View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk

brought to you by CORE

provided by White Rose Research Online

UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *The Ethnography of Digital Journalism*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/120088/

Version: Accepted Version

Book Section:

Paterson, CA orcid.org/0000-0003-3843-6355 (2016) The Ethnography of Digital Journalism. In: Franklin, B and Eldredge, S, (eds.) The Routledge Companion to Digital Journalism Studies. Routledge , Abingdon, Oxfordshire , pp. 108-116. ISBN 9781138887961

(c) 2017, Routledge. This is an Accepted Manuscript of a book chapter published by Routledge in The Routledge Companion to Digital Journalism Studies on 28 October 2016, available online:
https://www.routledge.com/The-Routledge-Companion-to-Digital-Journalism-Studies/Franklin-II/p/book/9781138887961

Reuse
Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown
If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/

Book chapter author accepted manuscript.
Chapter 10 in The Routledge Companion to Digital Journalism Studies, Taylor & Francis, 2016

THE ETHNOGRAPHY OF DIGITAL JOURNALISM

Chris Paterson

Digital journalism has developed as a genre of media production with a variety of characteristics which make it both distinct from and similar to whatever 'journalism' had previously been (a matter determined both by whom you ask and what they see as the purpose of this particular form of story-telling). Yet two decades from its advent, we are often constrained in understanding digital news manufacturing (but is it 'journalism'?) through an entrenched reliance on a remarkable era of newsroom research centered in the 1970s: the tradition of the ethnographic sociology of news production.

The US sociologists Gaye Tuchman (1978, 2014) and Herbert Gans (1979), political scientist Edward Epstein (1973), and British social scientist Philip Schlesinger (1978, 1980), in particular, used their long-term systematic observation of journalistic work—and the organizational structures surrounding it—to provide richly detailed, vividly described, and well-theorized examinations of how people within particular large media organizations followed—day in and day out—a rigid set of working practices (the 'routines' of news production') which created the world's daily diet of news. The research of Buckalew (1970), Warner (1970), Altheide (1976), Golding and Elliott (1979), and Fishman (1980) was also influential. These scholars helped us all not just to see that 'the news' is nothing more, and nothing less, than a set of stories told (and sold) to the public by a small group of people who have declared themselves uniquely qualified to do so, but also to understand, and reliably predict, why the news looked as it did.

Why immerse?

At the time this seemed a controversial, or even unnecessary, exercise. Had not Warren Breed (1955) and David Manning White (1950) adequately explained, in providing the foundations of gatekeeping theory, how stories get into newspapers—and how institutional policy made news less of a 'reflection of reality' than many assumed (Shoemaker and Reese, 2014: 35)? Did we really need sociologists to spend weeks, months, or years minutely examining and theorizing journalistic work to tell us something more? As Reese explains, by the end of the 1960s, scholars were less inclined to accept 'functionalist' explanations of communication at face value; thanks to the work of Goffman (1974), Berger and Luckman (1966), and later, Gitlin (1980) and Hall (1992), we increasingly understood that media present certain, ideologically loaded, interpretations of the world (at the expense of other interpretations) and that those collectively shape what we all regard as 'real.' If that were the case, intensive examination of the processes of news making was essential.

Tuchman would write decades later in a forward to the latest edition of Shoemaker and Reese's iconic Mediating the Message:

> looking back, I don't think that the authors of those newsmaking studies—Mark Fishman, Herbert Gans, Todd Gitlin, Harvey Molotch, Michael Schudson, and I—realized that we were documenting what Dan Hallin has since called the "high modernism" of American journalism, a period when newsworkers pledged obedience to codes of professionalism and claimed their news coverage was independent of the financial interests of the large corporations, then beginning to consolidate their grasp on the media landscape and eventually to hold it in thrall.

