EUROPEAN SCIENCE FOUNDATION

ESF Exploratory Workshop on

Mapping the digital news ecosystem

Professional journalism, new producers and active audiences in the digital public sphere

Barcelona, 8-11 May 2013

Convened by:
David Domingo [1] Pere Masip, [2]
and Karin Wahl-Jorgensen [3]

[1] Department of Information and Communication Studies, Université libre de Bruxelles, Belgium
[2] Faculty of Communication Blanquerna, Universitat Ramon Llull, Catalonia, Spain
[3] Cardiff School of Journalism, Media and Cultural Studies, Cardiff University, Wales, UK

SCIENTIFIC REPORT

1. Executive summary

The ESF exploratory workshop on "Mapping the digital news ecosystem" gathered 26 scholars from 14 countries in Barcelona from May 8 to 11, 2013. The aim of the meeting was to explore the challenges that researchers face with the blurring of boundaries between news producers and consumers in the digital public sphere by means of exploring the following key areas: (1) changing practices of professional journalism, (2) the role of new information producers in digital news ecosystems, (3) the habits of news consumers as actives audiences, and (4) the implications of the dynamics of news ecosystems for the public sphere.

The first day of discussions was devoted to theoretical and conceptual debates around news ecosystems, news production, and news audiences, as well as broader questions surrounding the conceptualisation of the digital public sphere. The second day focused on methods and tools to map and analyse actors in online news ecosystems (journalists, engaged citizens, and other information producers), their self-perceptions, motivations, status and relationships. This included contributions from scholars taking "big data" approaches to analysing digital journalism, as well as multi-method quantitative and qualitative approaches to audience and professional attitudes and practices. On the final day, the group collaboratively summarised the main insights of the workshop and explored avenues for future cooperation, including potential publications and funding bids.

The first evening was an informal gathering in a local brewery to enable participants to meet and catch up. Many of the researchers knew each other from previous conferences and, in some cases, from joint research projects, but the diversity of ages, geography and research interests besides the common thread of journalism as an object of study allowed to everyone to get to know new faces.

Prior to the workshop all participants submitted theoretical or methodological reflections on a topic relating to their expertise in the form of a brief (4-6 pages in length) position paper. Papers where organised around themes and shared among participants in April, prior to the workshop. This allowed us to devote sessions almost exclusively to discussion, rather than to presenting findings. We asked participants to focus their papers on proposing strategies to address the challenges of journalism studies, based on their research experience. The chair in each session summarized in 10 minutes the contributions and highlighted unresolved issues. The authors then clarified their proposals, and a debate followed, open to all the workshop participants. Sitting in a round table fostered this open discussion and many threads of debate continued over several sessions.

With this organisation of the sessions we achieved a high quality of focused debate which contributed to generating a robust number of theoretical and methodological proposals for future research across the thematic areas discussed. These ideas were more systematically organised in a wrap-up session on the third and final day of the workshop, in the form of tensions that researchers should focus on in future research projects (see the conclusions of this report for more details):

1. Metaphors about public communication as the context of news production and consumption

2. Journalism versus news practice

3. Diverse conceptions of audience participation

4. Big data versus small data

5. Continuity versus change

The rapporteur for the Humanities Scientific Committee of the ESF in the exploratory workshop was Balázs Kiss, who during the first day of the meeting introduced funding options and described how ESF will evolve into a new organisation focused on lobbying for EU support to research rather than being a funding body itself. Peter Dahlgren, one of the participants in the workshop, summarized the conclusions of the ESF Forward Look initiative on Media Studies: New Media and New Literacies, as it was closely related to the themes of the Barcelona workshop.

Both the scientific debates and the social aspects of the workshop were full of energy and collegiality, and we are all enthusiastic to take the necessary steps to further consolidate and institutionalise the informal network of researchers that this meeting, sponsored by ESF, made possible. A book and applications to several funding bodies are the concrete steps envisioned to continue the conversation and find collective ways to address the future of digital journalism as an object of study.

