovations) is key to the explanation of the micro processes of technology adoption within communities. Individuals and out of groups do not adopt new digital technologies in a void. Their adoption is very much a result of what they see as the norm, the actions of opinion leaders in their community, and the which which early adopters in their social network are using the technology (Jenkins et al., 2009). This theory also accounts for the quick often viral take off of platforms like WhatsApp for neighborhood watch groups or Facebook for local event organization which is in great part due to community leaders and early users which play a large role in the validation and integration of the technology into the fabric of community life.

Also in that which Community Media Theory presents we have a normative framework for the discussion of media's role in local life. This theory brings to light the important role played by media that is run by, for and within a specific community. It's base values are participation, access and the promotion of local identity and democratic discussion. This theoretical stand point puts forth a critical measure with which to gauge the effect of digital platforms which are automated and commercial. It brings up fundamental questions like does that which is run by algorithms truly serve local issues or do they instead promote what may divide? Can we use automation to support the cause of community media or does it in fact centralize control away from the local level? This theory also brings to the fore the special value of media which is answerable to its community (Lindgren, 2017).

Economic and Labor Perspectives on Automation

To study the great material impact of automation economic theories are a must. We look at the issue of Technological Unemployment and also include Political Economy which in turn looks at how automation plays out in local economies, restructures employment and in that which we may term the base of community life. Automation brings in the promise of greater efficiency but also we see it's a cause of job loss, task simplification and wage inequality which in particular play out in routine and low skill jobs present in local economies

(example – in local government admin, retail and even elements of journalism). This economic instability which is a result breaks down community stability.

These theories also present a view into adaptive strategies. The idea of Just Transition puts forth that we put in place policies which support workers and communities left behind by tech change via retraining programs, social safety nets, and also we look at new economic models like platform cooperativism (Pickard, 2020). Also we look at the issue of Digital Inclusion which goes beyond just access to tech to also include the elements of skill, affordability and relevant content which together will enable full and equitable participation in the digital space (Van Dijk, 2020). Also this approach we put forward is to see how tech is playing a role in either increasing or decreasing existing socio economic inequalities within and between local communities.

Literature Review:

Mapping the Digital and Automated Landscape

Existing research presents a full though at times broken picture of how digital media and automation are changing community life. This review brings that together which looks at communication, information ecology, and socio-economic structures.

The Dual Role of Digital Media in Community Engagement

Over the past decade research has reported that which we see is a double edge role of digital media. On the hand we see that platforms like Facebook Groups, Nextdoor, and dedicated community apps have become very integral to what we do in terms of community outreach and engagement (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012). They put out info very locally, see and respond to issues almost in real time which in turn prompts large scale action (for instance a local clean up, or a fund raise for a family in crisis) also we see the formation of interest based sub communities which break out of physical boundaries. Also from the likes of the Pew Research Center we see that these tools play a large role in what they term as the constant awareness of goings on in our communities, in effect they are strengthening what we may call weak ties and at the same time are a layer of connection we didn't have before.

On the other hand what we see is that this digital engagement exists with and at times does in fact worsen the want for in depth and genuine connection. Also we see that although Americans are growing to get their news from digital sources what is very much still in demand is that which which fosters local tie and accountability (Nielsen, 2015). This brings out what is a short coming of many digital platforms which while very good at what they do in terms of information out put and weak tie connection are in fact poor at the issue of in depth discussion which is a requirement for the solution of complex local issues. Also in to the hands of private companies we are putting the control of community communication which by and large have as there main accountability to their shareholders and not to the citizens (Zuboff, 2019).

The Transformation and Crisis of Local Journalism

Local news is at the core of what makes up a community's info environment and also is the most affected institutions. Digital technologies have brought about the decline of the traditional advertising based revenue models which in turn has led to mass lay-offs, newspaper shut downs and the growth of what we see as news deserts – communities which do not have a dedicated local news source (Anderson, Bell, & Shirky, 2015). This crisis also has very large scale democratic implications which include reduced civic participation, increase in corruption, and we see a greater political polarization.

