This is a repository copy of *BOUNDARY MAINTENANCE AND INTERLOPER MEDIA REACTION Differentiating between journalism's discursive enforcement processes*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/88817/

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Boundary Maintenance and Interloper Media Reaction: Differentiating between journalism's discursive enforcement processes.

Scott A. Eldridge II

In his fictional story The Interlopers*, Saki tells of two men fighting over the rights to a wooded hunting land. While both have long claimed the right to the land, one holds the legal right and the other – the interloper – claims to belong (Saki 1930). This story forms the allegorical locus of this paper, examining the way a self-defined in-group of traditional journalism protects its perceived professional identity against entities – Interloper Media – who claim belonging. This is achieved through distinct processes that echo but diverge from traditional boundary maintenance. This paper argues subtle and nuanced language in news texts referring to WikiLeaks serves to invalidate WikiLeaks' extant and persistent claims of 'being' journalism. These processes differ from boundary maintenance processes related to phone hacking, which serve as inwardly focused self-policing of the profession.[1]*

The rapid foregrounding of WikiLeaks in 2010 and 2011 and its claims and self-expressions of belonging to the in-group of journalism drew both practitioners and observers into a debate over whether or where WikiLeaks fits into a concept of journalism (Baack 2011, Beckett and Ball 2012, Peters 2011). In addition to its own challenge to journalism's primacy, WikiLeaks' new-found prominence came about after the July 2009 exposé into patterns of phone hacking by journalists and news organisations in the UK, compounding attention to journalism in the UK already under scrutiny, and challenging the definition and identity of journalism at a time when these topics were being publicly examined (Keeble and Mair 2012). While vastly different in their specific characteristics, both episodes prompted discourses of differentiation through reactions to the internal and external threats to journalism's authority, and both provide opportunities for analysing expressions of journalism's professional identity.

Now treated as common knowledge, the July 2009 coverage in *The Guardian's* was the first major exposure of phone hacking. Hopkins (2012) traces the origins of phone hacking in the UK to 2000, with the July 2009 *Guardian* package of articles exposing the breadth of the practice, and cresting in July 2011 with parliamentary and special inquiries. 'Hacking' consisted of monitoring voicemail accounts of celebrities, politicians, and other news figures by reporters at *The News of The World. The Guardian's* exposé made clear the scale of hacking, and the awareness of editors and executives of News International, the newspaper's parent company headed by Rupert Murdoch (Keeble 2012, Rusbridger 2012).

For WikiLeaks, it was the April 2010 release of the 'Collateral Murder' video that brought its first semblance of prominence, following several years of lesser-noticed releases. A noteworthy departure from WikiLeaks' origin as a website and conduit for whistle blowers, the video showed an edited version of a U.S. military helicopter attack in Iraq that killed civilians and two Reuters journalists. Later that

summer, the coordinated publishing with *The Guardian, The New York Times,* and *Der Spiegel* secured WikiLeaks' place in terms of both public awareness and scrutiny. Blurring the news/source boundaries with its overt claims of being journalism, WikiLeaks openly confronts definitions of journalism, and challenges traditional roles as it purports to provide a 'better' form of journalism (Beckett and Ball 2012, 42). Furthermore, as WikiLeaks became more widely known, the question of journalism's primacy became more evident in its extant claims of belonging to a journalistic identity, particularly in terms of information primacy and legitimacy (McBride 2011, Pilger 2013, Thomaß 2011, Warner 2011).

The conceptual definition of Interloper Media builds around this challenge of journalism's primacy and legitimacy by external actors claiming belonging – WikiLeaks – and is further defined through reactions to those entities and the ways they differ from reparative discourses of internal faults and failings – as with phone hacking. Interlopers, in this dichotomy, claim both the mantle of antagonist to the primacy and in-group/out-group dynamic of journalism's profession, and claim belonging to the in-group. Distinct from boundary maintenance, which occurs in very overt ways, Interloper Media processes occur through more nuanced and subtle reactions, woven into texts that are neither explicitly media-focused, nor occurring with the same intensity and immediacy that Bishop (1999) and Berkowitz (2000) scope in boundary maintenance and paradigm repair.

Boundary maintenance versus Interloper Media reaction

Similar to the treatment of plagiarists and paparazzi, phone-hacking coverage can be understood through analysing boundary maintenance. At their simplest, journalistic boundary maintenance processes employ overt and explicit discourses to define demarcations within a professional group, such as distinguishing between quality and tabloid newspapers, or photojournalists and paparazzi (Bishop 1999). Boundaries are maintained through overt discourses within news texts addressing perceived and public failings of journalistic standards, values, and professional norms. This is an inwardly focused self-policing of the profession of journalism by associated in-group members. In recent history the clearest example of boundary maintenance came with the public distancing of paparazzi from 'good' journalism after the 1997 death of Princess Diana (Bishop 1999, Berkowitz 2000), with reporting around the falsified 'Downing Street Memo', and with the plagiarism of Jayson Blair at *The New York Times* (Bicket and Wall 2007). In each of these cases, boundaries are: "created in order to be seen" (Bishop 1999, 92).