(Tuchman, 2014: xi)

That body of research explained a great deal about why the 'news' of that period looked the way it did, why it represented certain interests in society better than others, and why it considered a fairly narrow range of happenings in the world to be 'news.' News values research (Galtung and Ruge, 1970), emerging around the same time, demonstrated that we can fairly accurately plot what news workers are going to write about each day and what they will discard as 'un-newsworthy,' but it frustratingly told us nothing about working practices which consistently shape news in a particular way. Yet from the 1980s until only the past decade, interest in long-term ethnographic research into

newsrooms had faded. Vitally, for a brief moment, that early body of work permitted some limited understanding of the social construction of our world: why we carry certain shared 'pictures in our heads' of the way the world is (as put by Berger and Luckman, 1966; Fishman, 1980; Tuchman, 1978; Walter Lippman, 1922)

Reliance on those older studies to explain contemporary, digital, and news production processes has begun to seem less adequate. Relationships between publishers of information and their sources have become all the more complex and all the more crucial, and information production is far more widely disbursed, and often informalized, than in the days when a fairly small number of large broadcasters and newspapers dominated news production. But newsrooms—while these might now be defined more broadly—still often remain the principle locations of the collective decision making and working practices which generate the information we tend to label as 'news,' and the locations where an often difficult and painful transition from analogue to digital journalism continues to take place. Has the relevance of these earlier works of news sociology faded because contemporary digital newsrooms bear an ever decreasing resemblance to newsrooms of the late 1960s and 1970s? Moller Hartley's (2011) ethnographic study of Danish online newsrooms, for example, suggests not, as it builds usefully on the Tuchman's categories of news to explore how contemporary journalists routinize the handling of 'breaking news' in predictable ways, but Hartley also found that the explanatory theory offered by Tuchman required some elaboration to account for the modern speed of news production and other attributes of online news.

Importantly, this early ethnographic sociology of news uniquely explained the news process while avoiding the trap of the 'attitudinal fallacy' (Jerolmack and Khan, 2014). In the context of news, that is the resilient but naïve faith that what journalists say about their work (in interviews with researchers or in surveys) explains a significant amount about the manufacturing of the news. It is a trap in any social research to allow the phenomenon under examination to describe itself, but it is especially ironic in the examination of journalism that social researchers often simultaneously critique journalists' claims to have access to a 'truth' beyond the reach of the rest of us, while easily accepting as objective reality journalists' (necessarily) subjective nterpretations of their own practice. Jerolmack and Khan survey a body of research demonstrating that what people say is more often than not a poor predictor of what they do, in support of their argument that surveys and interviews too often confuse attitudes with actual behavior (2014). Put simply, this is a good argument that if you want to understand why journalism is manufactured in the way it is you need to systematically observe the process: you need to engage with the ethnographic sociology of news production.

Many researchers who embrace an observational, ethnographic approach to understanding how 'the news' is created also treat interviewing and other research methods (document analysis, news content research, examination of the audience/users) as necessary, complementary approaches to gathering data which allow the researcher to both describe the processes they seek to understand in richer detail and with greater nuance, and to 'triangulate,' comparing information discovered through one approach with information gleaned by another, moving ever closer to a (never fully obtainable) accurate and rich description. Epstein (1973) was perhaps the first news researcher to effectively employ a multi-method approach, involving interviews, observation, and content analysis, as well as detailed analysis of the institutions he wrote about. His use of content analysis enabled him to contrast interview data with actual television news output and find revealing discrepancies.

The essential failing of ethnography, particularly as argued by positivists, is that it represents a phenomenon from a single perspective and offers little opportunity for confirmation by other researchers. But the ethnographer of journalism will rarely claim to reveal and explain everything, instead seeking only to describe their research setting as comprehensively as is possible. As expressed by Clifford (Clifford and Marcus, 1986), the hope is only to reveal a 'partial truth.' Ethnography is a process of translating cultural meanings and social practices which are relevant to the subjects of the research—in this case, mostly journalists—to richly detailed interpretations which will be recognizable to broader audiences. Engaging in this translation honestly requires taking care not to overly interpret or assume meaning without cause.

The ethnography of news production has borrowed from, and been grounded in, the theory and research methodologies of anthropology, sociology, organizational studies, critical media studies, and more recently the study of professions (Abbott, 1993). But few ethnographers of media production fail to mention the inspiration and guidance of cultural anthropologist Clifford Geertz (1973), who is widely

credited for reviving interest in long-term, immersive ‘fieldwork’ as the means to understand unfamiliar human cultures. Exploitative, paternalistic, and ethnocentric—as well as scientifically dubious—accounts of primitive and exotic ‘others,’ which become a prominent feature of popular magazines like National Geographic in the 1950s had required reassessment of the role of the anthropologist and the processes by which one culture learns about another.