In response we see a great deal of innovation in local journalism. Digital native non profit news rooms (for example The Texas Tribune) have appeared which are running on grants and member donations. Legacy players are putting out digital subscriptions, podcasts and email newsletters. Also they are turning to technology for solutions which in turn is a path to survival. This includes in depth use of data journalism to break local stories, use of social media for audience growth and also as we will discuss integrate automation into news production (Lewis & Westlund, 2015).

Automation's Impact on Work and Information Production

The issue of automation in the workforce is a key focus of research which in turn has large scale economic implications for communities. From the research done by groups like McKinsey and the Brookings Institution we see that although automation does boost productivity, what is also true is that these benefits do not fall equally on all (Susskind, 2020). It also tends to take out routine jobs, at the same time which we see is to a large degree responsible for wage stagnation and income inequality. What we are seeing is a 'hollow out' of the middle of the labor market which in turn puts pressure on community resources and also increases social stratification.

In the field of local journalism we are seeing the adoption of automation to address what are very acute resource issues. Tools such as Automated Insights' Wordsmith and United Robots' software are used to produce large amounts of data driven content which we see in real estate transactions, local sports results, and crime reports (Carlson, 2015). This "robot journalism" is a complement to human reporters which in turn free them from routine tasks to do in depth investigative and analysis work. It also helps to expand coverage which in turn maintains audience engagement. From case studies in Scandinavian countries which have high adoption rates we are seeing very promising results in terms of news output.

However in the literature we see that which puts forth great issues. Automated systems are a reflection of the data they are trained on. They do what they are trained to do which is to repeat and amplify present biases and at the same time which may ignore niche or minority reports that do not have large representation in the training data (Gillespie, 2014). This in turn creates a risk of a new "algorithmic divide" which sees some community issues and groups left out in the automated news report. Also we are still at the stage which we are trying to work out the ethics of automated content generation – transparency, accountability for errors, and the issue of use which may include the spread of misinfo (Graves, 2018).

Methodology:

A Systematic Synthesis-Driven Approach

Given the large scale and multidisciplinary scope of the research question this study uses a systematic, theory based literature review approach. We put forth this approach which is best for the synthesis of present knowledge, to also which is to say we identify what is agreed upon and what is not in the literature and in which we present a novel conceptual framework that which puts forth the results of that analysis.

Data Collection and Selection Criteria

The research did a in depth and iterative review of sources put out between 2019 and 2025 which we did to get the latest data. We looked at four main types of sources :

1- Academic Databases: In Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar we found peer reviewed articles which we located via keyword combinations of ("automation" or "AI") and ("local journalism" or "local news"), ("digital media") and ("community engagement") and also ("algorithmic curation") and ("local community").

2- Industry and Policy Reports: Also we looked at grey literature from top groups like Deloitte, McKinsey Global Institute, Pew Research Center, and the Knight Foundation which gave us info on trends, adoption rates and economic impact.

3- Organizational Resources: We looked at what the Local Media Association, the Center for Community Media, and the International Center for Journalists had to say which covered practical applications and ground level challenges.

4- Case Studies: We did in depth qualitative analysis of certain put forth by which we look at automated community management platforms (for instance moderation tools on large community forums) and local media automation initiatives in particular in Scandinavia (which includes MittMedia in Sweden) and North America.

Data Analysis Framework

The we conducted a qualitative content analysis which included:

- Coding: We did thematic coding of the literature based on our prior theoretical frameworks (we used codes for "algorithmic bias", "digital literacy initiatives", "revenue model innovation", "social cohesion").
- Synthesis: We very carefully put together results from very diverse sources to bring out over arching themes, which reports what we found to be true time and again as well as the big issues we came across.
- Framework Development: We put together these themes to present a which is a whole new model that puts forth the what how digital media, automation and communities play off each other and what are the results of that play.

