Dalma Lilla Dominek– Zoltán Szűts

The complex impact of AI-generated content on communication[1]

Abstract

The rise of artificial intelligence (AI) is causing a paradigm shift in many areas of communication. This paper explores the diverse and often ambivalent implications of AI-generated content, focusing on the risks of homogenisation and sameness, the potential for manipulation and disinformation, and the erosion of human interactions and social skills. It also examines the challenges of preserving linguistic diversity, the risk of exacerbating social inequalities, the role of cultural differences in the adoption of AI-based communication, and the importance of adaptation, the acquisition of new skills, and ethical considerations. Finally, the paper also analyses the psychological impact of AI on communication, highlighting the importance of maintaining self-confidence, autonomy and creativity when integrating with AI. The study takes an interdisciplinary approach, drawing on relevant research in linguistics, communication science, sociology, ethics and psychology.

Keywords: AI, communication, skills, psychology, education, linguistics

Introduction

The rapid development of Artificial Intelligence (AI) is profoundly changing many aspects of society, including communication. AI-generated content, be it text, speech, images or video, is increasingly essential in our daily lives, from news sources to social media and professional communication (Balázs G. 2015; Farkas et al. 2024). While AI has significant potential to increase the effectiveness and reach of communication, it also raises several critical issues and potential risks. This paper aims to provide a comprehensive picture of the complex implications of AI-generated content for communication, focusing on the dangers of homogenisation, manipulation and erosion of social skills. It also explores the social, cultural and psychological factors influencing the adoption and impact of AI-based communication. The complex effect of AI-generated content on communication: homogenisation, manipulation and erosion of social skills (Balázs–Arató 2024).

[1] "Project No. TKP2021-NKTA-51 was realized with the support of the Ministry of Culture and Innova tion from the National Research Development and Innovation Fund, financed by the TKP2021-NK TA tender program."

Homogenisation of communication and the proliferation of templates.

AI algorithms are trained on existing, mostly English-language data sets, which can result in the texts and speeches they generate repeating specific patterns and styles. This phenomenon can be particularly pronounced in cases where the training data does not adequately represent linguistic diversity and individual idioms. We risk losing our unique verbal expressiveness and linguistic innovation if we rely too heavily on AI-suggested or generated content. The suppression of individual style and creativity can be particularly problematic in creative industries (e.g. journalism, literature, screenwriting), education (e.g. essay writing, presentations) and personal expression, where authentic voice and originality of approach are key. If content production becomes routine, AI-generated 'good enough' texts may overshadow work based on individual thought and creative expression. Shneiderman (2021) emphasises that AI design should enhance rather than replace human creativity, highlighting the potential of human-machine collaboration in creative processes. Dominek (2022) highlights the role of the flow experience in acquiring experience and developing creativity in education in the context of the flow-based pedagogical model. The overuse of AI in communication can prevent the experience of flow in creative processes, thus limiting individual expression and linguistic innovation. Rather than enhancing our creativity, AI can paradoxically limit it if we passively accept the content it generates. In the long run, this can lead to a loss of linguistic and intellectual diversity (Bender–Friedman 2018), leading to a poverty of forms of communication and a loss of cultural and social diversity. The impact of AI in this direction can be hazardous for younger generations, who increasingly require autonomous, authentic self-expression and linguistic creativity in their identity formation. The decline of critical thinking, originality and intellectual curiosity may negatively affect education and democratic discourse.

The threat to linguistic diversity

Despite the development of AI-based translation technologies, maintaining linguistic diversity can be a significant challenge. Although AI systems are increasingly capable of handling more languages and machine translation technologies have made spectacular advances, minor languages, dialects and linguistic diversity are often overshadowed. One of the main reasons for this is the dominance of large training datasets containing predominantly most languages. As Hinton's (2015) work points out, deep learning systems

require vast amounts of data to be effective. This approach puts resource-poor languages, for which a limited quantity of digitised text is often available, at a structural disadvantage. This digital inequality can have technological, cultural, and social consequences. In his work on language revitalisation, Fishman (2001) emphasises that languages are not only means of communication, but also complex cultural systems that are carriers of shared knowledge, worldviews, historical experiences and identities. Suppose AI systems are unable to represent these languages adequately. In that case, this is not only a technological shortcoming, but can also contribute to cultural homogenisation and the gradual disappearance of linguistic diversity.

