# The Active Recipient:
# Participatory Journalism Through the Lens of the Dewey-Lippmann Debate

Paper presented to:
International Symposium on Online Journalism 2011
**University of Texas, Austin**
**Austin, April 2011**

Alfred Hermida, University of British Columbia, Canada
David Domingo, Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Spain
Ari A. Heinonen, University of Tampere, Finland
Steve Paulussen, Ghent University, Belgium
Thorsten Quandt, Universität Hohenheim, Germany
Zvi Reich, Ben Gurion University, Israel
Jane B. Singer, University of Iowa, USA / University of Central Lancashire, UK
Marina Vujnovic, Monmouth University, USA


**Lead author contact information:**
Alfred Hermida
Graduate School of Journalism
University of British Columbia
6388 Crescent Road
Vancouver, BC, V6T 1Z2
Canada

Tel: 1 604 827 3540
E-mail: alfred.hermida@ubc.ca

# The Active Recipient: Participatory Journalism Through the Lens of the Dewey-Lippmann Debate

Alfred Hermida, David Domingo, Ari Heinonen, Steve Paulussen, Thorsten Quandt, Zvi Reich, Jane Singer and Marina Vujnovic

**Abstract:**

News outlets are providing more opportunities than ever before for the public to contribute to professionally edited publications. Online news websites routinely provide tools to facilitate user participation in the news, from enabling citizens to submit story ideas to posting comments on stories. This study on participatory journalism draws on the perspectives of writer Walter Lippmann and philosopher John Dewey on the role of the media and its relationship to the public to frame how professional journalists view participatory journalism. Based on semi-structured interviews with journalists at about two dozen newspaper websites, as well as a consideration of the sites themselves, we suggest that news professionals view the user as an active recipient of the news. Journalists have tended to adopt a Deweyan approach towards participatory tools and mechanisms, within carefully delineated rules. As active recipients, users are framed as idea generators and observers of newsworthy events at the start of the journalistic process, and then in an interpretive role as commentators who reflect upon professionally produced material.

**Keywords:** Audiences, Dewey, Lippmann, journalism, newspapers, participatory journalism

*"Vision is a spectator, hearing is a participator*," (Dewey 1927: 219)

Calls for the public to participate in some shape or form in journalism have become almost standard on news websites. Visitors to news sites are consistently urged to send in a photo, comment on a story or share a link on a social network. In the journalism of the 21st century, news organizations are providing more opportunities than ever before for the public to contribute to professionally edited publications. Online news websites routinely provide tools to enable the news consumer to do something that goes beyond just reading the news (Hermida and Thurman, 2008; Thurman and Hermida, 2010).

This study draws on the perspectives of writer Walter Lippmann and philosopher John Dewey on the role of the media in democratic societies to frame how professional journalists view participatory journalism. It explores whether the Internet's participatory potential is bringing about a shift in established modes of journalism and opening up the media to new voices, leading to what might be considered a more democratic and representative media space.

One of the motivations behind the adoption of participatory mechanisms by established media, and newspapers in particular, has been "to connect more effectively with changing usage patterns and the 'real' needs and preferences of their public" (Paulussen et al, 2008: 132). We hope to locate participatory journalism within the ongoing discussion begun in the 1920s by Lippmann and Dewey about the nature of democracy, the media and the ability of citizens to debate and decide on complex issues.

**The Lippmann-Dewey debate**

The Lippmann-Dewey philosophical discussion on democracy and the media is often characterized as a binary debate. Alterman (2008) depicts it as "one of the most instructive and heated intellectual debates of the American twentieth century" (2008: 52), describing Walter Lippmann as "the archetypal insider pundit" and John Dewey as "the prophet of democratic education" (2008: 53). The interchange between the two men continues to be relevant to the role of the media because of what Bybee calls the "interconnections of citizenship, media, and democracy" (1999: 30). He argues that the actions and decisions of citizens are linked to "the politics of how we know" (1999:30) - in other words, how journalists decide and report on the news.