In these instances, sign-posted and visible discourses distance those involved in the failures from those who uphold the in-group and professional standards of belonging (Bicket and Wall 2007). Beyond castigating paparazzi and plagiarists, boundary maintenance also addresses 'faux' journalism, as with the decision by ABC to have the actor Leonardo DiCaprio interview former U.S. president Bill Clinton for a news program (Bishop 2004). Boundary maintenance, then, examines the activities and actors that are considered members of an in-group understood to be journalism – newspapers, broadcast, etc. – or those imposed from within these structures. These processes go further to define a sense of journalism, and distinguish good

journalism and bad journalism by isolating and identifying the 'bad' and making clear where and how the 'good' differ.

Whereas authors such as Coddington (2012) approach WikiLeaks through the lens of boundary maintenance and paradigm repair, that approach struggles as it glosses over an acceptance of WikiLeaks as possessing either inherent or imposed belonging to the in-group of journalism, and draws distinctions based on norms and institutionality. While these are meaningful distinctions, in focusing on boundary maintenance, sign-posted discourses of these distinctions are given priority over more nuanced discourses of identity and ideology. Further, while boundary maintenance processes excoriate the imposition of a non-journalist into a journalistic role, as ABC News did with DiCaprio, WikiLeaks differs in its external encroachment. Expressed simply: Julian Assange and WikiLeaks claim the title of journalist and journalism though it is not widely granted, and DiCaprio does not. Furthermore, while boundary maintenance discourses take place in texts where journalism is both subject and object – journalistic pieces *about* journalism – discourses rebutting WikiLeaks as an interloper occur in texts where journalism is an ancillary or absent topic, as in texts that deal with information in the WikiLeaks releases, but are not about WikiLeaks per se. While both processes emphasise in-group belonging, the differences and distinctions are critical and warrant understanding.

Journalism's Professional Identity

Researching journalism as a profession and analysis of professional identity has been approached primarily through the listening to journalists and non-journalists, using ethnographic study, surveys, and interview methodologies. In terms of identifying the in-group/out-group elements of journalism, these approaches rely on prompted discourses of identity and focus on elements of belonging expressed when requested (Hanitzsch 2011, Örnebring 2009, 2010, Waisbord 2012). Textual analysis augments these approaches by looking at the outward facing expression of journalistic identity; analysing markers of belonging against expressions contained within the prompted discourses of surveys and interviews.

Focusing on *The Guardian's* coverage explores facets of professional identity within a public service tradition, distinguished from both the commercial tradition of tabloids, and the passé subjective tradition (Donsbach 2010). This categorisation invokes and evokes ideals and standards that revolve around tenets of social responsibility, speaking truth to power, and providing expert analysis. Beset with aspirational roles and responsibilities, expressions of this identity rely on a familiar lexicon of idealised societal roles and functions, as intermediaries between governments and publics. Professional identity is expressed as a 'Fourth Estate', with watchdog, analytical, and advocacy roles, all contributing to an overarching concept of journalism's professional identity (Hanitszch 2011). Even accepting this familiar sense of 'being' journalism, idealised expressions of what journalism 'is' remain contested. Classifying journalism as a profession is not without its challenges, and in instances these resolve in an abstract concept of what society *seems to know* as journalism (Donsbach 2010, 38). As this offers a fleeting and spurious understanding of journalism, a focal point of identity moves the argument further,

addressing ever-shifting formats of journalism more uniformly. Differences can be further assuaged by honing in on journalism's reinvigoration of professionalism in identity terms, as a response to a simultaneous de-professionalization in structural terms (Örnebring 2010).

Professional identity as in-group/out-group belonging, then, is maintained by enforcing adherence to an array of values, standards, practices, and paradigms, and by decrying non-adherence, regardless of structural differences. This approach can also be applied across varied concepts of journalism – culture, tradition, practice, trade, and profession – through shared foregrounding of specific elements of belonging, and backgrounding non-belonging, and non-compliance to standards of shared identity. As its own arbiter of professional belonging, the in-group expresses corrections when its members fail, and also clarifies the requirements of belonging to rebut external claims of belonging from members of the out-group (Aldridge and Evetts 2003, Deuze 2005, Örnebring 2009).

Media-to-media Discourses of Belonging

Analysing news texts in the two cases here as expressions of belonging addresses not only explicit expressions of belonging and non-belonging, but also more nuanced media-to-media conversations within texts. As Schudson states:

> A news story may be a complex construction that communicates one message to one audience and, by irony and innuendo, a very different message to a more sophisticated audience. (1995, 174)

This in-group communication reflects dynamics of peer accountability, and expressions of adherence to journalism's identity and belonging. Bell echoes this: "Mass communicators are interested in their peers, not their public. Fellow communicators and co-professionals are their salient audience" (1991, 90). Accordingly, journalistic texts can be interpreted as attuned messages of a self-preferred and self-perceived definition of identity, and the boundaries of that identity.

This media-to-media discourse also applies to texts regarding WikiLeaks. As, WikiLeaks' poses a confrontation with traditional media, requiring the in-group of journalism to reinforce their defined profession through exclusion:

> [T]he WikiLeaks episode forces us to confront the fact that the members of the networked fourth estate turn out to be both more susceptible to new forms of attack than those of the old, and to possess different sources of resilience in the face of these attacks. (Benkler 2011, 311)[2]

News texts reinforce this in-group/out-group dynamic; incorporating discourses of subtly encoded belonging, interlaced in word choice and syntax, and in a manner that emphasises both belonging and exclusion (Fairclough 1995, 18). Criteria for evaluating journalism's in-group focus on an inherent 'socially-shared' ideology that informs the professional identity of journalists, located within overt and covert discourses (Van Dijk 1998a, 26). Analysing the implicit as well as the explicit

identifications of belonging reinforces the way journalism, through texts, divides those who are spoken to or spoken about as out-group, and those with the authority to convey information as in-group.