It is important to note we did not collect any new primary empirical data for this study. Our contribution is in taking existing research and in a novel way we put it together and we gave a full picture of a very complex and evolving issue.

Results:

In a review of present day research we see that which is put forth is a world of what may be termed as in process and continuous change between digital media, automation, and local communities. This is not a one way street but a very complex set of issues which see in play for example between efficiency and equity, and also between scalability and authentic representation. We note 3 main thematics which contain in them these in between and at time conflicting issues.

1. The Efficiency-Scalability-Personalization Triad: New Capabilities and New Vulnerabilities

Automation technologies have infused local digital ecosystems with what was once beyond imagination, mainly in terms of efficiency, scale, and relevance.

- **As a Prerequisite for Success, Not a Nice To Have:**
Automation is what local institutions that are under very tight resources use as a primary tool. In which we see that in issue of economic pressure to which local newsrooms are at the moment of breaking point, use of AI within the form of NLG software is introduced. This technology is used to produce large amounts of data based content that reports out on things like which high school scored in what game this past weekend, which house sold for what price in that neighborhood, and what was the report on crime in our area for the week (Carlson, 2015). For example we see in the case of Scandinavian regional newspapers which have implemented reporting automation what we that they report an increase of 20% in the reporters' time which in turn they put into in depth investigative reports, nuanced feature stories and community engagement – which are very much a human element and require analysis and empathy. Also in local government we are seeing more and more use of chatbots on community association websites in regard to very regular citizen requests for info on trash collection, permit applications, or event registration. This is not just a way to cut costs but a strategic shift to run a base level of public service and info out put in a very resource starved environment which in turn allows basic civic functions to continue to operate with less human resources.

- **Unprecedented Scalability of Community Management:**

Digital platforms that which run on automated content moderation tools, sentiment analysis algorithms, and automatic membership management systems are now able to support community growth to a size and diversity which would be impossible through human effort alone (Bucher, 2018). A single community manager with these tools at her disposal is able to run a network of thousands of members which she does so by using the auto systems to report out on toxic language, to identify issues which are flaring up and to handle the routine admin tasks. This scale which we see is enabling the formation and also the maintenance of very large, distributed "communities of interest" which break free of physical geography, for instance national groups for owners of a certain breed of dog or global networks for professionals in a very niche field. But this scale also brings a trade off in that which we lose out on the in depth local knowledge a human moderator brings. The automation does a great job at managing scale but can fall short in the quality, context which goes into local community norms and in the interpersonal relationships.

- **Hyper-Personalization and the "Local Filter Bubble":**

AI designed recommendation algorithms do very well at personalizing what each individual gets out of digital communities (Pariser, 2011). What a member sees in terms of local news, which social groups to join, what events are put forward to them is very much a very tailored experience – we see news from a certain neighborhood, updates from your child's school, info on local zoning which affects your street. This very fine tuned personalization increases the relevance of the info right away and in turn engenders greater user engagement in a digital space that is made just for you. Also it creates what we may call a "local filter bubble" a personal information world that may in fact reduce what is put in front of a citizen which is the greater issues of the wider community. While it does increase that which which a like minded group affiliate with each other, at the same time it may also play a role in breaking down the common pool of info that is required to address wide scale community issues and in turn in the development of a common community identity (Nechushtai & Lewis, 2019).

2. The Challenges of Equity, Representation, and Human Agency: The Perils of Algorithmic Mediation

The push for efficiency, scale, and personalization presents great risks which in turn threaten the core principles of equitable representation and democratic accountability in local communities.