In the long term, marginalising minor languages in AI systems risks linguistic digital exclusion. This is exacerbated by the fact that in many cases, language communities do not have sufficient technical or financial resources to effectively digitise their languages and make them available to AI systems. In addition, collecting and using data raises several ethical issues, mainly if the data is used without the consent of the communities or in a non-transparent way. Jurafsky et al. (2020) highlight that a more inclusive, linguistically diverse approach that takes into account the specificities and cultural values of minority languages would be key in the development of language models for MI. This requires both technological developments and a commitment to language policy by developers, researchers and policy makers alike.

In the future, AI will have to speak as many languages as possible and represent each language community respectfully and responsibly (Balázs 2025). To this end, developing partnerships involving local language communities, linguists, cultural organisations and teachers is essential. In the long term, the marginalisation of minor languages in AI systems carries the risk of linguistic digital exclusion. This is exacerbated by the fact that the language-speaking communities often do not have sufficient technical or financial resources to digitise their languages and make them available to AI systems. In addition, collecting and using data raises several ethical issues, mainly if the data is used without the consent of the communities or in a non-transparent way. Jurafsky et al. (2020) highlight that a more inclusive, linguistically diverse approach that takes into account the specificities and cultural values of minority languages would be key in the development of language models for MI. This requires both technological developments and a commitment to language policy by developers, researchers and policy makers alike (Antal 2017; Antal 2024).

Manipulation and disinformation: the dark side of AI and ethical considerations

Being used as a tool for manipulation and disinformation is one of the darkest potential consequences of AI. AI can produce highly lifelike and convincing fake content, including deepfake videos, generated voice recordings, fake news, manipulated images and personalised misleading messages (Kenyeres–Szűts 2024: 2005; Kenyeres–Szűts 2025). These technologies can be highly sophisticated and often complex for experts to distinguish from accurate content (Goodfellow et al. 2014). This is particularly dangerous in digitally illiterate communities, where the ability to evaluate critically may not be able to keep up with algorithmic manipulation (Pennycook–Rand 2019; Kenyeres–Szűts 2024). AI can bring a new level of effectiveness to disinformation campaigns, with the ability to automatically produce targeted, personalised content for political or economic purposes. Micro-targeting exposes users to information bubbles that reinforce their views, increase polarisation and amplify social divisions (Lewandowsky et al. 2017). The narratives generated by AI can thus not only influence public opinion, but also directly impact the outcome of elections, trust in public institutions and the quality of democratic discourse. The danger is compounded by the tendency of users to over-rely on AI-generated content, which implies technological objectivity. This trust often leads to uncritical acceptance and diminishes the role of source criticism and awareness in information acquisition. The fake content created by AI not only disinforms, but also creates fear, anger or distrust in society through emotional manipulation - thus destabilising social cohesion.

A particularly worrying dimension of deepfake technology is that it can be used not only against public figures, but also against individuals, for example, in smear campaigns, online harassment or identity theft. At the same time, a new phenomenon is emerging: the strategy of plausible deniability, where the authenticity of real videos or statements can be challenged because they must be deepfakes, thus losing the power of facts in debates. Against this backdrop, prevention and protection through technological, educational and legal means are essential. Vaccari and Chadwick (2020) state that the fight against disinformation must occur at multiple levels: through media literacy and critical thinking education, technological solutions such as content authentication, source tracking and metadata-based identification systems.

Ethical considerations are central to the use of AI in communication. Privacy (Solove 2011), transparency of algorithms (Doshi-Velez et al. 2017),

fairness and avoidance of discrimination (Harris 2018), and accountability are all critical areas that require attention from lawmakers, technology developers, and users alike. Ensuring the authenticity and trustworthiness of AI-generated content and preventing the misuse of deepfake technologies is paramount to maintaining public trust (Taddeo–Floridi 2020). In the future, it will be necessary to develop comprehensive ethical frameworks that regulate the use of AI for communication purposes and ensure responsible and ethical use (Mittelstadt et al. 2016), taking into account the perspectives of different stakeholders (e.g. developers, users, society) (Anderson et al. 2018). Developers and users of AI have a shared responsibility to use these tools transparently, ethically and socially responsibly. Protecting the digital environment is not only a technological issue, but also a moral one, because the authenticity of our shared reality is at stake.