2. Scientific content

The first discussion on Thursday May 9 focused on identifying adequate theoretical concepts to analyse the communicative context in which journalism operates in the digital age. The session **"News ecosystems: conceptualising news producers beyond professional journalism, and their relationship with newsrooms"** was chaired by Steen Steensen. Chris W. Anderson provided a reflection on the genealogy of the term "news ecosystem" and discussed the implications of the biology metaphor as one that overemphasises order over change. He proposed as an alternative concept "rhizomatic news ecosystems", a different metaphor that suggests a dynamic network structure that may be more capable of revealing the relationships between actors in the digital communication environment. David Domingo proposed the concept of "journalistic networks", inspired in Actor-Network Theory (ANT), which clearly resonates with the idea of the rhizome presented by Anderson. In a journalistic network professional journalists and other social actors can, in principle, be both consumers and producers of news, and they negotiate the news narrative about an event through their practices and relationships, and thereby implicitly contribute to defining what constitutes news and journalism. Yana Breindl focused on one kind of social actor outside the newsroom that is active in producing information: activists. She suggested the relevance of the Internet's affordances (what the Internet enables them to do) along with activists' action repertoire (what they actually do, their tactics and strategies in information production). In her research, activists situate themselves as mediators between citizens and policy makers, portraying themselves as experts. In the practices of activists, it was relevant to identify different levels of involvement, from a core of campaigners to occasional contributors and followers. The networks forming around an issue may share information without the mediation of journalists, but activists still want to interact with the media, as they are aware of the visibility that news give to their proposals.

The discussion confirmed that most of the participants were not comfortable with the concept of "ecosystem" and rather liked the idea of understanding the relationship of journalists, their sources and the public as a "network". The Bourdieuan concept of "field" was also mentioned as having virtues for the analysis of the boundaries of the profession of journalism and the power struggles to define who belongs to it and who does not. The network approach has the advantage of putting the focus on tracing how certain discourses about events and about journalism itself may be proposed by one actor and then appropriated uncritically by others. Another advantage of an actor-network approach is that Latour's epistemological proposal allows us to treat human and non-human actors as equally relevant in shaping news production and consumption practices. Non-human actors are mostly technologies which after being designed by humans have agency to compel other humans to do things in specific ways. On the other hand, human actors may reshape technology to suit their needs if they have the power to do so. In any case, a network approach lets us retrace the relationships between different social actors in the context of news without imposing a priori the role of each of them in creating the dominant narrative. Some participants voiced the worry that researchers may be overwhelmed by the complexity of tracing all the actors involved in the production of news, let alone in the consumption of it. They argued that social institutions structure many of the practices and that this should be taken into account. The metaphor of the ecosystem or the field can be useful to define the boundaries of professional journalism and understand changes as disruptions, when new actors enter the system. From an ANT perspective, that would be understood as the network being reshaped because of the new power balance redefined by the new element in the network.

The discussion also revisited the dynamic concept of public sphere. This discussion led to a consideration of whether social scientists researching journalism have normative assumptions

regarding the profession and its social role. The concept of the public sphere as proposed by Habermas is strongly coloured by its normative orientation, proposing the ideal circumstances for democratic debates. Instead of embracing them uncritically, researchers can problematise journalistic ideals as a social construction, as a discourse that is shared (or not) by the journalists and their publics. These normative definitions of journalism should then be confronted with the actual practices, and the tensions among them may have considerable explanatory power. Issues of trust and legitimacy are clearly connected to this normative discussion, and open a relevant area of research regarding the position of journalism in society today. On the basis of the ideal of the public sphere, society expects something from journalism. As such the concept is a cultural resource that is used in power relationships and that shapes practices both of professional journalists and of other actors.

In session two, the discussion moved on to the concepts of audience and participation. Chaired by Irene Costera-Meijer, the title was **"Active audiences, engaged citizens: conceptualising citizen news consumption, production and engagement in public debates."** Laura Ahva proposed to distinguish between the "mass", the "audience" and the "public" as conceptual placeholders for different modes of engagement of the citizens with the news. Her research shows that audience members' practices are very diverse, and depending on the context and the aim, one person can behave as part of a "mass" (basically, passive consumer), "audience" (selective consumer) or "public" (involved citizen). For each of these kinds of audience engagement, participation strategies should be different, and empirical data suggests that the audience members generally resist active participation. In his paper, Peter Dahlgren pointed out the need to distinguish between participation *in* the media (what is usually labelled as participatory journalism) and participation *via* the media (how citizens use the information they get through the media in their daily life). He argued that professional journalism will have to distinguish itself from citizen-assisted journalism or advocacy journalism using principles such as accuracy, transparency and accountability, rather than objectivity, but acknowledged that these normative principles could also be applied to citizen producers. Ann-Kristin Juntti-Henriksson suggested that the news industry is increasingly incorporating entertainment elements in their products because news consumers engage more with that kind of content. Jérémie Nicey showed how contributors to the citizen journalism site CitizenSide tended to be freelance journalists rather than spontaneous witnesses. They used professional photo equipment and went to events where they expected to get newsworthy material, aiming to make some money and hoping to find a more stable job in the media industry. Therefore, the platform is an extension of the profession, rather than fostering citizen participation. Víctor Sampedro proposed a comprehensive classification of the profiles of citizens participating online during an electoral campaign, some of them very active, but not necessarily involved with the political parties. This individualistic, unorganised activism poses a challenge to structured parties to move from distance to co-presence, from places to networks, from transmission to dialogue and from show to play.