- **Algorithmic Oversight and Systemic Bias:**

Across large scale of studies we see that which we put forward in automation of efficiency brings with it inborn issues of bias and misrepresentation (Gillespie, 2014). We see that which which automated content moderation systems do of which they are trained on large general sets do in fact often fail to understand local context, dialect or satire. This in turn causes the mis identification and removal of what is in fact local discourse as toxic content which in turn goes after minority groups and activists whose language may not play by the main stream rules. Also that which news generating algorithms are only as objective as what they are given to feed them. If historical data on crime or event coverage which is in fact biased against certain neighborhoods is what is put in, the algorithm will not only reproduce but also amplify this issue which in turn does the marginalization of already underserved communities (Nechushtai & Lewis, 2019). Also the algorithms design to put out what gets the most user engagement does so which puts forward sensational, divisive or very emotional content which in turn skews the public digital sphere away from the serious fact based discussion and into conflict thus increasing the polarization of the community.

- **The Digital Literacy Imperative and the New Frontier of Inequality:**

The growth of digital automation has brought about a very steep and diverse learning curve for what it takes to be an active member of the digital civic space (Van Dijk, 2020). We see that simple access to the internet is no longer enough. What we are instead is a requirement for advanced digital literacy skills which in turn is a pre-requisite to use of algorithmic news feeds, to tell the difference between machine generated content and human journalism, to get to terms with complex issues of data privacy, and to think critically about the large volume of info we are presented with. Also this has brought up a new form of inequality – what we are seeing is a digital fluency gap. Seniors, low income groups and those with less formal education are at great risk of being left out – not just as info consumers but as players in the digital civic space (Jenkins et al., 2009). Thus, their voices and issues may go unrepresented in what we may call digital town squares which in turn plays into and increases the social economic gaps within communities.

- **Erosion of Traditional Accountability and the Devaluation of Local Knowledge:**

The integration of automation is blurring what used to be clear lines of accountability which at its core changes the character of labor in community information ecosystems (Graves, 2018). When an automated system gets out with an inaccurate story or a chatbot gives a citizen wrong info a key question we are left with is which is at issue – the software developer, the media company which put it out, or the public institution which bought it? This accountability gap can erode public trust. Also the transition of newsroom labor from field reporting to data management, algorithm monitoring and tech maintenance is a large scale issue. It may in fact erode what we may call "institutional knowledge" – that in depth knowledge of a community's history, power structures and unspoken rules which is held by the senior local journalists (Anderson, Bell, & Shirky, 2015). That which is the base of in depth and trusted journalism and effective community management which at present algorithms are not able to reproduce. The risk is we see a move towards a more technical efficiency but less context rich information environment.

3. Community-Led Adaptation and Resilience: Agency in the Automated Age

In response to these great challenges the literature reports that local communities do not passively accept technological change but are in fact very much a part of that change which they adapt to and which they in turn shape – also they develop innovative practices which restore their role.

- **Digital Literacy Coalitions as a Response:** We see that there is a digital fluency gap which has in turn produced from the bottom up responses to build up community based resources. Public libraries, community centers, and non profit organizations are at the fore front of digital literacy training (Jenkins et al., 2009). Also what we are seeing is that these initiatives go beyond the basic computer skills to include "algorithmic literacy" which is the study of how news feeds and recommendation systems work also we see the introduction of critical thinking skills which in turn help citizens to identify automated content and misinformation. These coalitions are a very important civic effort to see that the community as a whole is able to play a full role in the new digital public square.

- **Support for Alternative, Community-Centric Models:**

  A large trend at present is the increase in support for alternative economic and governance models which put out of play the big tech platforms' metrics of success and instead which account for local wants (Pickard, 2020). This includes the growth of member based non profit local news organizations (for instance City Bureau in Chicago, The Texas Tribune) which put forward civic value above all else. Also we see greater interest in platform cooperativism – which is when the digital community platform is run and governed by its members – thus the rules of the road and algorithmic principles are set by the community's themselves instead of by remote corporate entities (Lindgren, 2017).