Excessive interactions with AI can reduce empathy and social skills, as these interactions often lack human emotions, non-verbal cues and fundamental social dynamics. Communicating with chatbots, especially with ChatGPT (Balázs–Bek–Szűts 2024: 666) and virtual assistants, does not require the complex social skills developed in basic human interactions, such as patience, understanding, compromise, emotional intelligence and conflict resolution. Turkle (2011) explores how technology affects our social relationships and intimacy, pointing to the dangers of superficiality in virtual relationships and the lack of real intimacy. If people spend too much time in such artificial interactions, they may be less prepared for the complexity and emotional depth of genuine human relationships. The impoverishment of personal relationships and the decline in social skills can negatively affect individual well-being and social cohesion (Oberle 2016), leading to increased social isolation and mental health problems (Cacioppo–Hawkley 2009). Dominek (2021) interprets flow as the presence of positive psychology in education, promoting immersion and intrinsic motivation (Ryan–Deci 2000). Relying solely on AI-based communication may reduce the potential for the flow experience experienced in fundamental human interactions to contribute to developing emotional intelligence and social skills. Thoughts generated with AI will be without heart and soul (Czine 2024).

Social inequalities

Social groups with more limited financial resources, lower digital literacy or living in peripheral regions may be significantly disadvantaged by the diffusion of AI-based systems. This access gap is reflected in the ability to

use the technologies and their physical, economic and educational access. AI's communication and information benefits, such as real-time translation, automated administration, personalised academic support or online employment opportunities, are truly accessible to those with the necessary tools, network infrastructure and technological literacy. Van Dijk (2005) clarifies that the digital divide is not just a technical issue, but is intertwined with profound social, economic and cultural inequalities. Digital illiteracy is not only an information disadvantage but also reduces an individual's opportunities to participate in education, the labour market, and democratic decision-making. The spread of AI could exacerbate these disadvantages, as algorithmic systems are often based on pre-existing social patterns, and if not correctly designed, risk reinforcing or recreating discrimination.

The problem of inequality of access is not only at the level of individuals, but also at the level of whole communities. Some schools, workplaces or regions do not have the resources to implement and sustain AI tools. As a result, students or workers in such environments are disadvantaged - their chances of social mobility, skills development and economic advancement are reduced. It is also important to note that access to AI is not only a technical issue, but can also be a cultural and linguistic one. If technologies cannot adequately address a particular language, dialect or cultural code, members of a specific community may again be excluded from the opportunities offered by AI. This can be particularly critical for minority or immigrant communities, who may then face a new form of digital marginalisation. Floridi (2014) emphasises that promoting digital ethics and information justice is one of the pillars of equitable AI development. The widespread and equitable availability of AI-based communication tools is essential to ensure these technologies reduce, rather than reinforce, existing inequalities. This requires targeted education programmes, inclusive design, and territorial and social equity in technological infrastructure.

Different cultures may also interpret and use AI-based communication tools differently, significantly impacting their acceptance and communication norms (Arató–Balázs 2022: 92; Szöllősi-Baráth 2023: 95). Hofstede's (2001) theory of cultural dimensions highlights that collectivist and individualist cultures have different values that can influence technology adoption and communication preferences. For example, resistance to AI-mediated interactions may appear impersonal in a collectivist culture, where there may be a greater emphasis on personal relationships and community harmony. Conversely, AI-based communication may be more readily adopted in an individualistic culture, emphasising efficiency, autonomy and convenience.

Consideration of cultural context is essential for successfully implementing AI communication technologies and managing potential resistance (Akinnagbe 2024), including culturally sensitive design and localisation of user interfaces (Nielsen 1993).