The chair opened the debate with the reminder that empirical data shows only between 1% and 6% of news users are active in contributing content. The discussion acknowledged that existing research has focused too much on this active minority, and that there is a need to understand the reasons of those who *do not* participate, and explore whether they actually may be participating elsewhere outside the spaces provided by journalistic media (including online communities, social media, a "third space" of sociability). The academic conceptualisations of participation have usually taken for granted that citizens would imitate professional journalists in their news production practices. Here, researchers may be guided by their own normative ideals on the positive effects for democracy of fostering engaged citizens when studying participation, and by media industry discourses that celebrate participation even if journalists resist it in practice. However, the papers of the session suggest that in many cases the audience participates for fun or because they are engaged politically, not because they want to do something journalistic. Furthermore, they may be participating without following the ethical norms of journalism. What researchers have labelled as "citizen journalism" may also have little to do with rational democratic engagement.

One of the things that has traditionally distinguished journalism from other forms of public communication has been impartiality. Activists suggest that impartiality favours the powerful, that it is morally unacceptable, but journalists in many countries resist relinquishing it as a normative principle, because they feel that then journalism would lose its distinctive social and political status. But there

may be citizens that participate because they have a passion for facticity, for impartiality. Researchers should be able to explain varied forms of participation; ranging from the activist, to the ones who do it for fun, to the ones that want to contribute neutral knowledge about current events. It still makes sense to research active participants, especially if we can determine how their production resonates in the wider public sphere. Participants agreed that beyond the number of active citizens or the quality of their contributions, what is relevant is that audience participation forces journalists to reconsider their role in society.

All in all, research should pay more attention to news consumption, and the mechanisms and resources available to citizens to switch from being consumers to being producers, to foster initiatives that encourage meaningful participation.

While professional journalists were important to the discussion in the first two sessions, the third one was specifically devoted to them: **"Newswork in the ecosystem: conceptualising practices in the newsroom: newsgathering, transparency and audience relationships,"** chaired by Wiebke Loosen. In this session, Henrik Örnebring made the provocative proposal that participation is a form of outsourcing of labour for media companies, and that researchers rarely have a critical standpoint about it because of the normative bias already discussed. This happens in a context where journalism as a profession is becoming more precarious and journalistic values are less of a priority both for the workers and the companies, problems exacerbated by the current economic crisis. Steen Steensen argued that mass communication no longer adequately describes journalism, and proposed to label it "multi communication," as it combines different forms of discourse and interaction. On the one hand, there is a blurring between professional and personal discourses in what journalists produce in spaces like social media. On the other hand, live blogging is also an example of multilayered communication, characterised by intense interactions with the most engaged audience members. Steve Paulussen underlined that journalism fiercely resists change, and that in aspects like time, the relationship with the public, and the relationship with the sources, the Internet has not brought about radical innovations in work practices. Albert Sáez, with his hybrid profile of scholar and journalist in a managing position in a Catalan media company, offered the perspective of the industry insider, explaining the challenges that the newsroom faces to develop audience participation strategies that they see as enriching to the journalistic work.

The presenters in this session clearly agreed that there is an erosion of journalism from within the profession due to worsening labour conditions, the blurring between private and public communication of the reporters themselves, the prevalence of desk work over direct contact with sources (even though one participant argued that shoe-leather work was always a myth and the art of journalism is precisely the ability of covering events effectively without being there), and the outsourcing of many journalistic tasks to freelancers and, in some cases, to the audience. Journalism understood as work (tasks, practices) is more and more performed by not only professional journalists, but also other social actors. Some of this work is labour, which generates surplus value that is not necessarily paid. A shrinking part of it can be considered a job, with a professional journalist that has a contractual paid arrangement to produce news. However, presenters defended the need to not completely take the research focus away from the newsroom, as professional journalists retain some cultural authority as narrators of current events. In any case, journalism is becoming less and less distinct from other forms of text production, and media organisations do not do (and never have done) journalism all the time.