Clifford and Marcus (1986) focused on published, highly polished accounts of social life which they termed the ‘poetics of ethnography,’ whereas for Geertz the key to successfully enabling one culture to understand another was richly detailed and elegantly crafted field notes of observations. ‘Thick description’ (Geertz, 1973) is the painstaking art of minutely and precisely describing the social processes witnessed by the ethnographer; noting the most mundane details of what people do and how they interact and finding an effective balance between describing them in writing that is engrossing, detailed, and neutral and writing that identifies those observations which most matter and clearly ascribing meaning to them.

In the context of newsroom research, this might be done through noting, and exploring, moments of tension where cracks appear in the efficient news production machinery: a senior journalist causally remarking to a junior colleague ‘I wouldn’t have done it that way,’ a multi-skilled journalist making one less verification telephone call than they had hoped to in order to have enough time to produce their story for multiple media platforms, an editor swearing under her breath because an accounting department email has just demanded cuts to the cost of planned coverage (examples from this author’s ethnographic experience).

Indeed, one of the greatest values of ethnographic data, differentiating it from data obtained by other means, is its ability to reveal inconsistencies and conflicts in the actions of informants. Schlesinger (1980) reflected on his own ethnographic research, writing that ethnography uniquely permits the observation of moments of crisis, those occasional intra-organizational struggles about how to frame news, requiring the revision of news production routines. A journalist might helpfully recount in an interview with a researcher how some effort to aspire to the highest ideal of good journalism had to be compromised by the realities of economics or politics (or just because her editor didn’t like her approach) but revealing such moments of tension (a) isn’t always in the interests of interviewees and (b) is, as noted earlier, also nothing more than a subjective interpretation of an occurrence.

Interviews, and on a larger scale, surveys, can give researchers clues to points of tension in the machinery of journalism (Kohut’s [2000] revealing survey of self-censorship is a case in point), but only extended, systematic observation of news production practices can reveal these in a way in which they can be reliably described and analysed. As both the product and practice of journalism became ‘digital,’ the tradition of long-term researcher immersion in the news production process had faded. The new genre of ‘online news’ evolved amid a great deal of hype about its potential to be something far greater than its predecessor, but with little ongoing collection of empirical data to explain what it actually is. For example, a decade ago, Deuze, Neuberger, and Paulussen (2004) noted a distance between the ideals shared by online journalists and their practices, but observed that little empirical evidence had been published about the reasons for this distance. Digital journalism was becoming the dominant way people learn about the world, yet research into how it is made remained sparse. But many scholars have since focused their efforts on the (predominately or exclusively) digital newsroom and the domains of news production increasingly stretching far beyond newsrooms.

The limited ethnographically informed research into news production settings which blend traditional news forms with digital production processes and digital modes of news delivery—the central characteristic of ‘convergent’ news production—has demonstrated that new news production suffered from many of the same constraints as old news production, only with new constrains like 24-hour production cycles, ‘shovel-ware’ dependence on public relations and wire services to meet content production targets (Paterson and Domingo, 2008), the constant burden of immediacy (Weiss and Domingo, 2010) and, the most recent trend to bewitch and beguile news workers, the chase of the proper web metrics (Anderson, 2011b).