Journalists in modern Western societies see themselves as central to the proper functioning of democracy. News practitioners see it as their responsibility to ensure that citizens have the credible information necessary to govern themselves wisely (Kovach and Rosenstiel 2006; Gans 2003). Both Lippmann and Dewey shared a common belief in the crucial role of the press in a vibrant democracy. But Lippmann ([1922] 1965) thought that modern society had become too complex for the public to understand and be able to make informed decisions. He envisioned a role for the press as the bridge between the uninformed masses and powerful insiders who help formulate the policies of elected decision-makers. The function of the journalist, then, is to "evaluate the policies of government and present well-informed conclusions about these key debates to the public," (Champlin and Knoedler, 2006: 121).

While Dewey agreed with much of Lippmann's critique of the future of democracy, he diverges on his view of the public and role of the press. Dewey viewed journalists as the teachers of the public; Lippmann saw them as leaders of the citizenry (Champlin and Knoedler, 2006). Dewey ([1922] 1976) saw the public as

capable of rational thought and decision-making, with the active participation of citizens as essential for a healthy democracy. In this context, the job of the journalist is to engage and educate the public in the key policy issues of the day, enabling them to participate in the democratic discourse.

According to Schudson (2008), Lippmann's view of journalism is the dominant kind today due to the professionalization of journalism during the 20th century. Newspapers became finished products with virtually all their editorial content authored by individuals – the professional journalists (Stephens 2008). Lippmann ([1922] 1965) used a visual metaphor for democratic communication that just as easily applies to journalism. Whipple argues that "by emphasizing vision, the democratic process for Lippmann becomes something in which citizens do not actively participate, but passively watch—they become spectators rather than participants," (2005: 160).  Journalism largely developed as a spectator activity, with an elite group in control of the "overall process through which the social reality transmitted by the news media is constructed" (Shoemaker et al, 2001: 233).

Dewey, however, adopted a different metaphor — the ear, rather than the eye. For him the difference between being a spectator and a participant was the difference between watching and hearing. In contrast to Lippmann, Dewey emphasized conversation as the ideal form of human communication through which individuals construct the truth (Schudson, 2008). If citizens are "naturally active participants, not passive spectators," (Whipple, 2005: 161), then the ability of news consumers to take part in the production of their news and information environment offers a way to test Deweyan assumptions of participation.

**Lippmann, Dewey and participatory journalism**

While Lippmann viewed journalism as a hierarchical system of providers and consumers, Dewey viewed journalism as a much more collaborative system for conversation, debate, and dialogue. The two perspectives provide a framework to understand how news professionals view participatory journalism – whether journalists see themselves as an elite group who should evaluate and present analysis to a spectator public or whether journalists believe they should provide ways for citizens to interact and participate in the news (Champlin and Knoedler, 2006).

Proponents of participatory models of journalism (Gillmor, 2004) argue that the democratic role of journalism in a changing society needs to be redefined. These critiques address the top-down approach of the professional journalistic gatekeeper and reimagine journalism as a conversation with citizens that encourages them to take an active role in news processes. Alterman goes as far as describing new media platforms such as blogs as representing "a revival of the Deweyan challenge to our Lippmann-like understanding of what constitutes ''news'' and, in doing so, might seem to revive the philosopher's notion of a genuinely democratic discourse" (2008: 55).

Definitions of participatory journalism tend to be based on a normative assumption of the behavior of citizens, drawing from Dewey's view of the public as doing more than simply reading the news. Terms such as participatory journalism, citizen journalism and user-generated content are often used to describe what Bowman and Willis (2003: np) define as "the act of a citizen, or group of citizens, playing an active role in the process of collecting, reporting, analyzing and disseminating news and information." They add a public interest element to the definition, positing that the "intent of this participation is to provide independent,

reliable, accurate, wide-ranging and relevant information that a democracy requires,"
(2003; np).

The underlying assumption behind the notion of participatory journalism is a
shift from passive consumption to active engagement, embracing a "Deweyan
participatory approach to the information environment," (Whipple, 2005: 175).
Indeed, a Deweyan ethos underlies much of the rhetoric on participatory journalism.
Jenkins has evoked the emergence of a participatory media culture that "contrasts
with older notions of passive media spectatorship," (2006: 3), while Gillmor (2004:
136) has labelled the public as the "former audience" to stress that citizens should not
be considered as a passive group of consumers.

For this paper, we wanted to understand how journalists think about the role of
the audience in a participatory media culture that challenges long-established
journalistic norms and practices.  We draw on the perspectives of Lippmann and
Dewey on the role of the media and its relationship to the public to frame how
professional journalists view participatory journalism.

