



University of Groningen

Introducing the Complexities of Developments in Digital Journalism Studies

Eldridge II, Scott; Franklin, Bob

Published in:

The Routledge Handbook of Developments in Digital Journalism Studies

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Final author's version (accepted by publisher, after peer review)

Publication date:

2018

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Eldridge II, S., & Franklin, B. (2018). Introducing the Complexities of Developments in Digital Journalism Studies. In S. Eldridge, & B. Franklin (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Developments in Digital Journalism Studies* (1 ed.). Abingdon: Routledge.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Introducing the Complexities of Developments in Digital Journalism Studies

Scott A. Eldridge II and Bob Franklin

Development is a tricky thing; it can be positive, but there is no guarantee that it will be so. Moreover, while it can be linear, it often meanders. And, while the term can signal the expansion of a field, it can also refer to a growing body of ideas within an unruly domain with uncertain boundaries. These dynamics are particularly in focus when the conversation concerns developments in a field of scholarly research like Digital Journalism Studies that is made up in equal parts of developing research and research agendas, and is inherently concerned with developments in a rapidly changing field of journalism as it unfolds around us: perhaps unsurprising then in this context, that Peter Dahlgren notably dubbed digital journalism a “sprawling domain” (Dahlgren 2013: 160). In this Handbook, we identify developments in various components of Digital Journalism Studies, including shifts in what we understand as digital journalism, developments in how we research digital journalism, as well as developments in how we think about digital journalism and its place in our broader societies. The *Routledge Handbook of Developments of Digital Journalism Studies* aims to show how a field which itself has emerged only recently (Franklin and Eldridge 2017) has developed rapidly to present a more complex, and richer, set of academic discussions.

In addressing a range of concerns journalism scholars have raised in recent years while making sense of journalism within our increasingly (but not exclusively) digital environment, this Handbook also incorporates a series of answers to those concerns and presents new modes of research inquiry. In doing so, the ambition is to invigorate research agendas which can brighten the corners of digital journalism research. This collection brings together scholars who are producing leading edge research in digital journalism, including emerging scholars and work which focuses on aspects of change in journalism that have been underexplored as the field continues to take shape. Contributors illustrate how to approach the shifting technologies of a digital age, and explore ways to seat establish these while regarding their implications for journalism and its place in our societies. Chapters also show where digital developments have at times been more uneven than we might have initially anticipated, examining where early enthusiasm for digital opportunities left important debates and unforeseen consequences underexplored. In bringing these voices to the forefront, we also highlight research which explores those circumstances which make it hard to see developments in digital technologies as wholly positive. In this Introduction, we guide a discussion through the 39 contributions in the Handbook, situating their analyses within extant but also emerging areas of Digital Journalism Studies to introduce the themes, structure, and topics addressed in this collection.

New complexities, new debates, and fundamental concerns

Digital Journalism Studies could easily be cast as a field defined by change given that its focus is on the most recent shifts in journalism, and could equally be seen in large part through its inextricable link to the advancement of digital technologies. Yet this would paint an incomplete picture of the breadth of scholarship involved (as argued in Eldridge and Franklin, 2017), since while change remains a salient consideration and technology a key focus, we emphasize in this Handbook where these themes are interwoven into the broader social dynamics of journalism. Analysis also needs to consider where 'digital' does not necessarily offer an explanation of all that occurs within our societies, and where other factors temper any narratives of digital technology revolutionizing journalism, or its place in society (Broersma and Peters 2016: 9). This is reflected in the work of Bonnie Brennen (Chapter 31), who helpfully reminds scholars of those people who prefer to 'opt out' of digital media for a variety of reasons, and when we speak of the scope and scale of change in increasingly, but not exclusively, digital societies, we need to bear in mind that digital prominence is not the same as ubiquity. To begin our Introduction, it is helpful to keep this consideration in mind for what it says about the interaction between societies and technologies, and publics and journalism. Such measured reflection draws our attention to the ways Digital Journalism Studies is at once unpacking how news and information are being communicated using new technologies, but also to where journalism's current practices and our thinking about these resonate with journalistic roles that predate our digital age. Indeed, we see it as an encouraging sign that within the discussions of digital journalism explored here, we join researchers who have advanced research into digital journalism that considers the breadth of change within societies, of technologies, and for individuals who through their own activities help us better understand digital journalism.