Bourdieu's Habitus

This paper utilises the qualitative methodology of discourse analysis, and addresses the power dynamics encoded within news texts. Philosophically, this develops from Bourdieu (1990, 1991) who sees discourse and language as emerging from a socialised space, *habitus*. As such, texts can be interpreted as discourses amid an array of contested and competing claims and power dynamics. While this approach allows texts to be viewed as originating from socialised spheres, it does not purport to subsume individual voices into a monolith. Rather, analysis as engaged with in this study approaches texts as emerging from socialised spaces and their respective identities, through which group and identity contestations can be better understood.
    Fairclough (1995) and Fowler (1991) underscore these dynamics through analysis of word choices as decisions that represent the ways language construction in media involves choices from an array of other possible choices and constructions. Bourdieu's concept of *habitus* provides an underpinning for analysis of texts as media-to-media discourses, originating from and existing within social and power structures of journalism's profession, and analysed for their implications on and reflections of that space. Bearing this in mind aids in addressing the questions:

> *RQ1: How does language within journalistic news texts reinforce journalistic belonging when directed towards other members of the journalistic in-group?*

And:

> *RQ2: How does language within journalistic news texts reinforce journalistic belonging when directed towards members of the journalistic out-group who claim to belong?*

Methodology

This research studies *The Guardian's* coverage of its phone-hacking investigation and exposé in July 2009, and texts were selected from the coverage during the first days of the expose. This resulted in analysis of 34 articles, commentaries, and editorials from 8-10 July 2009. With regards to WikiLeaks, texts were selected from the initial coverage of its coordinated publication with WikiLeaks beginning 26 July 2010. It then proceeds to explore a structured sample of coverage of WikiLeaks ranging from the April 2010 release of 'Collateral Murder' (preceding the coordinated publishing) to the Autumn 2011 release by WikiLeaks of its full trove of diplomatic communiqués un-redacted. This second phase incorporates a preliminary analysis of 1,444 Guardian texts that mention WikiLeaks between April 2010 and November 2011, and a thorough analysis of 288 articles. The sub-set of 288 was chosen after dividing the corpus into sets of ten articles, and analysing every fifth set.
    Rather than seeking articles that only react negatively, Potter's (2000) call for deviant case analysis was adhered to, and both typical and atypical mentions of WikiLeaks were analysed to:

[I]dentify significant debates, controversies, and silences, and possibly suggest specifications and amendments to initial research goals and questions. (Carvalho 2008, 166)

In conducting this initial reading of the overall corpus with flexibility towards the research approach and questions, patterns and outliers of in-group/out-group professional identity general frames within which specific discourses take place are identified (de Vreese 2005). From there, a closer analysis of grammatical, syntactical, and associated elements was endeavoured. The framework being applied incorporates the Textual and Contextual analysis outlined in Carvalho (2008) as well as elements of discourse analysis in Van Dijk (1988, 1998a, 1998b), Fairclough (1992, 1995, 2003), Fowler (1991), and Hodge and Kress (1993).

Discursive arenas and themes

This study approaches news discourse as providing elements of 'showing' and 'calling attention to', rather than 'telling' or discerning motivations (Carvalho 2008, 169). Instead, Textual Analysis, and Contextual Analysis allow for comparison of texts at a moment through analysing initial coverage, and over time, allowing for cross-comparison and tempered findings to analyse the differences in process and dynamics between boundary maintenance and Interloper Media reactions.

Subsets of discourse addressed in this paper include: Personalisation; Active/Passive Language, including nominalisation and agency; Proximity/Distance language; Presence of identity belonging; Presence of self-referencing; and Immediacy. Within these categorisations, identification of the way "ideologies typically organise people and society in polarized terms" (Van Dijk 1998a, 43) are explored. Key elements of 'Us v. Them' dynamics appear through: Specification, Generalisation, Example, or Contrast that "cognitively and discursively […] may be realised by various forms of polarisation (ibid, 48-49). These incorporate elements of modality, hedging and vagueness, and elements of strength and weakness (ibid, 52-53).

Under personalisation, the presence or absence of personal identifiers creates a more pronounced 'Us v. Them' polarisation. When framed in positive language, personalisation can indicate a closeness and recognition of belonging, while in negative language it distinguishes between 'good' and 'bad' media. Analysing use of active and passive language, including the nominalisation of certain activity and the foregrounding or backgrounding of agency, incorporates analysis of rhetorical language. Active language carrying a negative tone demonises and distances individuals; creating a focus of the distancing language and cementing otherwise abstract boundaries. At the same time, passive language, including nominalised verbs and low agency qualifiers, restricts the role of the spoken-about media. These elements inform the "constitution of identity of the subject through discourse" (Carvalho 2008, 170) and can be used to give the actors particular power, or inversely deny power.