There are a number of terms used to describe the ability of citizens to
contribute in a myriad of ways to professionally edited publications, such as user-
generated content or citizen journalism. We have chosen the term participatory
journalism (Domingo et al., 2008; Deuze, 2006; Bowman & Willis, 2003) to
encompass the processes through which journalists and audiences are taking part in
the gathering, selecting, publishing, disseminating and interpretation of the news
featured within an institutional product such as the newspaper website.

Research in this area indicates that, so far, journalists have been reluctant to
open up most of the news production process to citizens (Domingo et al, 2008;
Hermida and Thurman, 2008).  The notion that participatory journalism could give

the public significant influence over the news process is widely unthinkable in the profession (Thurman and Hermida, 2010).

**Methodology**

Our study is based on semi-structured interviews with more than 60 news professionals drawn from about two dozen leading national newspapers, together with a consideration of the newspaper websites themselves (see Appendix A for a list of newspapers). The interviews were based on a common list of questions and conducted in 2007 and 2008 by a team of researchers.

A textual analysis of the transcriptions of the recorded interviews was conducted to identify themes and key ideas related to a set of core issues of interest to the researchers. These included journalistic rationales for opening up their websites to user input, the role of users as perceived by our interviewees and overall journalistic self-perceptions and ideologies. While participatory tools have evolved since the fieldwork was conducted, it remains important to understand how journalists view and frame the audience

We selected newspapers in 10 Western democracies - Belgium, Canada, Croatia, Finland, France, Germany, Israel, Spain, the United Kingdom, and the United States – because of the contribution of journalism to the democratic need for an informed citizenry (Kovach and Rosenstiel 2006; Gans 2004). Our focus is particularly relevant to this paper that considers the intersection between discourse and democracy (Dewey, 1927; Habermas, 1989), and what Gillmor describes as the shift of journalism from a lecture to a conversation (2004).

**Findings**

Our study found that all the newspaper websites were providing areas for readers to participate in the news. All sites offered similar generic types of participatory journalism formats, comparable to the technical processes identified by other researchers (Hermida and Thurman, 2008). However, the generic participatory formats mask the diverse attitudes of journalists working with this material as well as the uneven ways in which those journalists are implementing and managing participation options. We wanted to investigate to what extent audiences had the ability to contribute and influence the making of the news.

We categorized the participatory formats into the five stages of news production: access and observation, selection and filtering, processing and editing, distribution, and interpretation. Our approach breaks down the common components of the communication process, building on earlier work (Domingo et al. 2008). Traditionally, journalists have maintained jurisdiction over the first four stages, with audiences involved at the interpretation stage, essentially reacting to professionally produced closed news products. By breaking down participation formats, we were able to systematically analyze opportunities to contribute to the news process (see Table 1).

### *Access / Observation*

The primary way users were able to contribute at the access and observation stage of news production was through submitting text or audio-visual material. Newspapers adopted a range of tactics, either directly soliciting material on a specific issue or story, or providing generic email addresses to submit content. But it was left up to the professional journalist to decide if a story tip, photo or video was of interest

**TABLE 1: Stages of news production** (Developed from Domingo et al. 2008)

| Stage | Participatory formats |
|---|---|
| 1) **Access/observation**: The initial information-gathering stage at which source material for a story is generated, such as eyewitness accounts and audio-visual contributions. | **Citizen media**: Photographs, video and other media submitted by users, usually vetted by journalists. |
| 2) **Selection/filtering**: The "gatekeeping" stage when decisions are made about what should be reported or published. | **None** |
| 3) **Processing/editing**: The stage at which a story is created, including the writing and editing of an item for publication. | **Citizen blogs**: Blogs created by users hosted on the news organization's website. **Citizen stories**: Written submissions from readers on topical issues, including suggestions for news stories, selected and edited by journalists for publication on the website. |
| 4) **Distribution**: The stage at which a story is disseminated or made available for reading and, potentially, discussion. | **Content hierarchy**: News stories ranked according to audience ratings, often based on the most read or emailed content. **Social networking**: Distribution of links to stories through social media platforms such as Twitter and Facebook. |
| 5) **Interpretation**: The stage at which a story that has been produced and published is opened up to comment and discussion. | **Collective interviews**: Chats with journalists or invited guests, with questions submitted by readers and typically moderated by a news professional. These are usually webcast in audio or video, or transcribed live, offering a sense of interactivity and immediacy. **Comments**: Views on a story or other online item, which users typically submit by filling in a form on the bottom of the item. **Forums**: Discussions led by journalists or initiated by readers. Questions can be posed by the newsroom and submissions either fully or reactively moderated, or by readers. **Journalist blogs**: Authored by one or more journalists, with short articles in reverse chronological order. Journalist blogs (also called "j-blogs") often are associated with a specific topic or perspective, with the facility for readers to comment on entries. **Polls**: Topical questions posed by journalists, with users asked to make a multiple choice or binary response. These polls provide instant and quantifiable feedback to users. |