We can explore this breadth, for instance, by seeing where perceptions of journalism acting as a watchdog, a 'Fourth Estate', and as a source of news for audiences within societies have not been abandoned in a digital age, but reimagined (Benkler 2011). Embedded within these terms are an implied set of values and ideals which shape the ways we speak of journalism, often wrapped in its normative aspirations (Steel 2016). As a launching point for discussing roles taking shape in more digital contexts, we can look at the ways values and ideals shape journalists' role conceptions, and where these could be understood with greater complexity. This is the focus of Folker Hanusch and Sandra Banjac (Chapter 2), who identify role conceptions as central to journalists' positioning of themselves in societies, though these are underexplored in all their richness. In particular they highlight where audience's perceptions of journalists have been missing in extant role conceptions research. In this discussion, they draw a critical link between journalists, their products, and who they produce them for, which sees audiences' own expectations as potential shapers of journalists' approach to their work. It is a link that is often at the center of how we talk about journalism research, but warrants being considered anew as research agendas move ahead.

Within such agendas, we can see for instance where developing research could embrace new modes of understanding journalism as a societal field that is shaped by a range of internal and external influences (Eldridge 2018, Deuze and Witschge 2017). These aspects of journalism affected are linked to but not limited to the ways journalists imagine their roles or to audiences' contributions to shaping these in a digital age (Hanitzsch and Vos 2016). Instead, they are also tied to journalism in transition, particularly as journalists move from identifying with the traditional institutional locus to new dimensions of practice which take various guises. Tim Vos and Patrick Ferrucci (Chapter 3) show this shift in their interviews with digital journalists, considering stasis and change together as this new classification of digital journalists incorporates both new and traditional roles. These are arrived at by journalists who remain committed to making meaningful contributions to society, despite shifts in the ways these are made (Baack 2017). This points to one of the interesting threads within journalist-centered research in this Handbook, where the construction of journalistic identities is built around both emerging and traditionally established narratives of journalistic importance. This is found among journalists working in startups, and as Tamara Witschge and Frank Harbers (Chapter 5) outline their identities are shaped in part by aligning with and in part by contrasting against traditional notions of journalism. This revolves in part around critical perspectives of journalism as a business (Hardy 2017) which eschew traditional commercial priorities while embracing a more familiar allegiance to journalism's importance for society. Elsewhere, Magda Konieczna and Elia Powers (Chapter 15) reinforce this narrative, and when we contend with new types of journalism and where journalists are actively reimagining the ways journalism can operate, as with non-profit newsrooms, we see traditional concepts of a journalistic Fourth Estate and journalism's democratic roles prominently within the innovative nature of digital work.

These discussions have led us some distance towards situating new types of actors within the journalistic field. However, changes more widely in society have not been as a response to the digital changes journalism has embraced and which Digital Journalism Studies' scholars consider (Schudson 2017: 268-269). Within any discussion of journalists being newly able to capture the ideals of a journalistic field in a digital era, it is worth being reminded that as a societal field, journalism still contends with other institutions of power which have their own priorities and demands (Benson 2006). Errol Salamon (Chapter 14) shows this in particular, as shifting practices of journalism among freelancers place them in precarious labor positions, particularly when they are working at the whim of larger publishers. Further, Victor Pickard (Chapter 16) shows from a political economy perspective how, higher up among fields of power in society, ownership, regulatory frameworks, policy, and politics further pose risks to a more optimistic future for digital journalism being realized. In our opening chapter, by Jane Johnston and Anne Wallace (Chapter 1), the struggle in understanding journalism as recognizable, yet reflective of its many digital forms, has also exposed how the rapid change journalism has undergone has outpaced institutions' ability to respond to change, particularly within judicial and legal frameworks. Where

Johnston and Wallace show these institutions are moving less rapidly than the changes journalism itself has undergone, Ivor Shapiro and Brian MacLeod Rogers (Chapter 24) show how within legal protections for the public – for those who would rather be ‘forgotten’, for various reasons – institutions have been able to regulate privacy from digital search, even as the long-term implications of such protections for journalism’s informative roles remain unclear. This exposes a tension between journalists’ ability to inform and investigate those in power when legislation favors one societal group over the other (Thorsen 2017). This is a central theme among those working in investigative journalism who Paul Lashmar (Chapter 27) interviewed, as they are forced to contend with the very surveillance apparatuses they also report on.

Revisiting journalism studies’ tripartite approach

This initial sketch of some of the challenges explored within this Handbook starts to outline the need for researching journalism not on its own, but within an increasingly complex society where oppositions between different groups of actors and fields of powers regularly clash, and brings us to a particular struggle for understanding digital journalism in a digital age. While always a simplified construction of the breadth of research in journalism studies, the attention of journalism research has focused on some combination of studying the producers (journalists), the products (news), and the people (audiences) involved one way or another in journalism (Conboy 2013: 2-3). This tripartite approach assumed, reasonably in many instances, certain things of each of these foci. Of journalists, research could focus on those individuals in society who gathered, verified, and shared information with a public in their interest, even as this group of individuals grew past familiar boundaries (Eldridge 2017). Of news, it assumed a certain facticity within information-based content, communicated from one to many and later from many-to-many. Of audiences, it explored these in a variety of ways, and while these become increasingly more sophisticated, moving from public to publics and passive to active audiences, the focus was on their reception (Costera Meijer and Groot Kormelink 2015). For contemporary research to be situated within any of these three areas has, in all of its forms, become a more complicated demand (Bruns 2017).