Proximity refers directly to the in-group/out-group dynamics under study here. Distancing language referring to members of the in-group relates to the inward

processes of boundary maintenance within journalism. These devices identify both the speaking media and the subject through discourses of legitimization. Distancing language referring to the out-group reinforces standards of belonging to the in-group, and reinforcing the power and primacy of journalism's self-declared societal role and information primacy. The presence of familiar labels and a shared lexicon of belonging to the profession bestow an understanding of the accepted 'in-group', their absence indicating a rebuffing of Interloper Media claims. With regard to boundary maintenance, this can include referring to offending members of the media using typical and classical labels: Journalist, editor, publisher, etc. With regards to Interloper Media the absence of these labels and the use of vague or functional labels such as 'website', distances the Interloper Media as a passive source, conduit, or a non-transactive participant (Hodge and Kress 1993).

Findings and Analysis: Boundary Maintenance

RQ1: How does the language within journalistic news texts reinforce journalistic belonging when directed towards other members of the journalistic in-group?

Across articles referring to phone hacking, there are clear and archetypal elements of journalistic boundary maintenance. Under classical boundary maintenance frameworks, news texts first isolate and identify the offending journalism as failing to uphold the standards of belonging in clear and unequivocal language. Second, texts refresh and repair perceptions of journalism by promoting positive aspects of the speaking media's professionalism.

The Guardian's package fires its opening salvo in headlines across coverage, using the lead-ins of: "Tabloid hacking scandal" in eight articles and "Tabloid dirty tricks in six. Outside these lead-ins, the term "dirty tricks" is repeated in three additional headlines, including:

Revealed: Murdoch's £1m for hiding **dirty tricks**: Tory PR chief under fire over tabloid hacking: Politicians and celebrities among victims (*The Guardian*, July 9, 2009)

And:

Three inquiries launched into hacking claims as new victims emerge: MPs summon Murdoch chief over **dirty tricks**: Targeted public figures consider suing tabloid: Scotland Yard refuses to reopen tapping probe (*The Guardian*, July 10, 2009)

As headlines set the preferred reading for the text, these elements are key. In particular, use of the term 'tabloid', as opposed to 'newspaper', casts a negative pall over the subsequent text. Four headlines use the terms 'victims' and 'hacks', including: "Time to rein in Murdoch's hacks", and 'spies' as in: "Press and privacy: Secrecy spies", which enhance the polarised dynamics of wrongdoing.

Personalisation

Personalised references are mostly restricted – though not entirely – to negative mentions of *The News of the World* and News International, and to individuals involved in hacking. Fewer texts refer to *The Guardian* explicitly. Rather, references to *The Guardian* are made implicitly in headlines and texts such as: "Revealed: Murdoch's £1m bill for hiding dirty tricks" (*The Guardian*, July 9, 2009), which foregrounds *The Guardian* as "revealing", without specifically naming it.

Towards Murdoch, personalisation is negative, apparent, and explicit, and such headlines perform dually. Primarily, they foreground emphasis on Rupert Murdoch as individually tied to the phone hacking. Additionally, use of "hiding dirty tricks" attributes further negative, transactive, agency to Murdoch. Finally, this unequivocal personalisation is inversely related to the *Guardian's* positive journalistic role in: "revealed". In twelve separate articles individuals from News International are specifically named in headlines, further emboldening aspects of negative personalisation and boundary maintenance.

Commentaries and diaries can pose challenges for analysis as evaluations within them are perceived as subjective opinion, and must incorporate consideration of the tongue-in-cheek approach they sometimes take. In one such diary, *The News of The World's* "detachment" is used ironically, incorporating personalisation:

> "Police probe Murdoch paper hacking claims" it says. Further down the page, an ad. "We'll buy your old mobile phone for cash." Just don't erase the messages. (*The Guardian*, July 10, 2009)

Nonetheless, the discourses of difference contained within commentaries provide and complement other discourses of difference and derision. Straight news examples are not as problematic, though the use of personalisation is no lesser, as in this excerpt:

> In 2007 a *News of the World* reporter, Clive Goodman, was jailed for illegally hacking into the mobile phones of three members of staff in the royal households. (*The Guardian*, July 10, 2009)

As with many of the texts, there are several elements under study utilised here: personalisation, in the naming of Goodman; in-group referencing, in referring to him as a "reporter"; distancing, in qualifying his "hacking" as "illegal"; and negative active agency, in "illegally hacking ". In the full range of references, the contextualisation within articles provides essential elements for outlining boundary maintenance. References to Andy Coulson, Rebekah Brooks, and Les Hinton – all current or former News International and *News of The World* executives at the time of the report – are frequent, but the most explicitly and frequently personalised is Murdoch, cast as the figurehead behind the scandal, with "tentacles" across British society (*The Guardian*, July 9, 2009).

Proximity/Distancing language

As with the contrast of "revealed" and "hiding", mentions of Murdoch further create a singular focus for the isolating role of boundary maintenance discourses.

Replicating what Bicket and Wall (2007) refer to as "circling the wagons," these dynamics identify and isolate a villain by amplifying a sense of a 'rogue operator' acting against professional standards. While distancing, these texts still employ a familiar lexicon, using journalistic identifiers such as "reporter". Further evidence of boundary maintenance is found in the description of "systematic corporate illegality by News International", and through use of terms such as "accomplice" and "tactics" to describe phone hacking.