As AI becomes more integrated into our communication processes, we must learn how to interact effectively with these tools. This means not only understanding the technical skills but also being able to critically examine AI-generated content and identify potential biases and attempts at manipulation. The notion of AI literacy is becoming increasingly important, encompassing a basic understanding of how AI works, the effective use of AI-based tools, and knowledge of the ethical implications of AI (Long–Magerko 2020). Education and social awareness are key in helping people acquire these new skills, including critical thinking, media literacy and the responsible use of AI-based information resources (Buckingham 2003; Monika Rajcsanyi-Molnar 2024; Balázs L. 2023; Kőkuti et. al. 2023, Szűts–Szűts-Novák 2023: 566).

Ultimately, the actual societal value of AI communication technologies depends not only on their level of advancement but also on the fairness of their accessibility. The opportunity to participate in the digital world must not be a privilege – everyone deserves a fair chance to be part of the communication revolution of the 21st century (Arató–Balázs 2023: 756).

The psychological effects can also be profound. Excessive reliance on AI in decision-making and communication may reduce self-confidence and belief in one's abilities (Bandura 1977). The seemingly perfect texts and responses generated by AI can create unrealistic expectations of our communication skills, potentially leading to anxiety and self-esteem issues (Leary–Kowalski 1995). Constant comparison with AI-generated, flawless-looking content can negatively impact trust in individual creativity and self-expression. It is vital to view AI not as a replacement for creativity and independent thinking, but as a complement. Establishing a healthy balance in the interaction between human and artificial intelligence is crucial for maintaining psychological well-being (Ryan–Deci 2000), emphasising the fulfilment of psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness during interactions with AI. Overuse of AI can also reduce cognitive effort and weaken critical thinking skills (Carr 2010).

Conclusion

AI-generated text revolutionises communication but also brings significant challenges and risks. Homogenisation, manipulation, erosion of social skills,

threats to linguistic diversity, amplification of social inequalities, ethical dilemmas, and psychological impacts are all areas that require careful consideration and proactive measures. Future research and development should promote responsible AI use, enhance critical thinking, preserve linguistic and cultural diversity, and develop ethical frameworks. Only then can AI in communication truly benefit humanity without undermining individual creativity, social trust, and genuine human connections. Society must approach these complex challenges with an interdisciplinary perspective, involving technology developers, researchers, policymakers, and users alike in shaping a sustainable and ethical future for AI-based communication.

References

Akinnagbe, Olayiwola Blessing 2024. The Future of Artificial Intelligence: Trends and Predictions. *Mikailalsys Journal of Advanced Engineering International* 1(3), 249–261. https://doi.org/10.58578/mjaei.v1i3.4125.

Anderson, Janna – Rainie, Lee – Luchsinger, Alex 2018. Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Humans. Pew Research Centre.

Antal Zsolt 2024. A nyelvápolás és a közérthetőség nemzeti mintázatai a közszolgálatban. *E-nyelv Magazin*. https://e-nyelvmagazin.hu/2024/12/05/antal-zsolt-a-nyelvapolas-es-a-kozerthetoseg-nemzeti-mintazatai-a-kozszolgalatban/

Antal Zsolt 2017. Közszolgálati kommunikáció, közbizalom és médiaszabályozás. *In Medias Res* 2. 319–338. https://szakcikkadatbazis.hu/doc/4459648

Arató Balázs – Balázs Géza 2022. The linguistic norm and norm of legal language. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 146. 91–103. https://doi.org/10.38143/Nyr.2022.5.91

Arató Balázs – Balázs Géza 2023. Hol a tudás, amit elvesztettünk az információban? A digitális pedagógia diszkurzív-intuitív megközelítése antropológiai és jogi nézőpontból. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 147. 755–76. https://doi.org/10.38143/Nyr.2023.5.755

Arató, Balázs – Balázs, Géza 2024. The communicative-linguistic modes of artificial intelligence with a focus on justice. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 148. (Special Issue in English [2024–5]). 601–617. http://doi.org/10.38143/Nyr.2024.5.601.

Balázs Géza 2015. Netfolklór – intermedialitás és terjedés. *Replika* 1–2. 171–85.

Balázs Géza 2023. *Az internet népe*. Ludovika Egyetemi Kiadó. Budapest.