First, we can see this within research understanding journalists. When we spoke of journalists’ ambitions, or lauded their contributions, or explored their roles, research has focused on journalists acting on their journalistic agency (Hermida and Young 2017). Such research was primarily focused on human journalists, yet we see here – in the work of Tal Montal and Zvi Reich (Chapter 4) – this is no longer sufficient, as so-called robot journalism has entered the discussion in ways that further complicate our understanding of what it is to be a journalist, to exercise independence, to have a reporter’s initiative, and to situate the agency of journalistic endeavor. Konstantin Dörr (Chapter 23) analyzes this from an ethical perspective, where the use of algorithms reorients computational approaches to journalism towards more dispersed agency across more interconnected digital contexts. The

implications for these changes have become clearer as both technologies and research into these have advanced. Of course, with greater integration of computational approaches into news, further problems for understanding these aspects of journalism around specific societal understandings of journalism also emerge (Broussard 2015). Namely, these see journalism as driven by data and algorithms, and caught within a crisis narrative that suggests rather than improving the availability of information for society, the death of journalism will instead soon follow (Franklin 2016). A worrying prognosis, if it was to unravel in this way.

For such fears, we are well-served by considering more reflective discussions on the changes journalism is undergoing, such as those provided by Mark Coddington (Chapter 17), and Carl-Gustav Linden (Chapter 18) who each put the role of computational programming in context, and integrates into the discussion of changes for news producers the discussion of news products. Coddington offers a typology that demystifies the various types of computational journalism from algorithmic to data driven, while Linden emphasizes the advantages of automation where it complements the work of journalists themselves. We see in their treatment of computational journalism where work in digital journalism studies is at its best when it bridges the place of journalism in society *alongside* the way digital technologies have enabled new types of newswork, enriching new types of content which channel a familiar journalistic authority (Carlson 2017). Such solutions are often developed in the hands of computer-savvy journalists and coders – hacks and hackers, as Nikki Usher (Chapter 26) describes – who advance the opportunities of digital journalism to bring data, coding, and journalism’s societal contributions together. Such a story is also being told by Inka Salovaara (Chapter 30), as media platforms use open data to reshape discussions of nature and the environment, and engender new engagement with the changes our world is facing. Digital storytelling, and using data to paint richer pictures within news, is shown as a vibrant possibility by Tomasso Venturini, Mathieu Jacomy, Liliana Bounegru, and Jonathan Gray (Chapter 20) who show how joining the technologies of data journalism and network visualizations offer journalists new ways to engage with visual storytelling and open new ways for data journalists to do their work.

In these discussions, we are reminded that while ‘data’ is a prominent focus across digital journalism, it is not a singular source of information nor is it a discrete aspect of news storytelling; rather, it is complex and the way we think about data within digital journalism studies needs to be equally engaged with that complexity (Lewis 2014). For what remains a relatively small aspect of overall journalism practice, Eddy Borges-Rey (Chapter 21) places data journalism in the context of a diminished local news provision, and outlines where it remains a point of tension in newsrooms where data journalism is being integrated. And, while greater computer-mediated options have also meant new ways of telling journalistic stories, including through news games and the ‘gamification’ of journalism, as Igor Vobič (Chapter 34) writes [journalism] that playfulness has implications for the materiality of

journalism, and its commercial imperatives – including blurring lines between commercial incentives and information provision. Such caution alongside optimism can also be found when looking at the advantages and risks of native advertising, unpacked by Raul Ferrer-Conill and Michael Karlsson (Chapter 35), which have blurred the division between editorial and advertising, even as they open new revenue streams for struggling news organizations. Similarly, journalists straddle the demands of self-promotion and journalistic norms in the way they themselves have become ‘brands’, and as Avery Holton and Logan Molyneaux (Chapter 33) point out, this demands journalists confront a range of decisions as they weave personal and professional aspects of themselves into their social media presence (Lasorsa, et al. 2012).