Clearly negative and isolating, juxtaposing negative descriptors with the in-group lexicon of journalistic identifiers provides distance in terms of positive/negative descriptions of hacking, but do so within the profession. These texts refer not only to the actors in terms of a journalistic identity, but also reference standards and values, particularly public interest. The phrase "public interest" is repeatedly cited as the rationale given for hacking in five separate articles, though it is diminished as a false claim: "Specifically, there is no public interest defence for anybody caught breaking RIPA" (*The Guardian,* July 9, 2009). This repeated use of a familiar lexicon of belonging to the profession, at once familiar and accepted within the in-group of journalism, resonates with the self-policing and inward-looking dynamic of boundary maintenance.

Active/Passive language: Nominalisation and agency

The role of active and passive language operates in a fashion similar to personalisation. Active negative language allows the speaking media to identify and isolate offending members of the in-group, while ascribing agency to its actions. In a particularly resonant example, the use of quotes from hacking victims who refer to the journalists at *News of The World* as 'paparazzi', closely mirrors Bishop's (1999) work in both its functional and its thematic substance. Quoting:

> "It's one thing to see paparazzi at the Ivy. But I was finding them at Pizza Hut. There they were, even if it [the visit] had been arranged at the last minute." (*The Guardian*, July 10, 2009)

These activities are elaborated on to refer to information "obtained illicitly" and in explaining how "some of the same newspapers have systematically pried into the lives of people in rather repellent ways" (*The Guardian*, July 9, 2009). By using: "obtained illicitly", and "systematically pried into", the activities of those implicated in phone hacking are framed as active, transactive, and committed by individuals who can be isolated. This reflects attributes of Murdoch's "hiding" analysed above.

Conclusive boundary maintenance

The Guardian's coverage of the phone-hacking scandal typifies the elements of boundary maintenance laid out in Bishop (1999), Cecil (2002), and Bicket and Wall (2007). Through pronounced 'to be seen' discourses, texts clarify good journalism, up-fronting *The Guardian's* revelations, and admonish failed journalism, foregrounding News International's "systematic corporate illegality". From the first article referring to phone hacking, texts immediately delineate between those

maintaining the standards of the in-group, and those who have fallen out of favour. In consistently and immediately referring to those involved as journalists, reporters, and editors, and in naming them, the coverage draws clear distinctions between members of the profession in good standing, and those 'tabloidised' members who ignore these values. These discourses identify, isolate, and differentiate between those who maintain, and those who fail to maintain in-group standards, maintaining the professional boundaries through foregrounded aspects and definitions of journalism's identity.

Findings and Analysis: Interloper Media Reactions

> *RQ2: How does the language of journalistic news text reinforce journalistic belonging when directed towards members of the journalistic out-group who claim to be 'journalism'?*

Across references to WikiLeaks, language distinguishes WikiLeaks as an enigmatic and undefined facet of the overall story, and *The Guardian* as a responsible patron of information. However, these distinctions occur more subtly than the distinctions drawn regarding phone hacking. *The Guardian's* distinctions of belonging tie to standards of journalism's in-group, and through subtle language enforce and reinforce in-group primacy and belonging to the profession of journalism. These unfold across a longer trajectory, but nevertheless distinguish WikiLeaks' out-group status as such. While individual texts provide indications of these distinctions, cumulatively they make distinctions between the in-group and out-group stark.

Personalisation

In the days that followed the 25 July 2010 coordinated publication of the Afghan War Logs between WikiLeaks and *The Guardian*, there is a dearth of specific references to WikiLeaks or Assange.[3] As WikiLeaks was – ostensibly – a prime driver of the activity, this was an unexpected finding. It also serves as one of the indicators that a subsequent phase of analysis was necessary to understand differences between interloper media reactions and boundary maintenance.

In the initial set, only one headline refers to Assange: "The war logs: The leak: An individual, uncompromising rebel – with a website to match: Profile Julian Assange" (*The Guardian*, July 23, 2010), and none refer to WikiLeaks explicitly. Compare this to the exploration of phone hacking, where 12 headlines specifically name individuals tied to hacking, and the lack of personalisation is evident. This seems to indicate distancing between *The Guardian* and WikiLeaks. Emphasising the information within the leak, rather than Assange's or WikiLeaks' role in the publishing efforts, further distinguishes between the in-group and the out-group.

Passive/Active language: Nominalisation and agency

In instances, the strength of agency and activity varies from paragraph to paragraph, but primarily texts refer to WikiLeaks passively, and to leaked information as a mere product of WikiLeaks' technological purpose and conduit function. In the initial

analysis, there are no instances where Assange or WikiLeaks are described as within journalism's in-group, though they have long expressed that identity. Coverage of Assange in *The Guardian* prior to this foray describes him as a co-founder of WikiLeaks in an article that describes WikiLeaks as a 'site' (*The Guardian*, July 9, 2009), but never as a journalist or editor-in-chief or WikiLeaks as journalism.

Within texts, references that specifically identify WikiLeaks are also low, and regardless of article length, the majority of specific references only occur once or twice. In a few articles WikiLeaks is mentioned prominently – in the lede or headline – but more often than not it is referenced late in the article, and in a limited functional role as a "mechanism" that transmitted the leaks, or as a non-transactive descriptor – "The WikiLeaks disclosure". This bears out in more pronounced ways in later texts analysed below. In other instances, the role is more explicit and active, saying WikiLeaks "obtained" the documents. This ascribes active agency and responsibility to WikiLeaks and to Assange, though this use of agency vacillates. Still, between July and December 2010, increasingly negative, passive, non-transactive language emphasises distance and isolation from the in-group and journalistic roles.