The normative debate surfaced again in this context, and we wondered whether there is anything left of the normative ideals of journalism, and whether they were *ever* really enacted. Our intuition was that at some point in journalism history there was a bigger adherence to the ideals even if they were not applied in everyday news production. Perhaps a task for researchers would be to propose a new normative definition of journalism that is more realistic and adapted to the current digital environment, and also to empower journalists to obtain the appropriate conditions to reach that ideal. New values, such as being responsive to the audience, and being transparent seem to be increasingly embraced by younger journalists, but there are also new practices in online media connected to long-standing values of journalism. Empirical evidence suggests that journalists do not always respect their own values, and the movement of citizen journalism may have grown as a protest against this detachment of

professionals from their normative ideals, fostering a process of professional reflexivity that is unprecedented. Current trends can be seen as parallel processes of deprofessionalisation and reprofessionalisation.

Participants in the debate agreed that as researchers we feel that journalists still have a *raison d'être*. An intriguing research program would be to check whether wrong information is effectively corrected by the public, and how such correction occurs. Is there a collective intelligence in news production, or is it journalists that still have the last word?

Session four was entitled **"Digital public sphere: normative theories of journalism and democracy in the digital era,"** but presenters argued that "public sphere" as such is a concept that has become too vague to be useful. Peter Dahlgren chaired the debate. Agnieszka Stepinska presented a catalogue of journalistic normative models in different cultural contexts, underscoring a diversity of principles that in many cases European researchers tend to neglect. She wondered whether there should be a distinctive normative model for citizen participation. Nico Carpentier explained how participation is in itself a floating signifier that is contested, and is part of ideological debates about democracy. He argued for a relatively narrow use of "participation" to refer to processes of co-decision, leaving the concepts of "access" (presence) and "interaction" (socio-communicative relationships) for most other forms of audience engagement. Tamara Witschge argued similarly that not all forms of participation are equally meaningful from a democratic point of view, and most of audience participation in the news media is reduced to the interpretation stage, at the end of the production process. She defended an analytical perspective that is aware of the power relationships ruling participatory spaces, and described meaningful participation as one that gives voice to more people and thus fosters more diverse communication. Todd Graham and Marisa Torres da Silva presented papers focusing precisely on one of these forms of audience engagement: comments in news, and explored how Habermasian ideals of public discussion can provide a framework to analyse them. Da Silva proposed to move beyond the frustrating benchmark of deliberative practices, to consider that online public debates can produce mutual understanding rather than consensus. Graham suggested that journalists should be involved in the conversations, becoming facilitators rather than moderators and fostering that comment spaces become a public sphere about journalism.

Presenters agreed that mainstream media tend to reduce and control the implications of audience engagement for news production. Journalists, as a social group, advance an idea of participation that does not challenge their position. The debate about participation is part of a struggle about who has a voice in democracy. But giving voice to the citizens may not be enough, as they may not be heard if their input is not processed with the same visibility as the one of the journalists. It is important to analyse the consequences of participation.

It was argued that the interpretation phase of news production is still part of journalism if we consider that publication is the beginning of a conversation that will lead to new stories to be produced. But the space for comments in news remains highly domesticated space, as journalists make the rules and most citizens just want to share their opinion rather than provide facts. The debate ended up questioning again why do researchers want to encourage participation in journalism, and to what extent that debate can be led without discussing democracy more broadly.

On the second day of the workshop, Friday May 10, the discussion moved on to methodological challenges. We started with the session **"Measuring news ecosystems: networks and flows,"** chaired by Chris W. Anderson. The presenters, Axel Bruns and Krishna Gummadi showed software tools they had developed to research big datasets of Twitter conversations. They discussed the practical and epistemological problems that studying this data poses, and cautioned that theoretical concepts from journalism studies should guide the interpretation of results. They warned that it is very easy to be fascinated by the technological aspects of computational analytical tools, arguing that reliability should still be the standard for academic research using these tools: software should be developed and tested for reliability before publishing results.

The session served to acknowledge how social media let researchers track habits in production and consumption of information that were not visible before. However, participants agreed that the uneven

demographics and penetration of these services in different countries needs to be taken into account, as uses of social media may be very different, and significant parts of the population may not be involved in those spaces. More specifically, hashtags are easy to use as a tool to gather a sample, but that has many implications that researchers sometimes overlook: it is a very particular group of users that engage in using this feature in their tweets, and tweets with hashtags may just be the tip of the iceberg of conversations related to a topic. On the other hand, taking hashtags as the sampling criteria is a robust ethical argument, as users have explicitly engaged in a public conversation on the studied topic. Researchers could profile the users very clearly by seeing their evolution over time, but the common practice is granting anonymity by not using the nicknames.