and merited further attention. As one Croatian editor explained: "We publish everything that we believe is newsworthy."

By and large, we found that journalists were extending established newsgathering practices to the web, seeing the user as a source of material that journalists were unable to provide themselves. The journalists we interviewed placed greater value on soliciting audience contributions on specific stories or issues, rather than on unsolicited story ideas. "What's interesting for journalists is to have contributions that really relate to news, of the witness type," said one editor. This was a common sentiment amongst our interviewees, even at newspapers such as the *Washington Post* that offered few participation options. One of the editors acknowledged the value of having "a thousand people" telling the newspaper what is going on at a local level rather than solely relying on newsroom staff. Editors at the Belgian newspaper, *Nieuwsblad.be* also appreciated the significance of user submissions for local news. The newspaper offered a separate email address for each local news page on the website; "More than half the input we receive through these local email addresses is useful," said the newspaper's online editor.

Submissions from the audience were also highly prized during breaking news events. At the Canadian newspaper, the *National Post*, editors highlighted how the newsroom turned to its readers to help it report on a huge propane gas explosion that happened overnight in Toronto. "During breaking news, inviting your readers to chime in and add their observations is useful," said an online editor at the paper. "As journalists and editors, we can find that pretty handy to have." Another editor at the same paper said it didn't want "somebody gut's reaction, but somebody's testimony."

Journalists from other newspapers such as *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro* in France and the *Guardian* in the UK expressed similar views. An editor at *Le Monde* recalled

how on a recent news story, "our call for witness reports worked very well and we then established a synthesized version of events based on these reports." Users are clearly seen as sources on news stories or topics selected by journalists. An editor at the other Canadian newspaper in our study, *The Globe and Mail*, summed up this approach:

> "If a reporter is working on a story and he or she wants to get public input, we've often put a question on the website and said that if you have information or a story on this topic, please contact the reporter."

During this initial stage of news production, users were mainly framed as idea generators and observers of newsworthy events. Most of the newspapers we studied provided little room for users to decide the news, leaving the agenda-setting capability in the hands of the professionals. There were exceptions, such as the user-dominated spaces of LePost.fr in France, which was part of the *Le Monde* newspaper group, and the online edition of the Spanish free daily, *20 Minutos*. Both of these were relatively new journalistic products so may be more open to the idea of users as co-collaborators than some of more well established newspapers in our study.

### *Selection / Filtering*

The reluctance of editors to give users agency over the news was reflected at the selection and filtering stage of the journalistic process. None of the newspapers offered any meaningful opportunities to influence what makes the news. The few spaces where users exercised some agency over selection and filtering of news were in spaces delineated from the main website of a parent organization. The best example was LePost.fr, a spinoff website of French newspaper *Le Monde*, based almost

entirely on user contributions. On the website, users are encouraged to filter news from other sources and "give them an angle", according to the editor in chief.

### *Processing / Editing*

The newspapers in our study offered some opportunities for users to write the news but within clearly prescribed formats. One of the main mechanisms we identified was written submissions from readers on topical issues. These citizen stories were selected and edited by journalists for publication on the website. The space for users to contribute stories was subject to newsroom editorial controls. For example, at the Spanish newspaper *El País*, story submissions were filtered and fact-checked by journalists, before being published in a separate section of the website. Similarly, the *Het Nieuwsblad* in Belgium published citizen stories on its local pages online, though an editor explained "all user-generated news needs to be double-checked."