Balázs Géza 2025. Három szakma marad vagy minden? *E-nyelv Magazin*. https://e-nyelvmagazin.hu/2025/04/01/balazs-geza-harom-szakma-marad-vagy-minden/

Balázs Géza – Beke Ottó – Szűts Zoltán 2024. ChatGPT language recognition limitations. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 148. 666–81. https://doi.org/10.38143/Nyr.2024.5.666

Balázs, László 2023. Az iskolai kommunikáció egy rejtett dimenziója – szalutogén pedagógiai kommunikáció. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 147(5), 692–712. https://doi.org/10.38143/Nyr.2023.5.692

Bandura, Albert 1977. Social learning theory. Prentice Hall. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
Bender, Emily M. – Friedman, Batya 2018. Data statements for natural language processing: Toward mitigating system bias and enabling better science. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 6. 587–604.
Buckingham, David 2003. *Media education: Literacy, learning, and contemporary culture.* Polity. Cambridge.
Cacioppo, John T. – Hawkley, Louise C. 2009. Perceived social isolation and cognition. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 13(10), 447–454. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2009.06.005
Carr, Nicholas G. 2010. *The Shallows: What the Internet does to our brains.* W. W. Norton & Company. New York.
Czine Ágnes 2024. Words, phrases, thoughts without heart and soul... *Magyar Nyelvőr* 148. 570–578. https://doi.org/10.38143/Nyr.2024.5.570
Dijk, van, Jan A. G. M. 2005. *The deepening divide: Inequality in the information society.* Sage Publications. London. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452229812.
Dominek, Dalma Lilla 2021. A flow, mint a pozitív pszichológia jelenléte az oktatásban. *Eruditio – Educatio* 16(4), 72–82. https://doi.org/10.36007/eruedu.2021.4.72-82.
Dominek, Dalma Lilla 2022. On a Flow-Based Pedagogical Model: The Emergence of Experience and Creativity in Education. *Eruditio – Educatio* 17(3), 72–81. https://doi.org/10.36007/eruedu.2022.3.072-081.
Doshi-Velez, Finale – Kim, Been 2017. Towards a rigorous science of interpretable machine learning. *arXiv preprint* arXiv:1702.08608.
Farkas Imre – Kővári Attila - Rajcsányi-Molnár Mónika: The emergence of artificial intelligence in education and its impact on individual literacy in higher education In: IEEE – IEEE (ed.) *2024 IEEE 7th International Conference and Workshop Óbuda on Electrical and Power Engineering (CANDO-EPE): Proceedings* Piscataway (NJ), IEEE (2024) 347 p. pp. 83-88.
Fishman, Joshua A. 2001. *Can threatened languages be saved? Reversing language shift, revisited: A 21st century perspective.* Multilingual Matters. Clevedon. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853597060
Floridi, Luciano 2014. *The fourth revolution: How the infosphere reshapes human reality.* Oxford University Press. Oxford.
Geoffrey, Hinton – Deng, Li – Yu, Dong – Mohamed, Abdel-rahman – Dahl, George E. – Kingsbury, Brian – Jaitly, Navdeep – Senior, Andrew – Vanhoucke, Vincent – Nguyen, Patrick – Sainath, Tara N. – Rahman, Brian 2012. Deep Neural Networks for Acoustic Modelling in Speech Recognition: The Shared Views of Four Research Groups. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine* 29(6), 82–97. https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2012.2205597.
Goodfellow, Ian J. – Pouget-Abadie, Jean – Mirza, Mehdi – Xu, Bing – Warde-Farley, David – Ozair, Sherjil – Courville, Aaron – Bengio, Yoshua 2014. Generative adversarial nets. *NIPS'14: Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems* 2. 2672–2680.

Harris, Mateen 2018. Weapons of Math Destruction: How Big Data Increases Inequality and Threatens Democracy. *Berkeley Journal of Employment and Labour Law* 39(1).

Hofstede, Geert 2001. *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviours, institutions and organisations across nations.* Sage Publications. Thousand Oaks.

Jurafsky, Dan – Chai, Joyce – Schluter, Natalie – Tetreault, Joel 2020. *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics.* Association for Computational Linguistics. Online.