In his writing on the transition to online news at a Dublin newspaper, Anthony Cawley managed in a few paragraphs to both richly convey the atmosphere of the newsroom he was examining and vividly

and clearly explain the importance of what he was witnessing—the effect of print to digital transition for one journalist:

> The newsroom looks like a normal print newsroom: messy desks, coffee mugs, background noise of ringing telephones, scenery of PC screens displaying stories in various stages of completion. The journalists are a bit young and casually dressed, but little else stands out. On Anderson's desk are the normal tools of a print journalist: a notebook, a pen, a telephone, his contacts book, a telephone book, a tape recorder, and a PC. His work practices resemble those of a print journalist: he calls sources, press offices, organisations, writes down what they say and assembles the story into an inverted pyramid structure.
>
> One difference is significant, however. Each time he finishes a run at a story—adds fresh information or reaction—he publishes the update directly himself. A reader who has been paying close attention this morning would have seen the G8 arrest story evolve from bare facts, to having reaction from a source close to the arrested man, to having official confirmation of his deportation, to having his flight and expected arrival time. Anderson controls the information gathering process, the writing, the sub-editing and the publication of his story. He controls stages where, conventionally, a sub-editor, a page setter or a printer would have assumed responsibility on the story's journey from the newsroom to the public domain. This is an online newsroom, Anderson is an online journalist, and the traditional demarcation of news production doesn't apply.

(Cawley, 2008: 47)

Process

Domingo summarized the benefits of ethnography in the examination of online news in this way:

- Gathers a huge amount of very rich first-hand data.
- The researcher directly witnesses actions, routines, and definitions of technology and social relations.
- The researcher can gain a confident status with the actors, obtaining insiders' points of view.
- The researcher can witness conflicts and processes of evolution.
- Analysis of the gathered data allows a comprehensive description of the social use of a technology and offers insights to understand the factors involved in its social construction and shaping (Paterson & Domingo, 2008: 5).

The first challenges in taking an ethnographic approach to news production research come before a researcher approaches any news organization for permission to observe their work. Like all good research, clear, well-crafted research questions are vital at the outset, and it is these which would determine if observational research is appropriate and where it should take place. If the question is why the content produced by a media organization as it is, an ethnographic approach might be the only viable research tool.

If the researcher's hope is to explain all news production or the production practices across a certain type of news (net-native sports news sites in the German language, for example), there might be little reason to expect that close analysis of practices at one exemplar from this group would reliably explain anything about the practices of the whole group. But, conversely, extended ethnographic analysis across several, or many, organizations—in the hope of assessing differences and better grasping a broader truth about a whole class of media producers—is normally impossible for individual researchers.

Might one simply compress observation to a few days, and thereby improve one's chances of getting in? US news ethnographer David Ryfe has argued that ethnographic newsroom research which falls short of many months, and even years, of observation, has little hope of capturing the dynamics of newsroom change and capturing subtle details of how production processes and specific journalistic cultures shape our news. But he makes this point with the acknowledgement that contemporary realities for research students and professional academics make such long-term field research exceedingly rare (Ryfe, 2016).

But time with a news organization is also dependent on the extent to which the institution will allow itself to be observed, and that is a matter for negotiation once the doors to some observation have been opened. Schlesinger (1980) reflected on the challenging process of gaining the access to conduct long-term observational research within media organizations, observing that it is usually challenging, and that access, when granted, can be tenuous. Paterson observed in the introduction to his partially ethnographic study of television news agencies that a longstanding obstacle to genuinely ethnographic production research "is that organizations risk criticism when they permit independent analysis of what they do: what makes sense in the context of their business may look irresponsible or arrogant to people outside of that context" (2011a: xi). Suspicion and caution about the purpose of media production research from inside media organizations continues to be an obstacle for researchers, although there are few records to indicate how much of an obstacle, since researchers tend not to publish accounts of their struggles to gain access or the refusals they receive.

Paterson and Zoellner (2010) commented on the usefulness of some prior professional media or journalism experience in gaining research access based on a small survey of production researchers who generally agreed this offers an important advantage. Munnik (2016) and Garcia (2008) both helpfully reflect on the challenge; Munnik in the increasingly familiar context of seeking access to media organizations which were especially defensive and reclusive following a series of scandals involving the UK media.