These discussions are part of the challenges which journalism as an industry has also faced in the digital era, including how journalists and news organizations make contact with the third aspect of journalism research – their audiences. This includes both how they are measured and how they are informed (Schrøder 2017). While there may be (seeming) solutions in new forms of communicating news and information, for a large portion of journalism these are seated within financial concerns, and a ‘crisis narrative’ of newspapers in particular trying to resolve their balance sheets in a digital age (Gasher et al. 2016). Iris Chyi and Ori Tenenboim (Chapter 12) look at how this has taken shape across twenty years of multiplatform reading – comparing newspaper and online readership figures alongside one another – to put newspapers’ struggles into perspective. They argue from this we may need to revisit measures of readership as these practices have grown increasingly complex. In doing so, however, they note that where there is enthusiasm for online approaches, digital content should not be seen as a panacea to newspapers’ existential crises; instead, they contend ways we make sense of these challenges warrant refinement.

Neil Thurman, Robert Picard, Merja Myllylahti, and Arne Krumsvik (Chapter 13) argue for such refinement, indicating new ways of considering audience engagement with journalism in light of newspapers’ financial interests. These, they contend, would consider more than just the reach of newspapers, and by exploring journalism through engagement would see a way forward from ominous narratives of journalism in crisis. Newspapers may fade, they note, but the journalism traditionally found in newspapers can live on through innovative approaches. Where in instances this shift is demonstrable, new approaches are still needed in order to make sense of such transitions that weigh where journalism’s move from paper to page has not been uniform (Williams, et al. 2015). As Philip Napoli, Matthew Weber, and Kathleen McCollough (Chapter 8) identify, for local news the shuttering of local news outlets and the move towards online information provision has led to news deserts, at worst, and uneven information provision elsewhere. Napoli and his colleagues pose a methodological approach which can help identify gaps between journalism’s work in society and society’s need for information, while making sense of the many ways this may emerge online, and where this is happening unevenly.

Caution and enthusiasm: Critical perspectives

Stretching between caution and enthusiasm, we find not only in the ways journalists see their work but also in how they conduct their work that recent technologies have foregrounded new types of journalistic endeavor. Claudette Artwick (Chapter 22), for example, demonstrates this in an examination of social media livestreaming, highlighting both its advantages for cutting newswork, and the risks of an open and instantaneous mode of broadcasting for journalism and beyond in a series of case studies. One could draw similar tensions between enthusiasm and consternation with news sites' user comments (Ksiazek 2016). These were imagined first as a welcome space for interaction between newsrooms and their digital audiences, but realized later by Thomas Ksiazek and Nina Springer (Chapter 36) as uneven spaces for engagement, where norms of civility are sometimes lacking, and where the demands of maintaining a participatory space for all mean that early enthusiasm often goes unrealized. Pamela Hill Nettleton (Chapter 32) takes caution a sobering step further. In a crucially important look at the violent language and harassment directed at women journalists online, she brings into sharp focus that for all the directions digital spaces could have developed, they remain spaces of risk for many working in journalism. These aspects of trolling, harassment, and verbal assault, while deplorable, also underscore the complex challenges in the digital environment where journalists, audiences, and other members of society more generally, all come together (Eckert 2017). As much as the boundaries of journalism have shifted in recent years (Carlson and Lewis 2015), and as we show throughout this volume, Vittoria Sacco and Diana Bossio (Chapter 25) illustrate that when it comes to resolving the conflicts that emerge between people, including journalists, the unbounded spaces of the internet pose particular challenges. Sacco and Bossio show in particular where the prevailing norms of journalism no longer control public discourse, and how within the ambient flows of news, defamatory speech sits alongside journalism in sometimes uncomfortable ways.

These discussions shift our attention towards seeing the spaces of digital journalism as uneven terrain, and reveal where experiences for different actors vary dramatically. Take the activist-journalists Allissa Richardson (Chapter 29) interviewed, who were involved in reporting on Black Lives Matter but also in mobilizing communities. Here, digital technologies proved crucial not only for reaching audiences, and telling stories, but in leveraging mobile technologies they were able to bring hitherto unheard voices to the public. These opportunities are seized upon in part out of necessity, as other avenues to be heard in society were not available for those communicating and engaging with the Black Lives Matter movement (cf. Barnard 2017; Smit et al 2017). In these cases where a lack of journalistic access or opportunity mean critical voices may go unheard, one way digital journalism has developed a path forward is in the 'pop-up' news ecologies of citizen and activist voices in journalism. Melissa Wall (Chapter 28) describes these as emerging in contrast to authorities' own accounts of 'news', including under authoritarian regimes in

places like Syria. Placing these cases in dialogue alongside one another paints a picture of a complex digital landscape of opportunities and challenges, but also solutions. Yet there are limits to the ways voices can subvert oppressive controls. Aras Coskuntuncel (Chapter 38) has shown that reaching publics, particularly in Turkey, is a path controlled at least in part by those in power, both commercially and politically, who have 're-gear'd' their levers of power to contend with digital forms of protest, activism, and journalism. Certainly, these restrictions are worrying signs for journalism's potential, and as Coskuntuncel points out they are not only in force in Turkey.