Kenyeres Attila Zoltán – Szűts Zoltán 2024. Az álhírek (fake news) definíciós kísérletei és nyelvi jelei. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 148. 203–235. https://doi.org/10.38143/Nyr.2024.2.203

Kenyeres Attila Zoltán – Szűts Zoltán 2025. Az adathalászat (phishing) fogalmi definiálása és főbb nyelvi jelei. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 149. 159–185. https://doi.org/10.38143/Nyr.2025.2.159

Kőkuti, Tamás – Balázs, László – András, István – Rajcsányi-Molnár, Mónika 2023. Collaborating with Artificial Intelligence – AI in Business Communication Education. In: Óbudai, Egyetem (szerk.): *IEEE 6th International Conference and Workshop in Óbuda on Electrical and Power Engineering (CANDO-EPE 2023): Proceedings.* IEEE. Danvers (MA). 287–294.

Leary, Mark R. – Kowalski, Robin M. 1995. *Social anxiety.* Guilford Press. New York.

Lewandowsky, Stephan – Ecker, Ullrich K. H. – Seifert, Colleen M. – Schwarz, Norbert – Cook, John 2012. Misinformation and Its Correction: Continued Influence and Successful Debiasing. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest* 13(3), 106–131. DOI: 10.1177/1529100612451018.

Long, Duri – Magerko, Brian 2020. What is AI Literacy? Competencies and Design Considerations. In: *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI'20).* Association for Computing Machinery. New York. 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376727.

Mittelstadt, Brent Daniel – Allo, Patrick – Taddeo, Mariarosaria – Wachter, Sandra – Floridi, Luciano 2016. The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. *Big Data & Society* 3(2). https://doi.org/2053951716679679.

Nielsen, Jakob 1993. *Usability engineering.* Academic Press. Boston. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-052029-2.50007-3

Oberle, Monika 2016. Robert D. Putnam: Bowling Alone. The Collapse and Revival of American Community, New York: Simon and Schuster 2000. In: Salzborn, S. (ed.): *Klassiker der Sozialwissenschaften.* Springer VS. Wiesbaden. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-13213-2_95.

Pennycook, Gordon – Rand, David G. 2019. Lazy, not biased: Susceptibility to partisan fake news is better explained by lack of reasoning than by motivated reasoning. *Cognition* 188. 39–50.

Rajcsanyi-Molnar, Monika – Balazs, Laszlo – Andras, Istvan 2024. Online Leadership Training in Higher Education Environment. *Acta Polytechnica Hungarica* 21(1), 39–52.

Ryan, Richard M. – Deci, Edward L. 2000. Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist* 55(1), 68–78.

Shneiderman, Ben 2021. Human-Centred AI: A New Synthesis. In: Ardito, C. et al. (eds): *Human-Computer Interaction – INTERACT 2021. Lecture Notes in Computer Science,* vol. 12932. Springer. Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-85623-6_1

Solove, Daniel J. 2011. *Nothing to hide: The false tradeoff between privacy and security.* Yale University Press. New Haven.

Szöllősi-Baráth Szabolcs 2023. A normavilágosság követelményének vizsgálata a közbeszerzési jogszabályok esetén. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 147. 93–107. https://doi.org/10.38143/Nyr.2023.1.93

Szűts Zoltán – Szűts-Novák Rita 2023. A social media és az okoseszközök kommunikációs jellemzőinek hatása a pedagógiára. Elméleti alapvetés a kommunikáció és a neveléstudomány kapcsolatáról. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 147. 565–582. https://doi.org/10.38143/Nyr.2023.5.565

Taddeo, Mariarosaria – Floridi, Luciano 2018. Regulate artificial intelligence to avert cyber arms race. *Nature* 296–298.

Turkle, Sherry 2011. *Alone together: Why we expect more from technology and less from each other.* Basic Books. New York.

Vaccari, Cristian – Chadwick, Andrew 2020. Deepfakes and disinformation: Emerging challenges for democratic communication. *Social Media + Society* 6(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120903408

Dalma Lilla Dominek
associate professor
Ludovika University of Public Service
E-mail: Dominek.Dalma.Lilla@uni-nke.hu
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8460-640X

Zoltán Szűts
university professor
Eszterházy Károly Catholic University
E-mail: szuts.zoltan@uni-eszterhazy.hu
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8539-670X