With an alien culture laid out before them, ethnographers are challenged to know where to focus their observations and how to use them to draw conclusions about journalistic work. That process is simplified through the application of a clear theoretical framework to understand journalistic work. Ida Willig has explained the value of Pierre Bourdieu's reflexive sociology in providing greater insight to ethnographic newsroom research (Willig, 2013), and Bourdieu himself has suggested the utility of viewing journalistic work as a 'field' and has reflected on the process of participant observation (2003). Willig suggests that Bourdieu's field theory provides a framework to 'analyse journalistic practice at the same time as macro contexts outside of the newsroom' and suggests a key advantage of doing so is a "consistent, theoretical framework incorporating the analytical concepts highly applicable in empirical research" (2013: 384). Others have found this approach unhelpful and have grounded their work in other theoretical frames such as gatekeeping (Paterson, 2011a), actor-network theory (Domingo, 2008), and others.

Well-theorized newsroom research by Paulussen et al. (2011), Domingo (2008), and Ryfe (2012), among others, has helpfully shifted the discourse about convergence from technological or organizational determinism to an approach focusing on human agency and the varying ways news workers are adapting to technological challenges. Geens conducted research for 4 months at a Flemish regional news website in Belgium and confirmed earlier research which found that the convergent (what Geens terms 'Post-Fordist') newsroom job descriptions have changed dramatically from traditional news production with most people in the converged newsrooms having many tasks and goals as opposed to just one or two main tasks, with hierarchies, relationships, and criteria for reward all becoming more complex (Paulussen et al., 2011).

This author sought to move beyond major news providers to seek understanding of how their principal source of the raw components of their stories were manufactured by news agencies such as the Associated Press, Reuters, and Agence France Press, which for a century had produced for the world's media the easily digestible bits of information which make up all the reporting which a news organization cannot do on its own. Observation in the newsrooms of three international television news agencies provided a first-hand glimpse of the internal struggles and practices which determine which television pictures of global events every other media outlet in the world has to work with each day; effectively, what ingredients are available from hour to hour to the chefs (the editors at every television station globally) to make that dish we readily consume each day: television news (Paterson, 2011a: x). As news agencies transition into a fully digital age, they still set the agenda for global media (Lewis, Williams, and Franklin, 2008; Paterson, 2007), but research has failed to keep pace with understanding how their non-stop, multi-media, global digital news product is created (Paterson, 2011b).

We learn from the accounts of the ethnographers that cooperation between old and new media is uncommon—that in fact new media journalists continue to mostly operate independently of old media

and are normally considered to have a lower status than old media journalists. The new breeds of journalists are often chained to their desks and tend to communicate exclusively through their computers. As Deuze (2008: 204) expressed it "a picture emerges of an atomized profession, isolated and connected at the same time, yet also blind to each other (and thus itself), and the wider society it operates in." There is not integration, but frequently division and distance. Extended ethnographic research into combined legacy media (print, television, radio) and new media news operations often found that online news professionals were lacking authority and legitimacy within their organizations and growing frustrated at their lack of status. But as Deuze (2008) suggests, their 'liquid,' flexible, and changing identities mirror the 'liquid,' constantly shifting nature of the news of the online news product, as media work generally becomes ever more precarious (Gill and Pratt, 2008). And Anderson (2011a, 2013) has demonstrated by innovatively (and metaphorically, it must be said) 'blowing up the newsroom' that news production is increasingly distributed across many actors and different kinds of institutions, but these networks of production—the news ecosystem—can be richly described and plotted.

Conclusion

As the recent comprehensive and long-term ethnographic research projects of Usher (2011, 2014), Ryfe (2012), Domingo (2008), Boczkowski (2004), and others have shown, it is possible to gain access to new (net-native) and to fast changing traditional (legacy) news organizations and comprehensively explore and theorize their news manufacturing processes using the tools of immersive ethnography. As the definitions of 'news' and of 'newswork' become ever more elastic, it will be increasingly difficult to determine the most useful target of ethnographic research, just at these changes make such research ever more important. But more is needed than the patience and will to engage in such research: media institutions must remain willing to exhibit accountability through permitting intrusive investigation (and not seeking to censor it when it has been done), and academic institutions and funding bodies must recognize that there remains no better way to understand the creation of our 'shared reality' and to provide the resources and time for it to happen.