Journalists were more relaxed about sharing the production of soft news areas, but still exercised a degree of editorial supervision. The *Guardian* in the UK enabled readers to submit travel stories to the Been There section of its news website. Journalists then select some of the submissions to appear in the newspaper: "It goes onto the website and then in edited fashion in the paper," explained an editor. In Germany, users could post what it called "contemporary eyewitness accounts" to a micro-site about 20th century history called *Einestages*, though these contributions were labelled as amateur content.

The desire to separate user material from professionally produced content was most obvious in the implementation of citizen blogs. At the time of our study, a handful of newspapers in Croatia, France, Spain, the UK and the USA provided a

hosted space for users to create and publish their own content. These spaces for unfiltered and unedited material were kept separate from the content produced by professional journalists.

Opinions on the provision of citizen blogs were far from unanimous. Some editors saw value in providing users with a piece of real estate on their site as a place "to meet like-minded people to talk about things that they were interested in," as an executive at the UK *Telegraph* newspaper put it. But others were more sceptical, arguing that users could easily set up their own blog, or that it was simply not the purpose of the newspaper: "It is out of the question for us to broadly install a user blog and to offer all users the option to inscribe their name for eternity," said an editor at the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* newspaper in Germany.

### *Distribution*

At this stage of the production process, editors expressed concerns about balancing the perceived need to maintain control over the hierarchy and distribution of news, while at the same time allowing users greater agency. Most newspaper websites created user-driven story rankings based on the most-read or most-emailed stories. But the hierarchy of stories on a homepage was firmly in the hands of editors. "It is still important to provide a package of news chosen by the professional newsroom, a package that says 'this is what happened today. Here is according to *Nieuwsblad.be*, the most important news of today'," said the online editor at the Belgian newspaper.

The editors interviewed were also grappling with the growth of social networks as mechanisms for the distribution of stories. "You don't expect people to come to your content; you want to send it out to people. And so everybody is

scrambling to figure out, how do you do that?" said the online managing editor for Canada's *The Globe and Mail*.

Most newspapers provided ways for users to share stories by email, social bookmarking or via links on Facebook and Twitter. But there were mixed views on how far to allow users to personalize their news experience. The French newspaper *Le Figaro* saw allowing personalization as a way of increasing reader loyalty. "If a user wishes to have a personalized page to view news, he'll have to come back to Figaro," said an editor. The Israeli newspaper, *Ynet,* went further by developing its own social network for readers. For others, this was a step too far. "It's not a social networking site," said online executive editor of Canada's *The Globe and Mail* website. But even he, like other editors, acknowledged the impetus to offer "social networking functionalities along with its journalism."

### *Interpretation*

Our study found that editors were most comfortable with opening up this final stage of the journalistic process, where users were encouraged to give their views on the news of the day. Newspaper websites offered a wide range of mechanisms for users to express themselves, from simple polls on topical issues to collective chats to comments on stories.

The most common mechanism for interpretation was comments on stories. Despite widespread adoption among newspapers, our interviewees expressed mixed feelings about the worth of some of the material posted. For example, a *Guardian* editor described users who comment as "a group of obsessives", adding, "most people don't want to comment. And actually, most people don't want to read other people's

comments." His views were echoed by a *Globe and Mail* editor, who described most comments as "not terribly well-thought through or just vitriolic."

The most favourable views tended to come from journalists who saw comments as a space for public discourse. A *Guardian* editor said comments were part of its strategy to "make lots of voices, including ones we don't agree with, heard." We found that a number of our interviewees saw comments and other spaces for interpretation as an extension of the traditional role of the newspaper in sparking a national conversation. An editor at *Le Monde* talked about how "debate in the wake of news, that's still doing fundamental activities of journalists' work." A community editor at the *Telegraph* explained, "we've been trying to stimulate debate, we've been trying to get people to have conversations around the breakfast table, and in the pub and in the office, and now we can take part."