- **Strategic Partnerships for Sustainable Innovation:**

  Finally, we see a trend of local media players and community groups which have begun to form strategic alliances to pool resources and expertise. These collaborations which may include local universities (for research and technical development), tech start ups (for tool development and implementation) and community foundations (for funding and local legitimacy) (Lewis & Westlund, 2015). These hybrid models they put in place create a more sustainable and resilient ecosystem for local info. For example a local news room may team up with a university's computer science dept to develop a custom ethically audited algorithm for which curates local event news thus the tech is tailored to the community's specific values and needs as opposed to a one size fits all commercial product. This is a practical solution which also brings in the benefits of automation while at the same time keeping development and deployment in a local context and under human supervision.

Discussion

This study reports we see a very complex and at the same time very much a part of each other relationship between digital media, automation, and local communities. That which we see is not of a linear cause and effect but of a continuous feedback loop in which technical systems put forth new terms for social interaction and info flow and at the same time communities which are responsive, resistant, and also shapers of these very technologies. This plays out as a very fine line we must walk between efficiency and equity, scalability and true representation, personalization and public discourse which determines the future of local community life in the digital age.

The key issue we face is to put in place a framework which takes in the great benefits of what we get from the efficiency-scalability-personalization trio while at the same time very carefully dealing with its issues. We must go beyond a pure technical approach; we require a socio technical solution which puts social values into tech design (Bucher, 2018). This begins with a very strong base in human centered design which sees algorithms as aids to human decision making not replacements. In practice this means we see to it that there is meaningful human input – what some term a "human in the loop" system – which puts forward issues for final human review by automated content moderation and which has algorithmic news generation supported by in depth reporting and ethical editing. Also this approach protects the in depth understanding, context awareness and

moral responsibility which is the base of community trust and democratic discussion. Also we must have transparency which is non negotiable in this issue of accountabiliity; users must be made aware of how algorithmic systems put together their info environment and when they are in fact interacting with auto generated content (Graves, 2018).

However, it is true that tech design by itself is not enough. In the coming age of automation what we see is that which which local communities will sustain themselves out of will be a balance between what we put into digital tools and also into social infrastructure (Van Dijk, 2020). This is a two pronged approach of which we build digital literacy and at the same time we strengthen physical institutions. We must develop what I will term advanced digital fluency in our citizens which includes the ability to critically use algorithmic feeds, to sort through automated content and to protect privacy (Jenkins et al., 2009). Also at the same time we must put forward that while libraries, community centers, and local press may be of the past they are in fact the present and the future of community identity. These institutions serve as that which is trusted and human curated which in turn foster serendipity and face to face connection that algorithms do not. They are the cure to the breaking up and isolation that automated systems may cause.

In the base of these efforts should be a radical rethinking of economic models which in turn will ensure that the benefits of automation are equitably distributed and do not worsen present inequalities (Pickard, 2020). We are at a point which large tech players' power and revenue is concentrated in the hands of a few which in turn requires we think up innovative policy and community based solutions. This may include in to negotiating community benefit agreements which see tech companies put a part of their profit into the local digital infrastructure which they use, putting forward public funding models and tax breaks for independent local journalism, and also pushing for platform cooperativism which is a model in which digital community platforms are run and governed by their users (Lindgren, 2017). These models put forward that governance and algorithmic issues should support community values as opposed to profit extraction.

In the end which is what this all comes down to we have a great need for strong policy and governance responses. Self regulation has0 out proved to be insufficient for the size of the issue at hand (Zuboff, 2019). It is time for legislators and regulators to take action in the mandating of algorithmic transparency which in turn will enable independent audit to identify and put a stop to bias. Also required are antitrust measures which will break up big tech's dominant position in the market and in their wake foster the growth of alternative community based models. What we as a policy must aim for is the development of what we may term a digital public sphere which we will know is successful by its impact on issues like informed discussion, civic participation, and social cohesion not by the shallowness of user engagement metrics (Vredenburg & Spry, 2020). We will see this through with thought out design, in put from into social infrastructure, creative economic models, and bold policy – only then will we be able to guide our way through to a world in which digital automation is a force that which does good by our local communities' health and diversity, instead of damage.