Development in methods

From these discussions, it may seem there is reason for pause in enthusiastic discussions of digital journalism as reflecting an all-encompassing change in our societies, and to be certain some reflection to weigh the approach research is taking to make sense of digital journalism in light of these disparities, is warranted (Carlson 2016: 58). In some cases, we too advocate restraint, however within the frameworks advanced in this Handbook we also see where critical research agendas have been developed in concert with refined methodologies that place these complexities in journalism's development in a broader societal context. Take, for instance, how 'post-truth' and 'fake news' ran through public and academic discourses in the past years. While the role of truth, and of veracity, is evidently critical to journalism research, there seems a risk of research that favors immediacy over reflection. Within this handbook we join scholars who consider instead how within the crucibles of innovation, the zeitgeist can be better understood by researching the new ways journalism functions in new spaces within a grounded discussion of journalism's broader role. From this perspective, we can see the advantage of innovative research approaches which make sense of digital journalism in all its complexities, and which take into account its ever-changing nature – including those that focus on the individuals involved in implementing these technologically driven changes. This comes to our attention when considering news that comes to us through algorithmically tailored presentations. Michael Koliska and Nicholas Diakopoulos (Chapter 19) explore this practice not through analysis of the software itself, but rather through focus groups with those involved in employing algorithms for news organizations. Here we begin to see where attention paid to the technology, and in particular the way news organizations implement algorithms, can bear in mind the perspectives of those tasked with the implementation of these.

This brings this introductory into a discussion of methods, and in this volume we address a range of research designs which tackle digital journalism research by deploying multiple approaches. For as much as our discussion in this introduction has steeped critical engagement within Digital Journalism Studies around journalism's traditional contributions, it would be nearsighted to suggest that the scale and pace of developing technologies have not posed particular methodological challenges for scholars that cannot be addressed without technological approaches (Malik and Pfeffer 2016). As Cornelia Brantner and Jürgen

Pfeffer (Chapter 6) illustrate, when we speak of analyzing content in this environment for instance, we are often considering billions of social media posts, and when we speak of audiences, we may be trying to consider the perspectives and activities of millions of users. Indeed, the ways we assess journalists, journalism, and their audiences have all been complicated by the ways each of these approach digital technologies in different ways (Hasebrink 2016).

These challenges, however, are not insurmountable, and in the work here we are shown paths to understand journalism in these contexts. The contribution by Rodrigo Zamith (Chapter 7), for instance, illustrates how computational approaches can ‘freeze’ the flow of news, but also where challenges still exist when designing research around content on regularly changing, and interactive, websites. Grappling with changing content is a challenge that stretches across the news ecosystem online, and is the specific focus of Elisabeth Günther, Florian Buhl, and Thorsten Quandt (Chapter 9), who are able to show how beyond the sheer scale of news available online, tracking its diffusion can be achieved. These methods may seem blearily complex for those unfamiliar with computational approaches to research, but we see in the discussions offered by Zamith and by Günther, Buhl, and Quandt that situated within these approaches are fundamental concerns of understanding journalism, and reasonable ways of addressing them. Indeed, these two chapters speak to similar concerns of understanding how information changes and the way this is presented within news stories being told, and further how these changes echo across the larger digital news environment (Van Hout and Van Leuven 2016). They also bring our attention to how specific challenges of research, when the content and technologies are beyond the investigative lenses of most researchers, can be overcome.

Ike Picone (Chapter 11) poses this as a challenge of confronting digital devices, platforms, and their affordances, which more often than not are closed off to researchers (Diakopoulos 2014). In exploring these obstacles, Picone maps the ways we can take advantage of technologies to break through and address the publics using news technologies. He poses a range of approaches which may help better understand audiences, and publics, engaging with news devices. This can help us critically explore common assumptions about algorithms and devices, including seeing users among enclaves of similar users, and restrained by filter bubbles that limit their awareness of the world around them (Haim, et al. 2017). Jacob Ørmen (Chapter 10) describes this as the ‘myth of enclaves’, a challenge not to the existence of filtered repertoires of information, but rather a challenge for digital journalism scholars to confront as there remains so much uncertainty about what they are, and what they look like.