Some of our interviewees tended to talk of these spaces for interpretation as ways of accomplishing deliberative ideals. An editor at Germany's *Der Speigel* described its online forum, with 100,000 members, as "one of the biggest debate platforms in the German-speaking region, at least regarding political, economic and social issues." Another German editor, at *the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, spoke of the potential to create a platform that is "an expression of democracy, and in my view is bringing forward society." Similarly, an editor at the *Washington Post* spoke of the benefits of its online discussion groups to "provide valuable information to users that we wouldn't be able to [provide] just because of resources."  Editors at the paper also spoke highly of the moderated chats it hosts, describing them as "very valuable." In Canada the *Globe and Mail* also viewed their chats positively. The newspaper's online executive editor said they "cater to informing the public in depth about important issues, from the perspective of an intelligent national debate."

**Discussion**

We approached this examination of how journalists conceived and implemented participatory journalism to explore whether they fell into the Lippmann or Dewey camp. We found that while audience participation has become an integral part of professionally edited online publications, it is misleading to suggest that journalists are embracing opportunities to share jurisdiction over the news. There are few indications that participatory journalism is democratizing the journalistic process itself. Journalists still see themselves as an elite group which mediates the flow of information to the public. Despite a myriad of ways for audiences to take part in the news, we found that journalists retained control over the stages of identifying, gathering, filtering, producing and distributing news.

The most opportunities for user participation across the 10 different countries and news cultures we studied were at the interpretation stage. Comments on stories, which allow users to offer their input after an item has been published, were by far the most popular format at the time of our study. The technical tools that facilitate participation, as well as the way those tools are implemented, are constantly evolving and changing, in some cases significantly since our interviews. However, the way professionals frame participatory journalism has remained remarkably consistent (Harrison 2009; Hermida and Thurman, 2008; Thurman and Hermida, 2010), with journalists sharing a governing occupational ideology (Deuze 2002; Weaver 1998).

In the interviews, journalists tended to resist the notion of relinquishing control over the process of making decisions about what is news and how that news should be reported, issues that arise at earlier stages of story production. This attitude can be partly attributed to a desire to preserve the status of professionals in the

process of making journalism. "Journalism remains journalism and it's not going to change its fundamentals," said the *Globe and Mail*'s online executive editor, while a *Washington Post* editor argued readers wanted "good old-fashioned journalism." To a large extent, journalists saw themselves as the defining actors in the process of creating news.

However, there are also indications that journalists do not view users as just consumers of professionally produced media. Often, we found conflicting views among the editors we interviewed, who expressed both apprehension and support for involving audiences in the process of journalism. Such ambivalence is understandable at a time when journalists are negotiating their standing in a shared media environment.

Our study suggests that journalists see audiences as what we call "active recipients" of news – somewhere between passive receivers and active creators of content. Users are expected to act when an event happens, by sending in eyewitness reports, photos and video. Once a professional has shepherded the information through the news production stages of filtering, processing and distributing the news, users are expected to react, adding their interpretation of the news. As "active recipients", audiences are framed as idea generators and observers of newsworthy events at the start of the journalistic process, and then in an interpretive role as commentators who reflect upon the material that has been produced.

We suggest that the way participatory journalism has been adopted and implemented falls somewhere between Lippmann's view of the media and a Deweyan approach. Overall, news professionals view audiences as receivers of information created and controlled by the journalist. But at the same time, news organizations are providing greater opportunities for audiences to engage in the public discourse.

Indeed, some journalists are intrigued by the possibilities of participatory journalism to enable more voices to be heard, and perhaps even fulfil deliberative ideals in a democratic society.

**References:**

Alterman, Eric. (2008): Out of print: The death and life of the American newspaper. *The New Yorker*, March 31, 48-60.

Bowman, Shayne and Willis, Chris (2003) We media: How audiences are shaping the future of news and information. The Media Center. Accessed 23 January 2010 from http://www.hypergene.net/wemedia/weblog.php.

Bybee, Carl (1999). Can democracy survive in the post-factual age?: A return to the Lippmann-Dewey debate about the politics of news. *Journalism and Communication Monographs*, 1(1), 29 62.

Champlin, Dell P. and Knoedler, Janet T. (2006) The Media, the News and Democracy: Revisiting the Dewey Lippmann Debate. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 40 (1), 135-152.

Deuze, Mark. (2002) *Journalists in the Netherlands: An analysis of the people, the issues and the (inter-) national environment*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.

Deuze, Mark (2006). Participation, remediation, bricolage: Considering principal components of a digital culture. The Information Society 22: 63-75.

Dewey, J. (1927). *The public and its problems*. New York: H. Holt and Company.