Further reading

The two volumes of Making Online News (2008, 2011) edited by this author and David Domingo collected research from around the world from within fast evolving digital newsrooms. Usher's explanation of her research in Making News at The New York Times (2014) will be useful to prospective ethnographers of the digital newsroom. Cottle (2007) provided an overview of the role of ethnography in journalism and its future directions, and the 2016 collection, Advancing Media Production Research, attempts to expand the horizons of ethnographic production research through new approaches to method and theory and attempts to cross methodological, disciplinary, and genre boundaries.

References

Abbott, A. (1993) The System of the Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Altheide, D. (1976) Creating Reality: How TV News Distorts Events. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Anderson, C.W. (2011a) "Blowing up the Newsroom: Ethnography in the Age of Distributed Journalism." In Domingo, D. and Paterson, C. (eds) Making Online News, Newsroom Ethnographies in the Second Decade of Internet Journalism. New York, NY: Peter Lang, pp. 151–60.

Anderson, C.W. (2011b) "Between Creative and Quantified Audiences: Web Metrics and Changing Patterns of Newswork in Local US Newsrooms." Journalism 12(5): 550–566.

Anderson, C.W. (2013) Rebuilding the News: Metropolitan Journalism in the Digital Age. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Berger, P.L. and Luckman, T. (1966) The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

Boczkowski, P.J. (2004) Digitizing the News: Innovation in Online Newspapers. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2003) Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste. London, UK: Routledge.

Breed, W. (1955) "Social Control in the Newsroom: A Functional Analysis." Social Forces 33: 326–335.

Buckalew, J. (1970) "News Elements and Selection by Television News Editors." Journal of Broadcasting (Winter): 47–54.

Cawley, A. (2008) “News Production in an Irish Online Newsroom: Practice, Process, and Culture.” In Paterson, C. and Domingo, D. (eds) Making Online News: The Ethnography of New Media Production. New York, NY: Peter Lang, pp. 45–60.
Clifford, J. and Marcus, G. (1986) Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Cottle, S. (2007) “Ethnography and Journalism: New(s) Departures in the Field.” Sociology Compass 1(1): 1–16.
Deuze, M. (2008) “Epilogue: Toward a Sociology of Online News.” In Paterson, C. and Domingo, D. (eds) Making Online News: The Ethnography of New Media Production. New York, NY: Peter Lang, pp. 199–210.
Deuze, M., Neuberger, C. and Paulussen, C. (2004) “Journalism Education and Online Journalists in Belgium, Germany, and the Netherlands.” Journalism Studies 5(1): 19–29.
Domingo, D. (2008) “When Immediacy Rules: Online Journalism Models in Four Catalan Online Newsrooms.” In Paterson, C. and Domingo, D. (eds) Making Online News: The Ethnography of New Media Production. New York, NY: Peter Lang, pp. 113–126.
Epstein, E.J. (1973) News from Nowhere: Television and the News. New York, NY: Random House.
Fishman, M. (1980) Manufacturing the News. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
Galtung, J. and Ruge, M. (1970) “The Structure of Foreign News.” In Tunstall, J. (ed.) Media Sociology. London, UK: Constable.
Gans, H.J. (1979) D*eciding What’s News: A Study of CBS Evening News, NBC Nightly News,* Newsweek, and Time. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
Garcia. E.P. (2008) “Print and Online Newsrooms in Argentinean Media: Autonomy and Professional Identity.” In Paterson, C. and Domingo, D. (eds) Making Online News: The Ethnography of New Media Production. New York, NY: Peter Lang, pp. 61–76.
Geertz, C. (1973) Interpretation of Cultures. New York, NY: Basic Books.
Gill, R. and Pratt, A. (2008) “In the Social Factory? Immaterial Labour, Precariousness and Cultural Work.” Theory, Culture & Society 25(7–8): 1–30.
Gitlin, T. (1980) The Whole World is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Goffman, E. (1974) Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Golding, P. and Elliott, P. (1979) Making the News. New York, NY: Longman.
Hall, S. (1992) “Encoding, Decoding.” In During, S. (ed.) The Cultural Studies Reader. London, UK: Routledge, pp. 90–103.
Hartley, J.N. (2011) “Routinizing Breaking News: Categories and Hierarchies In Danish Online Newsrooms.” In Domingo, D. and Paterson, C. (eds) Making Online News, Newsroom Ethnographies in the Second Decade of Internet Journalism. New York, NY: Peter Lang, pp. 73–86.
Jerolmack, C. and Khan, S. (2014) “Talk Is Cheap: Ethnography and the Attitudinal Fallacy.” Sociological Methods & Research 43(2): 178–209.
Kohut, A. (2000) “Self-Censorship: Counting the Ways.” Columbia Journalism Review, May/June, pp. 42–43.
Lewis, J., Williams, A. and Franklin, B. (2008) “A Compromised Fourth Estate? UK News Journalism, Public Relations and News Sources.” Journalism Studies 9(1): 1–20.
Lippman, W. (1922) Public Opinion. New York, NY: Macmillan.
Munnik, M.B. (2016) “When You Can’t Rely on Private or Public: Using the Ethnographic self as Reference.” In Paterson, C., Lee, D., Saha, A. and Zoellner, A. (eds) Advancing Media Production Research. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 147–160.
Paterson, C. (2007) “International News on the Internet: Why More is Less.” The International Journal of Communication Ethics 4(1/2): 57–65.
Paterson, C. (2011a) The International Television News Agencies: The World from London. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
Paterson, C. (2011b) “Convergence in the News Wholesalers: Trends in International News Agencies.” In Domingo, D. and Paterson C. (eds) Making Online News Newsroom Ethnographies in the Second Decade of Internet Journalism. New York, NY: Peter Lang, pp. 129–140.
Paterson, C. and Domingo, D. (2008) Making Online News: The Ethnography of New Media Production. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
Paterson, C., Lee, D., Saha, A., and Zoellner, A. (eds). (2016) Advancing Media Production Research. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
Paterson, C. and Zoellner, A. (2010) “The Efficacy of Professional Experience in the Ethnographic Investigation of Production.” Journal of Media Practice 11(2): 97–109.