Proximity and Distance

Developing on personalisation dynamics, there are explicit and clear examples of language minimising and lessening Assange's and WikiLeaks' role. Most explicitly language reading: "WikiLeaks was not involved in the preparation of the *Guardian's* articles" (*The Guardian,* July 26, 2010) wholly distances WikiLeaks from *The Guardian*. References highlight the cautious nature of the reporting to eliminate anything that could cause harm to informants, and stronger yet, saying: "the three [newspapers] have published excerpts from the documents which do not pose a risk to informants or military operations" (*The Guardian,* July 27, 2010).

In one article, a later (updated) version includes a statement by Assange where he takes credit for implementing "harm minimisation" policies, re-emphasising the contestation over journalistic identity, social responsibility, and the questions over these dynamics within these endeavours. Further, texts consistently highlight *The Guardian's* expertise and analysis of the raw documents. In these instances, the in-group's value-adding and analysis roles are emphasised as a differentiating feature between journalism and WikiLeaks.

The impact and role of WikiLeaks and Assange is lessened, and even condemned, in several opinion pieces which use descriptors including: "hubristic", and "treasonable", and delegitimising WikiLeaks' and Assange's statements as "suggestions" and "claims". While these instances – written in columns and letters – cannot be strongly associated with *The Guardian*, they cannot be entirely disconnected either as they represent editorial selections and reflect a recognition that *The Guardian's* audience could be receptive to them (Tuchman 1978). These dynamics further foreground the positive attributes of *The Guardian's* role, and backgrounds WikiLeaks and Assange.

Positive Self-References

While WikiLeaks is often presented in either a pure-neutral or negative light, when it comes to foregrounding the role of *The Guardian*, the language is dramatically positive. As with the coverage of phone hacking, and the most potent statements against WikiLeaks, specific laudatory language is mostly restrained to comments made by non-members of *The Guardian* in letters and columns. Equally, the strongest condemnations - mostly emphasising a risk to security of troops and inciting further violence, and one referring to the documents as a weapon for terrorists – are made by non-employees of *The Guardian*.

Subsequent analysis

Following the above analysis of the initial coverage of WikiLeaks, articles extending through 2011 were analysed to allow for more robust analysis of the initial trends. As coverage shifted from stories tied to additional leaks, and then to Assange's legal issues with Sweden, and to the spectre of extradition to the U.S., his claims of belonging to the in-group of journalism are more acutely discussed:

> One argument that Assange and WikiLeaks could make is that it is a news organisation, **as it describes itself on its website**, and should be protected from prosecution under the freedom of the press. It could be argued that if Assange were to be prosecuted, why not the *New York Times* and the *Guardian*? (*The Guardian,* December 17, 2010, emphasis added)

Assange's claim is minimised through qualifying it as self-described. The article further refutes the claim through this quote:

> Rosenzweig agreed: "Newspapers like *the Guardian* **add analysis and value to the enterprise**. WikiLeaks is **just a compiler or a means of distribution**. As for Assange's character, he seems likely not to be well received by an American jury if he ever goes in front of one." (ibid.)

As the references become more explicitly distancing in straight news, mentions of WikiLeaks become less and less personalised, and more and more nominalised. In an article on 25 April 2011, WikiLeaks is not mentioned until the 17th of 19 paragraphs. In later instances, positive references to *The Guardian* and its reporters are foregrounded and WikiLeaks' role is minimised, or absent: "A *Guardian* team has been spending months combing through the data", and: "As on previous occasions, the *Guardian* is removing information likely to cause reprisals against vulnerable individuals" (*The Guardian,* November 29, 2010); and, in a second article that day: "With the leaking to the *Guardian*"; "The *Guardian* can disclose"; and, "obtained by WikiLeaks". These three quotes distinguish responsibility, with WikiLeaks in a transactive role, delivering information to *The Guardian.*
Describing the leaks as information that "came into the hands of a *Guardian* reporter", removing any journalistic role or agency on WikiLeaks or Assange's part, the same article refers to Assange's "circle" as "freedom of information activists" and labels Assange a "former hacker", a label he bristles at (Assange 2011). These examples cast *The Guardian* in a responsible frame of professional journalism, while

placing the burden of obtaining classified documents, with all its legal implications, on the 'hacktivist' WikiLeaks (Lindgren and Lundstrom, 2011). This dichotomy is emphasised again in an article exploring WikiLeaks' activities in Russia and Belarus, where its identity as a "left-wing enterprise" and Assange as "buccaneering fighter for free speech" is challenged. This and similar articles emphasise the divisions between responsible members of journalism's in-group, and rogue activists as the out-group, are made salient (*The Guardian*, January 2, 2011).

As the coverage moves into 2011, WikiLeaks is increasingly described in a purely functional, and often-nominalised, role of hosting or fronting a website, or as a convenient source of colour in coverage of the royal wedding: "WikiLeaks revealed that a US diplomat described him [Prince Andrew] as cocky and rude" (*The Guardian*, March 6, 2011). In later texts, WikiLeaks is used as a punch line, a joke, or a point of contrast justifying the running of a column: "A column devoted to giving readers an opportunity to talk about why they like the paper is not the same as WikiLeaks" (*The Guardian,* March 28, 2011). In this way WikiLeaks role is de-emphasised and limited to being a passive intermediary (Van Dijk 1998b, 32-33).