Dewey, John ([1922] 1976). *The Middle Works of John Dewey, 1899–1924*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Domingo, David, Thorsten Quandt, Ari Heinonen, Steve Paulussen, Jane B. Singer and Marina Vujnovic (2008) Participatory journalism practices in the media and beyond: An international comparative study of initiatives in online newspapers. *Journalism Practice* 2 (3), 326-342.

Gans, H. J. (2004) Democracy and the news. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gillmor, Dan (2004) *We the media: Grassroots journalism by the people, for the people*. Sebastopol, O'Reilly.

Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Harrison, Jackie (2010) User-generated content and gatekeeping at the BBC hub. *Journalism Studies* 11 (2): 243-256.

Hermida, Alfred, and Thurman, Neil (2008) A clash of cultures: The integration of user-generated content within professional journalistic frameworks at British newspaper websites, *Journalism Practice* 2 (3): 343-356.

Jenkins, Henry (2006) *Convergence culture: Where old and new media collide*. New York: New York University Press.

Kovach, Bill, and Tom Rosenstiel (2007) *The elements of journalism: What newspeople should know and the public should expect*. New York: Crown.

Lippmann, Walter ([1922] 1965) *Public Opinion*. New York: Free Press.

Paulussen, Steve, David Domingo, Ari Heinonen, Jane B. Singer, Thorsten Quandt and Marina Vujnovic (2008) "Citizen participation in online news media: An overview of current developments in four European countries and the United States." In: Quandt, Thorsten, and Wolfgang Schweiger (eds.), *Journalismus online: Partizipation oder profession?* Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, pp. 263-283.

Schudson, Michael (2008). The "Lippmann-Dewey Debate" and the invention of Walter Lippmann as an anti-democrat 1986-1996. *International Journal of Communication*, 2, 1-20.

Stephens, Mitchell (2008) New media, new ideas: Escape from the holy of holies. *Journalism Studies*, 9 (4), 595-599.

Shoemaker, Pamela J., Martin Eichholz, Eunyi, Kim and Brenda Wrigley, (2001) Individual and routine forces in gatekeeping, *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 78 (2), 233-246.

Thurman, Neil and Hermida, Alfred (2010) Gotcha: How newsroom norms are shaping participatory journalism online. In: Monaghan, Garrett and Tunney, Sean (eds.) *Web journalism: A new form of citizenship*. Eastbourne: Sussex Academic Press, pp. 46-62.

Whipple, Mark (2005) The Dewey-Lippmann debate today: Communication distortions, reflective agency, and participatory democracy. *Sociological Theory*, 23 (2) June 2005.

Weaver, David (1998) *The global journalist: News people around the world*. Cresskill, New Jersey: Hampton Press.

**APPENDIX A**
Newspapers in the study, by country

| Country | Newspaper | Website homepage |
|---|---|---|
| Belgium | *Het Belang van Limburg /* <br> *Gazet van Antwerpen* | hbvl.be <br> gva.be |
| | *Het Nieuwsblad* | nieuwsblad.be |
| | *De Standaard* | standaard.be |
| Canada | *The Globe and Mail* | theglobeandmail.com |
| | *The National Post* | nationalpost.com |
| Croatia | *24 Hours* | 24sata.hr |
| | *Vecernji List* | vecernji.hr |
| Finland | *Helsingin Sanomat* | hs.fi |
| | *Kaleva* | kaleva.fi |
| France | *Le Figaro* | lefigaro.fr |
| | *Le Monde* | lemonde.fr |
| | Le Post (affiliated with Le Monde) | lepost.fr |
| Germany | *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* | FAZ.net |
| | *Focus* | focus.de |
| | *Der Spiegel* | spiegel.de |
| | *Süddeutsche Zeitung* | sueddeutsche.de |
| Israel | *Haaretz* | haaretz.co.il |
| | *NRG* | nrg.co.il |
| | *Ynet* | ynet.co.il |
| Spain | *20 Minutos* | 20minutos.es |
| | *El País* | elpais.com |
| United Kingdom | *The Guardian* and *The Observer* | guardian.co.uk |
| | *The Daily / Sunday Telegraph* | telegraph.co.uk |
| United States | *USA Today* | USAToday.com |
| | *The Washington Post* | washingtonpost.com |