Accessing raw Twitter data for analysis may be very expensive (around 1 million dollars per year for the whole firehose) but if you do not need to do real-time analysis it is more reasonable to gather the data a posteriori, little by little, to make the process affordable. Another challenge is cleaning up the data and selecting the sample that will actually be analysed. Having user accounts as the unit of analysis rather than individual tweets can guarantee the generation of sufficient data to draw meaningful conclusions.

Social media seem to fit very nicely in the methodological premises of an actor-network approach. The algorithms that predict what people may want to consume (recommended videos on YouTube, recommended users on Twitter or Facebook) should be seen as actors in that network, interacting with the users. The analysis of the flow of information in social media allows to trace back influence, but cause and effect are hard to detect. A key research question is around the role of journalism in these information flows. We can also research news diversity from the perspective of the citizen as consumer: what they are exposed to (following), what they share, and how they interpret it in their tweets. But the analysis of Twitter data does not tell us the whole story about news uses by citizens, as it lacks sufficient context. Connecting online and offline research on the same object of study may strengthen the analysis.

The session on **"Content analysis of unfolding news and debates"** was chaired by David Domingo. Anders Olof Larsson presented his experience with Twitter as an object of study, explaining how he selected a sample of tweets that linked to news articles by combining computer and manual analysis. Thorsten Quandt focused on website analysis, which has the problem of the lack of standard APIs to gather data. This, in turn, forces researchers to develop their own tools ad hoc. He stressed the possibility of having the machines learn from human categories and manual classification of a sample which enables automatic text analysis and allows for the processing of millions of documents without human intervention, actually with more precision than human coders. Pere Masip presented another hybrid methodological design combining automated capturing of online data and manual coding, and agreed that computational analysis tends to focus on counting rather than on interpreting, and tends to be shallow as it lacks context.

Researchers acknowledged that the risk of using big data is that insights might be limited in the absence of theoretical frameworks that produces strong research questions. The combination of computer and manual analysis was portrayed as the future of research in online environments. Computers are powerful and let us reach amounts of data that we could not process otherwise, but human analysis can be more precise and necessary in different stages of the research process, including the collection of the data, cleaning up of the sample, and analysis of the content.

Participants pondered whether software tools for online media research should be open source and shared in repositories to foster the quality of research overall, and at the same time argued that this was not always possible, particularly in working with proprietary data like the one provided by Twitter.

The last session of debate was chaired by Tamara Witschge and was based on a discussion of methods that moved beyond content analysis: **"Assessing attitudes and practices: quantitative and qualitative approaches."** Irene Costera-Meijer presented the methodological program of Actor-Network Theory, as a way to neutralize preconceptions of the researcher and interpret journalists' and citizens' practices from their own perspective. Wiebke Loosen proposed a systematic model for the

analysis of the journalist/audience relationships and argued for a multi-method approach to understand the asymmetric nature of those relationships. Zvi Reich explained the method he has developed to assess news production and the relationship of journalists with sources, based on face-to-face reconstruction interviews about specific news stories, quantitatively encoded. Karin Wahl-Jorgensen explained the problems that researchers face in explaining journalistic practices at a time when the newsrooms are less and less the privileged sites of news production.

Presenters insisted on the need to be aware of power relationships in the collective production of news, and argued that there are elite contexts (Twitter being one of them) and alternative contexts that do not reach out to the majority of the population. Journalists may believe that social media are representative, but it may be much of a self-reflection, populated by people like them, and keep them as estranged from the average citizen as before.

The participants wondered if as researchers we can afford to keep production and audience analysis separate. The methods to analyse production could be applied to analyse consumption, for example doing reconstruction interviews to know how citizens get information (their sources, technological channels, timings, context). Practices and discourses of both journalists and audiences, are pertinent and relevant objects of study.

The discussion came back to the relationship between journalism and its audiences. It was argued that journalism may not always be relevant for the audience, but that the audience is usually able to identify which information is valuable for them as individuals and collectives. As such, they have clear normative expectations regarding professional journalism. They do not want to lose professionally produced information even if they do not consume it extensively. Identifying what is perceived as journalism by the audience, and what other information inputs they draw on –including ones that they do not identify as forms of journalism– is a relevant research area.