Conclusion:

The digital transformation of our age is seeing local communities and the media which serves them influence each other in new ways – it is a defining process of our time that is very much in the process of redefining how we interact socially, do business, and participate in civic affairs. AI and automation put at our disposal very powerful tools to improve the scale, scope and impact of local info exchange (Susskind, 2020). But also they are not magic solutions; they are rather what we put into them which in turn will play out existing issues of intent and inequality.

We will not achieve a sustainable future for local communities in a digital age through tech alone. What is required is a whole scale, integrated approach which puts together tech innovation with effective, people centered governance, wide scale and inclusive digital education, and design that is empathetic, equitable and which is accountable to the local community (Dutton, 2009). The health of our local communities is in our hands as we navigate this co evolutionary process which we are a part of, and which we must steer with care to see that the digital spaces we create are not just about connection but also about true belonging, not just the flow of info but also that of understanding and not just growth in efficiency but in also in terms of resilience and democracy.

Future Research should focus on longitudinal studies which track these changes over time, also we should see to it that we develop and evaluate adaptive policy frameworks, and very much so we put in place participatory design methods which include community members in the development of the technologies which are to serve them (Tandoc, 2019). The issue is not that automation will shape our communities but that we will together shape automation to build the communities we wish to live in.

References

1. Anderson, C. W., Bell, E., & Shirky, C. (2015). *Post-industrial journalism: Adapting to the present*. Tow Center for Digital Journalism. https://doi.org/10.7916/D8N01JS7
2. Bennett, W. L., & Segerberg, A. (2012). The logic of connective action: Digital media and the personalization of contentious politics. *Information, Communication & Society, 15*(5), 739–768. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2012.670661
3. Bucher, T. (2018). *If...then: Algorithmic power and politics*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190493028.001.0001
4. Carlson, M. (2015). The robotic reporter: Automated journalism and the redefinition of labor, compositional forms, and journalistic authority. *Digital Journalism, 3*(3), 416–431. https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2014.976412
5. Couldry, N., & Hepp, A. (2017). *The mediated construction of reality*. Polity Press.
6. Dutton, W. H. (2009). The fifth estate emerging through the network of networks. *Prometheus, 27*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/08109020802657453
7. 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. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262525374.003.0009
8. Graves, L. (2018). *Understanding the promise and limits of automated fact-checking*. Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism. https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/our-research/understanding-promise-and-limits-automated-fact-checking
9. Jenkins, H., Purushotma, R., Weigel, M., Clinton, K., & Robison, A. J. (2009). *Confronting the challenges of participatory culture: Media education for the 21st century*. The MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/8435.001.0001
10. Lewis, S. C., & Westlund, O. (2015). Big data and journalism: Epistemology, expertise, economics, and ethics. *Digital Journalism, 3*(3), 447–466. https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2014.976418
11. Lindgren, S. (2017). *Digital media and society*. SAGE Publications.
12. Nechushtai, E., & Lewis, S. C. (2019). What kind of news gatekeepers do we want machines to be? Filter bubbles, fragmentation, and the normative dimensions of algorithmic recommendations. *Computers in Human Behavior, 90*, 298–307. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.09.003
13. Nielsen, R. K. (2015). Local journalism: The decline of newspapers and the rise of digital media. *Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism*. https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/our-research/local-journalism
14. Pariser, E. (2011). *The filter bubble: What the Internet is hiding from you*. Penguin Press.
15. Pickard, V. (2020). *America's battle for media democracy: The triumph of corporate libertarianism and the future of media reform*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781139991722
16. Susskind, D. (2020). *A world without work: Technology, automation, and how we should respond*. Metropolitan Books.
17. Tandoc, E. C., Jr. (2019). The facts of fake news: A research review. *Sociology Compass, 13*(9), e12724. https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12724
18. Van Dijk, J. (2020). *The network society* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
19. Vredenburg, J., & Spry, A. (2020). Brand purpose and the prioritisation of societal well-being. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing, 39*(4), 450–461. https://doi.org/10.1177/0743915620949233
20. Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. Public Affairs.