In exploring deviant cases, there is one notable example, a straight-news article by two *Guardian* reporters (December 10, 2010) where Assange is described as editor-in-chief in the opening line, and later referred to as "the most famous inmate in the Victorian jail." This language is not only supportive in positioning and rhetoric, but uses Assange's self-title. In every sense this example is isolated among the analysed texts, though it may indicate a more uncertain, contested, or at least ill-defined guide towards describing WikiLeaks. However, across the 288 articles reviewed in the second set, this is the most explicit instance of a news text, written by members of the in-group, describing WikiLeaks with in-group identifiers.

As a point of comparison, one column mocks these same identifiers in a 'nomination' for Editor of the year:

> Julian Assange, of WikiLeaks, more for emptying a sackload of secrets than for editing anything – but still contriving to seduce at least three women a week. (*The Guardian,* January 2, 2011)

While language a year on emphasising the in-group/out-group distinction is broadly consistent with prior analysis, it comes across most strongly in September and October 2011, when articles and commentaries present an unequivocal condemnation of WikiLeaks publishing of un-redacted cables, citing journalism's public-interest standard:

> Some WikiLeaks devotees and extreme freedom of information advocates will applaud this act. We don't. We join the *New York Times, Der Spiegel, Le Monde,* and *El Pais* in condemning it[….] The public interest in all acts of disclosure has to be weighed against the potential harm that can result. (*The Guardian,* September 3, 2011)

On the same day, the headline: "I support the principles, not the methods"[4], draws an unequivocally distinct line between the in-group and out-group, demonstrated again on 26 October 2011 in a column describing Assange as "desperate". These

come at the tail of the analysis, and finalise the trajectory of distancing WikiLeaks as an out-group member, separate and distinct from the in-group criteria of belonging to the profession of journalism.

Conclusion: Differentiating Interloper Media Reactions and Boundary Maintenance

The range of analysis here demonstrates the differences in discourses of distance employed in boundary maintenance processes between members within journalism's in-group when compared to reactions to Interlopers and the discourses used to maintain in-group/out-group dynamics.

These findings allow for understanding journalistic boundary maintenance as developing along a certain set of criteria that differ from the ways texts surrounding WikiLeaks enforce professional in-group/out-group dynamics. These distinctions occur in terms of both the immediacy with which boundary maintenance occurs, and regarding the explicitness of the processes. Whether by design or default, the speed with which distinctions between 'good' and 'bad' journalism and journalistic belonging are drawn provides a point of comparison with Interloper Media reactions. While both employ identity-imbued language, distancing occurs with different speed, pace, and strength in each case. Those differences can be put in this way:

> ***Boundary Maintenance:*** *Active + negative language (through agency/nominalisation) + high personalisation + distancing (low relation + presence of in-group referencing) + high positive self references + immediacy*

> ***Interloper Media Reaction:*** *(Negative passive language + negative/neutral nominalisation) + (low immediate personalisation + high eventual personalisation) + low proximity + high presence of in-group/out-group references + high positive self references + long trajectory*

This analysis indicates a need for alternative approaches and theoretical understandings of media-to-media discourses of belonging and exclusion, of self-policing, and of professional defence. The differences between discursive responses to differing threats support the need for a framework of Interloper Media reactions on two points: First, The analysis of WikiLeaks and the broader references to WikiLeaks by and large show that even absent overt signifiers of a discourse of journalism's professionalism, journalistic in-group belonging is expressed in news texts. Second, addressing emerging entities that challenge traditional understandings of journalistic primacy requires a flexible, long-term, and nuanced analysis when compared to boundary maintenance.

What is evident from this paper and the larger research associated with it is the language and the directness with which traditional texts refer to failures in their accepted in-group differs from the language and the directness with which they deal with problematic interlopers. While boundary maintenance does well as a theory for analysing and explaining occasional and episodic failures of the criteria for belonging to the in-group of journalism, it is ultimately inward looking. In terms of rebutting claims of belonging, boundary maintenance is ill suited to explore reactions to

interlopers. In these instances, the slower pace and nuanced rebuke contrasts with processes of boundary maintenance, employed rapidly and overtly to counteract failings of the professional in-group.

This separates theories of boundary maintenance from interloper media reactions; the latter process being more protracted, more covert, and subtler, and in its cumulative effect enforcing a sense of 'being' journalism. While the interloper media out-groups offer demonstrable value – privy information – their enigmatic missions and purposes and interpretations of being journalism pose a challenge to the in-group. The findings of this study support the initial approach and call for a more nuanced theoretical framework to analyse the relationship between traditional journalism and emerging entities such as WikiLeaks properly – an approach that has been developed here as Interloper Media Reaction Theory.

Notes

1. This paper, and the research within it, develop out of a much larger PhD study exploring elements of journalism's identity and ideology in reaction to WikiLeaks.

2. Both Benkler, and Pilger cited elsewhere in this paper, are listed as WikiLeaks supporters on the WikiLeaks.org website.

3. While there has been a well-documented falling out between WikiLeaks, Assange, and The Guardian and New York Times (cf. the 2011 Channel 4 documentary 'WikiLeaks: Secrets and Lies), by most accounts there was no such falling out leading up to the launch of the Afghan War Logs. Instead, the relationships devolved over the course of subsequent publications, with Assange objecting to coverage in the *Times* and *Guardian*, and differing views as to who was responsible for releasing files unredacted.