Conclusion: Further brightening the corners of digital journalism studies

Across this *Handbook* we explore new ways of considering change – asking what defines a digital journalist and what makes their work unique, while focusing on the contradictions

that have emerged in the ways these questions have been posed, and who they consider. At the outset, we suggested that development can take shape in different ways, and that the coherence between traditional and new ways of understanding journalism needs to contend with each of these. Fittingly, Jane Singer (Chapter 37) brings this all into focus in her contribution near the end of this volume by revisiting this particular challenge. Seeing digital journalism as more than merely the adjectival appendage of 'digital' to extant forms of journalism (Eldridge and Franklin 2017: 1), Singer shows where digital journalism research insists on making sense of a complex set of new relationships. She calls for a new approach called 'relationship affects' that moves beyond trying to wrap so-called analogue approaches of media effects around digital journalism, towards instead grappling with the challenges of digital journalism and all of its developments. Singer's is a call for new approaches, informed by all we know and have known about journalism up until now but with a watchful eye towards the greater complexities we have come to realize and may yet experience. One response to such a call is inscribed in Marcel Broersma's epilogue, examining whether journalism scholarship and its focus on journalism in a digital age should be resituated not to examine the digital in journalism, but rather how journalism takes root throughout a digital media ecology. Inasmuch as the breadth of research in this volume explores digital journalism, this epilogue suggests that as we go forward, a new appraisal of the ways which journalism is woven throughout our experiences with digital technology is needed. Within this Handbook we see such complexities as both the challenges and the opportunity facing the field of Digital Journalism Studies as it continues to grow.

In this volume, contributors' ambitions and our own have been to provide a grounded discussion for better understanding how any particular aspect of digital journalism which may seem prominent in moments – ranging from fake news to online trolling to information deserts and oppressive controls – can be more effectively appreciated by contextualizing such moments within critical, reflective research. Authors contribute to this discourse by outlining methodological approaches to journalism's modern demands, and introducing new agendas for understanding journalism's place in society. They also show where the nascent demands for exploring this field already evident two years ago, when we were finishing the *Routledge Companion to Digital Journalism Studies* (Franklin and Eldridge 2017) have developed into a more complex set of dynamics, and where our inclination then that there was something unique occurring around Digital Journalism Studies has been reconfirmed. The collection here also demonstrates that when making sense of a quickly moving object of study like digital journalism, the reflective space and pace of academic scholarship becomes a help, not a hindrance, to offering measured reflections of news and media in a digital era. Where in the *Routledge Companion to Digital Journalism Studies* we mapped the fundamentals of an emerging field, here we challenge the boundaries of that field by asking whose voices have been left behind, and unpack not only enthusiastic changes in journalism which emerged in the interceding years, but also the problems that have arisen. We ask as well where narratives of digital journalism and technological change

have favored enthusiasm over reflection, and in the work of contributors gathered here have introduced that necessary pause for considering the broad implications of digital change.

Structure

The Digital Journalist: Making News

Part 1 poses and addresses fundamental questions about journalistic identity, exploring what shapes journalists' self-perceptions of their changing roles, values and relationships with other actors and actants. Legal identity is particularly in focus to establish who is deserving of 'additional' legal protections reflecting their status as a journalist, which has emerged as a key debate in Digital Journalism Studies. Further, but no less important, debates over who deserves a byline in the context of automated robot journalism, how employers perceive the identity of journalists and, finally, the precise meaning and implications of 'entrepreneurial' in the phrase entrepreneurial Journalist, are examined.

Digital Journalism Studies: Research Design

Part 2 presents a group of chapters focusing on the changing methodological requirements for effective research design in an age of digital media, and new tools for digital research including data mining software and automated content analysis of journalism texts that facilitate research design and inquiry. Chapters here address the challenges of analysing constantly changing, digital and news content, innovative methods for quantitative analysis of big data, news 'dissemination' studies being applied to research of online news networks, methodological approaches for assessing local news provision, new ways to consider the provision of news via search, as well as methodological advances for studying news users.

The Political Economy of Digital Journalism

Part 3 considers prominent financial and political concerns present in the variety of approaches to resourcing, sustaining, and establishing a viable and democratic environment for digital journalism. Chapters explore the complexities of the debate around liberation and regulation for digital journalism, including ownership and content regulation of digital media, journalists' resistance and opposition to imposed precariat status, the commitments and contribution of non-profit organisations to democratic ambitions for digital journalism, and a reassessment of trends in readerships, sales and resources for multiplatform news.

Developing Digital Journalism Practice

Part 4 addresses key debates in the development of digital journalism practice, including the conceptualising of journalistic uses of big data, the impact of the sustained use of automation in the newsroom, the significant issue of transparency, rather than objectivity, as a central commitment in journalism in the specific context of algorithms, the central role claimed for networks in creating news narratives, and critical assessments of the expansive

uses of big data. This section introduces measured discussions of each of these aspects to situate their developments within the broader context of a changing field

Digital Journalism Studies: Dialogues

Part 5 examines and rehearses significant (sometimes public) dialogues which emerge with heightened salience in the context of digital journalism and media. Dialogues, for example, about journalists' freedom and rights to privacy in the context of the surveillance of journalists post-Snowden, the right to be forgotten when social media/internet memory seems elephantine, the apparent right to defame in online settings as well-established legal redress which applies in offline settings becomes less available, the growth of grassroots movements like the Hacks/Hackers Global Network which seeks to create dialogue between journalism and technology to promote news innovation and, finally, dialogues about broad ethical concerns triggered by the advent of algorithmic journalism for both journalistic practice and Digital Journalism Studies.