3. Conclusions and outcomes

The fruitful discussions in each of the sessions had common underlying themes and recurring debates. The overall impression was that even though it is very difficult for radically new practices to emerge in the production and consumption of news, existing ones tend to blur or amplify, with a broader diversity of actors involved and increased visibility of changes. Social media offer a privileged site for witnessing this evolution of public communication on current events. Participants agreed that new conceptual and methodological tools were required to analyse continuity and change in journalism, and blurring the existing paradigmatic barriers between newsroom research and audience research.

The debates contributed to contesting concepts that have been relatively stable in journalism studies for decades: journalism as a profession and as a social role, audience/public/mass as imagined by professionals and as engaged citizens, participation/access/interaction, news, public sphere, legitimacy/trust, normativity, values versus practices, consumption of information, democracy, sources/activists, power and media literacy.

In the conclusions session, starting from a summary of the sessions coordinated by Karin Wahl-Jorgensen, we discussed five tensions that were detected during the workshop sessions. They render visible the limitations of existing theoretical and methodological approaches, and trace the areas where future research on journalism and society should focus.

Tension 1: Conceptualising the context of journalism in the digital age

The different concepts proposed during the workshop and used elsewhere by researchers to describe the context for news production and consumption are not neutral, but rather have implications in how we understand our objects of study and what methods we use. Participants agreed that there needs to be a more nuanced evaluation of the differences between news ecosystems, journalistic networks, (networked) public spheres and journalistic fields. These concepts, linked to specific sociological

traditions, also influence our views on power relationships and normativity in journalism.

Tension 2: Journalism versus news practices

The boundaries of professional journalism are being challenged from the outside, by the multiplication of information producers, and from the inside, by the deskilling and precarity of the profession. Labour conditions of journalists have worsened dramatically in the last decade, and the separation between professional activities and private life is blurring in social media. The most active citizen journalists share with professionals many characteristics, as they aspire to be part of the core of the profession. Institutions, organisations and activists involve more and more professional journalists to manage their communication mediated by mainstream media and directly connecting to their constituencies online. That suggests that a focus on news pratices may be more fruitful to understanding the idiosyncrasies of the different actors that produce newsworthy material. Journalism could then be understood as a news practice that is only articulated as a profession in specific circumstances, and with fragile boundaries. The focus of research should not be limited to (professional) newsrooms, but should rather expand to analyse the relationships between all these actors.

Tension 3: The audience and its practices

Researchers agreed that journalism studies has neglected the audience for too long, and that it is necessary to place it in the center of the analysis. In this case, the sessions also showed how diverse can be what we usually simply label as "audience." We can see the audience as consumers of news; as citizens; as users; and as as participants. Focusing on the practices of active consumers (and also producers) of information seemed an approach that could dismantle the preconceptions embedded in the concepts. Participation itself was also deconstructed as a phenomenon that has many levels of involvement which should not be simplified. Understanding its purposes and its outcomes may neutralize the paradox that seems to stem from the fact that participation seems very desirable in theory and despicable in practice, overwhelming for the journalists that manage it and failing to give voice to those who are usually marginalized by mainstream media.

Tension 4: Small data versus big data

The workshop sessions revealed an emerging productive relationship between research based on "small" and "big" data. Thus, rather than a tension between two methodological approaches, this could be understood as a call for collaboration, to acknowledge the complementarity. The traceability of communication in social media allows for automated content analysis of millions of data points; volumes that were not previously imaginable by researchers. However, discussions highlighted the weaknesses of big data analysis in terms of accuracy and interpretation. Qualitative methods, such as online ethnography, reconstruction interviews and conversation analysis, can provide "small data" that should be combined with the computer-generated analysis.

Tension 5: Continuity versus change

Journalism studies in the digital age seem to have "nostalgia for the future," a focus on newness and innovation rather than on continuity. The political economy of academia, having to prepare attractive grant applications to secure research funding, encourages dramatic narratives of radical change. This may obscure from our results the continued relevance of traditional media and of journalism as a profession; overshadow cases of failure with cases of success; and overlook the efforts of the actors to resist change and maintain existing boundaries. A more comprehensive research approach that problematises existing concepts as argued in tensions 1 to 3 would allow us to render the tension between continuity and change more explicit and offer more realistic research results.

The participants in the workshop were well aware that these proposals generate more complexity rather than simplifying it, but the shared intuition was that it was necessary to move in that direction in order to formulate relevant research questions about the future directions of journalism.