Paulussen, S., Geens, D. and Vandenbrande, K. (2011) “Fostering a Culture of Collaboration: Organizational Challenges of Newsroom Innovation.” In Domingo, D. and Paterson C. (eds) Making Online News: Newsroom Ethnography in the Second Decade of Internet Journalism. New York, NY: Peter Lang, pp. 4–14.
Ryfe, D.M. (2012) Can Journalism Survive? An Inside Look at American Newsrooms. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
Ryfe, D.M. (2016) “The Importance of Time in Media Production Research.” In Paterson, C., Lee, D., Saha, A. and Zoellner, A. (eds) Advancing Media Production Research. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 38–50.
Schlesinger, P. (1978) *Putting “Reality” Together: BBC News*. London, UK: Constable.
Schlesinger, P. (1980). “Between Sociology and Journalism.” In Christian, H. (ed.) Sociology of the Press and Journalism. Keele, UK: University of Keele.
Shoemaker, P. and Reese, S.D. (2014). Mediating the Message. New York, NY: Routledge.
Tuchman, G. (1978) Making News: A Study in the Social Construction of Reality. London, UK: Free Press.
Tuchman, G. (2014) “Forward.” In Shoemaker, P. and Reese, S.D. (eds) Mediating the Message. New York, NY: Routledge, pp. ix–xii.
Usher, N. (2011) “Redefining Public Radio: Marketplace in the Digital Age.” In Domingo, D. and Paterson C. (eds) Making Online News: Newsroom Ethnography in the Second Decade of Internet Journalism. New York, NY: Peter Lang, pp. 45–56.
Usher, N. (2014) Making News at The New York Times. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
Warner, M. (1970) “Decision-Making in Network Television News.” In Tunstall, J. (ed.) Media Sociology. London, UK: Constable, pp. 158–167.
Weiss, A.S. and Domingo, D. (2010) “Innovation Processes in Online Newsrooms as Actor-Networks and Communities of Practice.” New Media & Society 12(7): 1156–1171.
White, D.M. (1950) “The Gate Keeper.” Journalism Quarterly 27: 383–390.
Willig, I. (2013) “Newsroom Ethnography in a Field Perspective.” Journalism: Theory, Practice and Criticism 14(3): 372–287.