Minority Voices and Protest: Narratives of freedom and resistance

Part 6 offers a platform for voices of protest and resistance, including those rejecting aspects of the digital world and digital journalism as well as those seizing its technologies as new platforms of resistance. Contributions here include consideration of the impact of mobile technology on citizen witnessing for African American communities in the United States, the role of computer-assisted cartography and data journalism platforms in producing environmental news, challenges faced by women working online in news media, alongside the empowered voices of oppressed groups using the affordances of digital media and journalism to engage in journalism.

Digital Limits: New debates and challenges for the future

Part 7 explores what we have called the 'Digital Limits' to consider new debates in Digital Journalism Studies and the challenges for the future. We begin by examining concerns about personal branding by journalists and media corporations in their uses of Twitter and other social media, and go on to look at the blurred lines between commercial and informative roles in games journalism. We also explore the increasing uses of native advertising in digital journalism, and the inevitable clash with commitments to transparency, as well as the growing furore about 'civility' (including abuse, bullying, and misogyny) in comments sections. The section concludes with two essays exploring the reconceptualising of long established concepts in journalism studies which have accompanied the development of its digital successor; the first considers and revitalises established understandings of the media effects literature, the second offers a national case study reworking of Herman and Chomsky's Propaganda model for the era of digital journalism. Finally, the Handbook concludes with an epilogue that encourages digital journalism studies scholars to consider the priority that has been placed on the way digital technologies have been integrated into journalism, calling for a renewed emphasis on the

overall digital ecology, in which journalism is woven throughout a range of media and networks.

References

- Baack, S. (2017) "Practically engaged: The entanglements between data journalism and civic tech" *Digital Journalism*, DOI: 10.1080/21670811.2017.1375382
- Benkler, Y. (2011) "A free irresponsible press: WikiLeaks and the battle over the soul of the networked fourth estate", *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review* 46: 311–397.
- Benson, R. (2006) "News Media as a 'Journalistic Field': What Bourdieu Adds to New Institutionalism, and Vice Versa", *Political Communication* 23(2):187–202.
- Barnard, S. (2017) "Tweeting #Ferguson: Mediatized fields and the new activist journalist", *New Media & Society*, DOI: 10.1177/1461444817712723.
- Broersma, M. and Peters, C. (2016) "Introduction: Towards a functional perspective on journalism's role and relevance", in: C. Peters and M. Broersma (eds) *Rethinking Journalism Again: Societal Role and Public Relevance in a Digital Age*, Abingdon: Routledge (pp. 1-18).
- Broussard, M. (2015) "Big Data in Practice: Enabling computational journalism through code-sharing and reproducible research methods", *Digital Journalism* 4(2): 266-279.
- Bruns, A. (2017) "Making Audience Engagement Visible: Publics for Journalism on Social Media Platforms", in: B. Franklin and S. Eldridge (eds) *The Routledge Companion to Digital Journalism Studies*. Abingdon: Routledge (pp. 325-334).
- Carlson, M. (2017) *Journalistic Authority: Legitimizing news in the digital era*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Carlson, M. (2016) "Establishing the boundaries of journalism's public mandate", in: C. Peters and M. Broersma (eds) *Rethinking Journalism Again: Societal Role and Public Relevance in a Digital Age*, Abingdon: Routledge (pp. 49-63).
- Carlson, M. and Lewis, S. (2015) *Boundaries of Journalism*, Abingdon: Routledge.
- Conboy, M. (2013) *Journalism Studies: The basics*, Abingdon: Routledge.
- Costera Meijer, I. and Groot Kormelink, T. (2015) "Checking, Sharing, Clicking and Linking: Changing patterns of news use between 2004 and 2014", *Digital Journalism* 3(5): 664-679
- Dahlgren, P. (2013) "Online Journalism and Civic Cosmopolitanism: Professional vs. Participatory Ideals" *Journalism Studies* 14(2) 155-171
- Deuze, M. and Witschge, T. (2017) "Beyond journalism: Theorizing the transformation of journalism", *Journalism* DOI: 10.1177/1464884916688550.
- Diakopoulos, N. (2014) "Algorithmic Accountability: On the Investigation of Black Boxes", at: <https://towcenter.org/research/algorithmic-accountability-on-the-investigation-of-black-boxes-2/>
- Eckert, S. (2017) "Fighting for recognition: Online abuse of women bloggers in Germany, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States", *New Media & Society*, DOI: 10.1177/1461444816688457.