The workshop clearly reinforced the feeling among participants that international research projects on the changing practices of news production and consumption are necessary, and there was an agreement that multiple initiatives could emerge from the discussions. There will be an attempt at obtaining funding to institutionalise the informal network created by the workshop, and researchers will inform each other of their existing research projects and invite each other to participate in new projects. A book project inspired by the conclusions of the workshop is already being negotiated with a publisher. It will discuss in detail the identified conceptual and methodological tensions in journalism studies, and lay out the key themes for future research in the discipline.

4. Final programme

Wednesday, 8 May 2013

Afternoon   Arrival. Informal meeting after 19h at Moritz.

Thursday, 9 May 2013

09.00-09.15   **Welcome by the convenors**
David Domingo (Université libre de Bruxelles, Belgium)
Pere Masip (Universitat Ramon Llull, Catalonia)
Karin Wahl-Jorgensen (Cardiff University, Wales)

09.15-09.30   **Presentation of the European Science Foundation (ESF)**
Balázs Kiss (Scientific Review Group for the Social Sciences)

09.30-11.00   **News ecosystems: conceptualising news producers beyond professional journalism, and their relationship with newsrooms.**

Chair:
Steen Steensen (Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, Norway)

Participants:
Chris W. Anderson (CUNY, USA) *Media ecosystems: Some notes toward a genealogy of the term and an application of it to journalism research.*
Yana Breindl (Georg-August Universität, Germany) *"All Information should be free": Digital rights activists as news producers in the networked public sphere.*
David Domingo (Université libre de Bruxelles, Belgium) *Journalistic networks: an actor-network approach to the study of the construction of news narratives in contemporary societies.*

11.15-13:00   **Active audiences, engaged citizens: conceptualising citizen news con-sumption, production and engagement in public debates.**

Chair:
Irene Costera-Meijer (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

Participants:
Laura Ahva (University of Tampere, Finland) *The mass, audience and public: Scrutinizing media partnership from the viewpoint of audience research.*
Peter Dahlgren (Lund University, Sweden) *Journalistic 'producers', participation, and the dilemmas of advocacy.*
Ann-Kristin Juntti-Henriksson (Lulea University of Technology, Sweden) *Citizen news consumption and production: Opportunities in today's digital culture.*
Jérémie Nicey (Université François Rabelais, Tours, France) *From participation to engagement?: Discussing the activity, reactivity and interactivity of news 'content contributors'.*
Víctor Sampedro (Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, Madrid, Spain) *Citizens' participation in electoral cyber-campaigns. Theoretical debates and a tentative*

typology.

14.00-15:45　**Newswork in the ecosystem: conceptualising practices in the newsroom: newsgathering, transparency and audience relationships.**

Chair:
Wiebke Loosen (Universität Hamburg, Germany)

Participants:
Henrik Örnebring (Karlstad University, Sweden) *Participation or outsourcing?Some reflections on the space and status of newswork in the digital news ecosystem.*
Steve Paulussen (Universiteit Antwerpen, Belgium) *Journalists' changing relationship with time, their public and their sources.*
Albert Sáez (Universitat Ramon Llull, Catalonia) *Newsroom transformation and public audiences.*
Steen Steensen (Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, Norway) *Journalism as multi communication.*

16.00-17.45　**Digital public sphere: normative theories of journalism and democracy in the digital era.**

Chair:
Peter Dahlgren (Lund University, Denmark)

Participants:
Nico Carpentier (Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium) *Differentiating between access, interaction and participation.*
Todd Graham (Universiteit Groningen, Netherlands) *What's readers' comments got to do with it? The role of journalism in the age of social media.*
Agnieszka Stepinska (Adam Mickiewicz University, Poland) *Normative implications for journalism and citizens in the era of digital media.*
Marisa Torres da Silva (Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal) *The new media ecology and citizen debates in online newspapers: Challenges and starting points.*
Tamara Witschge (Universiteit Groningen, The Netherlands) *When is participation meaningful? In search of new understandings of audience contributions to journalism.*

Friday, 10 May 2013

9.00-10.30　**Measuring news ecosystems: networks and flows.**

Chair:
Chris Anderson (CUNY, USA)

Participants:
Axel Bruns (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Germany / Queensland University of Technology, Australia) *The Australian Twitter News Index: Measuring news sharing in social media.*
Krishna Gummadi (Max Planck Institute for Software Systems, Germany) *Understanding news generation, dissemination, and consumption in online social media.*

11.00-12:45　**Content analysis of unfolding news and debates.**

Chair:
David Domingo (Université libre de Bruxelles, Belgium)

Participants:
Anders Olof Larsson (University of Oslo, Norway) *Bots or humans? A large-*

scale analysis of news linking on Twitter.
Pere Masip (Universitat Ramon Llull, Catalonia) *Content analysis of unfolding news and debates.*
Thorsten Quandt (University of Münster, Germany) *Reconstructing the digital public sphere?*