- Eldridge, S. (2018) *Online Journalism from the Periphery: Interloper Media and the Journalistic Field*, Abingdon: Routledge.
- Eldridge, S. (2017) "The Digital Journalist: The journalistic field, boundaries, and disquieting change", in: B. Franklin, and S. Eldridge (eds) *The Routledge Companion to Digital Journalism Studies*, Abingdon: Routledge (pp. 44-54).
- Eldridge, S. and Franklin, B. (2017) "Introduction: Defining Digital Journalism Studies", in: B. Franklin, and S. Eldridge (eds) *The Routledge Companion to Digital Journalism Studies*, Abingdon: Routledge (pp. 1-12).
- Haim, M., Graefe, A., and Brosius, H. (2017) "Burst of the Filter Bubble?: Effects of personalization on the diversity of Google News", *Digital Journalism*, DOI: 10.1080/21670811.2017.1338145.
- Hardy, J. (2017) "Money, (Co)Production and Power: The contribution of critical political economy to digital journalism studies", *Digital Journalism* 5(1): 1-25.
- Hermida, A. and Young, M. (2017) "Finding the Data Unicorn: A hierarchy of hybridity in data and computational journalism", *Digital Journalism* 5(2): 159-176.
- Franklin, B. (2016) "The Future of Journalism: Risks, threats and opportunities" *Journalism Studies* 17(7): 798-800.
- Franklin, B. and Eldridge, S. (2017) *The Routledge Companion to Digital Journalism Studies*, Abingdon: Routledge.
- Gasher, M., Brin, C., Crowther, C., King, G., Salamon, E. and Thibault, S. (2016) *Journalism in Crisis: Bridging Theory and Practice for Democratic Media Strategies in Canada*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Hanitzsch, T. and Vos, T. (2016) "Journalism beyond democracy: A new look into journalistic roles in political and everyday life", *Journalism*, DOI: 10.1177/1464884916673386.
- Hasebrink, U. (2016) "Audiences and information repertoires", in: B. Franklin, and S. Eldridge (eds) *The Routledge Companion to Digital Journalism Studies*, Abingdon: Routledge (pp. 364-374).
- Ksiazek, T. (2016) "Commenting on the News: Explaining the degree and quality of user comments on news websites", *Journalism Studies*, DOI: 10.1080/1461670X.2016.1209977.
- Lasorsa, D., Lewis, S. and Holton, A. (2012) "Normalizing Twitter: Journalism practice in an emerging communication space", *Journalism Studies* 13(1): 19-36.
- Lewis, S. (2014) "Journalism In An Era Of Big Data: Cases, concepts, and critiques", *Digital Journalism* 3(3): 321-330.
- Malik, M. and Pfeffer, J. (2016) "A Macroscopic Analysis of News Content in Twitter", *Digital Journalism*, 4(8): 955-979.
- Schudson, M. (2017) "Comment: The journalism studies tree" in: P. Boczkowski and C. W. Anderson (eds) *Remaking the News: Essays on the future of journalism scholarship in the Digital Age*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press (pp. 267-272).
- Schrøder, K. (2017) "Towards the 'Audiencization' of Mediatization Research?: Audience dynamics as co-constitutive of mediatization processes", in: O. Driessens, G. Bolin, A.

- hepp, and S. Hjarvard (eds) *Dynamics of Mediatization*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan (pp. 85-115).
- Smit, P., Heinrich, A. and Broersma, M. (2017) "Activating the past in the Ferguson protests: Memory work, digital activism and the politics of platforms", *New Media & Society*, DOI: 10.1177/1461444817741849.
- Steel, J. (2016) "Reappraising journalism's normative foundations", in C. Peters and M. Broersma (eds) *Rethinking Journalism Again: Societal Role and Public Relevance in a Digital Age*, Abingdon: Routledge (pp. 35-49).
- Thorsen, E. (2017) "Whistleblowing in a Digital Age: journalism after Manning and Snowden", in: B. Franklin, B. and S. Eldridge, (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Digital Journalism Studies*. Abingdon: Routledge (pp. 569–578).
- Van Hout, T. and Van Leuven, S. (2016) "Investigating 'churnalism' in real-time news", in: B. Franklin, and S. Eldridge (eds) *The Routledge Companion to Digital Journalism Studies*, Abingdon: Routledge (pp. 117-125).
- Williams, A., Harte, D. and Turner, J. (2015) "The value of UK hyperlocal community news: Findings from a content analysis, an online survey and interviews with producers", *Digital Journalism*, 3(5): 680-703.