14.00-15:45   **Assessing attitudes and practices: quantitative and qualitative approaches.**

Chair:
Tamara Witschge (Universiteit Groningen, The Netherlands)

Participants:
Irene Costera-Meijer (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, The Netherlands) *Advantages of an Actor-Network Theory approach in journalism studies.*
Wiebke Loosen (Universität Hamburg, Germany) *Journalism and (its) audience: How to assess the nature of a changing relationship?*
Zvi Reich (Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Israel) *Face-to-face reconstruction interviews as a method for studying newswork in a rapidly changing ecosystem.*
Karin Wahl-Jorgensen (Cardiff University, Wales) *On the challenges of newsroom-centricity in ethnographic research: Coming to terms with the digital news ecosystem.*

16.00-16:45   **Briefing on the conclusions of the ESF Forward Look initative: Media Studies – New Media and New Literacies**

Peter Dahlgren (Lund University, Denmark)

Saturday, 11 May 2013

9.15-11.00   **Towards new theoretical and methodological frameworks**

Chairs:
Karin Wahl-Jorgensen (Cardiff University, Wales)
Pere Masip (Universitat Ramon Llull, Catalonia)

11.15-13:00   **Exploring agendas for future cooperation. Foundations for an international research project on news ecosystems and digital public spheres.**

Chairs:
David Domingo (Université libre de Bruxelles, Belgium)
Tamara Witschge (Universiteit Groningen, The Netherlands)

4. Final list of participants

Australia/Germany

Axel Bruns — Queensland University of Technology / Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

Belgium

Nico Carpenter — Vrije Universiteit Brussel
David Domingo — Université libre de Bruxelles
Steve Paulussen — Gent University

Finland

Laura Ahva — University of Tampere

France

Jeremie Nicey — Université François-Rabelais, Tours

Germany

Yana Breindl — Georg-August Universität
Krishna Gummadi — Max Planck Institute for Software Systems
Wiebke Loosen — Hans-Bredow-Institut
Thorsten Quandt — Hohenheim University

Israel

Zvi Reich — Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

Netherlands

Irene Costera-Meijer — Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
Todd Graham — University of Groningen
Tamara Witschge — University of Groningen

Norway

Anders Olof Larsson — University of Oslo
Steen Steensen — Oslo University College

Poland

Agnieszka Stepinska — Adam Mickiewicz University

Portugal

Marisa Torres da Silva — Universidade Nova de Lisboa

Spain

Víctor Sampedro — Universidad Rey Juan Carlos
Pere Masip — Universitat Ramon Llull
Albert Sáez — Universitat Ramon Llull

Sweden

Ann-Kristin Juntti-Henriksson — Luleå University of Technology
Peter Dahlgren — Lund University

| Henrik Örnebring | Karlstad University |

United Kingdom
Karin Wahl-Jorgensen   Cardiff University

USA
Chris Anderson   CUNY

6. Statistical information on participants

The workshop gathered a diverse group of scholars both in age, experience and geographic origin. Of the 26 participants, seven can be considered junior scholars (they finished their dissertation in the last 3 years) and eight are full professors. The majority of the participants were between 35 and 45 years old, with consolidated experience in journalism studies, political communication, audience research or computer science. It is hard to quantify the proportions of these different scientific domains in the workshop, as some of the researchers work in more than one. However, it is fair to say that journalism studies was the most common background among participants, and that we would have liked to have more computer scientists in the discussions. The youngest participant was 32 and the oldest 67.

According to the criteria of ESF the institution where researchers are working defines the country of origin. Taking this into account, the mobility of the participants between the planning phase of the workshop and the actual gathering, as well as the fact that some participants could not come in the end slightly shifted the balance. The United Kingdom, for example, went from 3 to 1 scholar in the end, while Germany jumped from 3 to 5, if we take into account that Australian Axel Bruns was visiting researcher in München during the month of the workshop. Including him, there were three scholars from outside the ESF area (Australia, Israel, and the USA). Eastern Europe was more underrepresented in the end than initially intended, as one scholar was forced to cancel at the last minute, and another was associated with a US institution at the time of the workshop instead of a European one. The breakdown of countries according to the number of representatives was:

Number of participants	Countries
4	Germany
3	Belgium, Netherlands, Spain, Sweden
2	Norway
1	Australia, Finland, France, Israel, Poland, Portugal, UK, USA