4. Written by Guardian reporter and ex-WikiLeaks member James Ball.

References

Aldridge, Meryl, and Julia Evetts. 2003. "Rethinking the Concept of Professionalism: The Case of Journalism." *British Journal of Sociology* 54 (4): 547-564.

Assange, Julian. 2011. *Julian Assange: The Unauthorised Autobiography*. Edinburgh: Canongate.

Baack, Stefan. 2011. "A New Style of News Reporting: Wikileaks and Data-Driven Journalism." *Cyborg Subjects: Discourses on Digital Culture* 1.

Beckett, Charlie, and James Ball. 2012. *Wikileaks: News in the Networked Era*. Cambridge: Polity.

Bell, Allan. 1991. *The Language of News Media*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Benkler, Yochai. 2011. "A Free Irresponsible Press: Wikileaks and the Battle over the Soul of the Networked Fourth Estate." *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review* 46: 311-397.

Berkowitz, Dan. 2000. "Doing Double Duty: Paradigm Repair and the Princess Diana What-a-Story." *Journalism* 1 (2): 125-143.

Bicket, Douglas, and Melissa Wall. 2007. "Circling the Wagons: Containing the Downing Street Memo Story's Impact in America." *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 31 (3): 206-221.

Bishop, Ronald. 2004. "The Accidental Journalist: Shifting Professional Boundaries in the Wake of Leonardo Dicaprio's Interview with Former President Clinton." *Journalism Studies* 5 (1): 31-43.

Bishop, Ronald. 1999. "From Behind the Walls: Boundary Work by News Organizations in Their Coverage of Princess Diana's Death." *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 23 91): 90-112.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990. *In Other Words: Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language of Symbolic Power*. Edited by John B. Thompson Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Carvalho, Anabela. 2008. "Media(Ted) Discourse and Society." *Journalism Studies* 9 (2): 161-177.

Cecil, Matthew. 2002. "Bad Apples: Paradigm Overhaul and the CNN/Time "Tailwind" Story." *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 26, (1): 46-58.

Coddington, Mark. 2012. "Defending a Paradigm by Patrolling a Boundary: Two Global Newspapers' Approach to Wikileaks." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 89 (3): 377-396.

de Vreese, Claes H. 2005. "News Framing: Theory and Typology." *Information Design Journal + Document Design* 13 (1): 51-62.

Deuze, Mark. 2005. "What Is Journalism? Professional Identity and Ideology of Journalists Reconsidered." *Journalism* 6, (4): 442-464.

Donsbach, Wolfgang. 2010. "Journalists and Their Professional Identities." In *The Routledge Companion to News and Journalism*, edited by Stuart Allan. 38-59. Oxon: Routledge.

Fairclough, Norman. 2003. *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, Norman. 1992. "Discourse and Text: Linguistic and Intertextual Analysis within Discourse Analysis." *Discourse & Society* 3 (2): 193-217.

Fairclough, Norman. 1995. *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.

Fowler, Roger. 1991. *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London: Routledge.

Hanitzsch, Thomas. 2011. "Populist Disseminators, Detached Watchdogs, Critical Change Agents and Opportunist Facilitators. Professional Milieus, the Journalistic Field and Autonomy in 18 Countries." *International Communication Gazette* 73 (6): 477-494.

Hodge, Bob, and Gunther Kress. 1993. *Language as Ideology*. London: Routledge.

Hopkins, Huw L. 2012. "'Nobody likes a rotten apple, but someone picks them': A Hackgate timeline. In *The Phone Hacking Scandal: Journalism on Trial,* edited by Richard L. Keeble and John Mair, 9-15. London: Abramis

Keeble, Richard L. 2012. "Guardian angels? How Hackgate places the Mainstream under the Microscope." In *The Phone Hacking Scandal: Journalism on Trial,* edited by Richard L. Keeble and John Mair, 125-128. London: Abramis.

Keeble, Richard L., and John Mair. 2012. *The Phone Hacking Scandal: Journalism on Trial*. London: Abramis.

Lindgren, Simon, and Ragnar Lundström. 2011. "Pirate Culture and Hacktivist Mobilization: The Cultural and Social Protocols of #Wikileaks on Twitter." *New Media & Society* 13 (6): 999-1018.

McBride, Kelly. 2011. "What is WikiLeaks? That's the Wrong Question." In *Page One: Inside The New York Times and the Future of Journalism,* edited by David Folkenflik, 35-45*.* New York: Public Affairs.

Saki (Munro, H. H.). 1930. "The Interlopers". In *The Short Stories of Saki (H. H. Munro)*. London: Bodley Head.

Örnebring, Henrik. 2010. "Reassessing Journalism as a Profession." In *The Routledge Companion to News and Journalism*, edited by Stuart Allan. Oxon: Routledge.

Örnebring, Henrik. 2009. "The Two Professionalisms of Journalism: Working Paper." *Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, Oxford University*.

Peters, Jonathan. 2011. "Wikileaks Would Not Qualify to Claim Federal Reporter's Privilege in Any Form." *Federal Communications Law Journal* 63 (3): 667-95.

Pilger, John. 2013. "WikiLeaks is a rare truth-teller. Smearing Julian Assange is shameful." *The New Statesmen,* February 14. http://www.newstatesman.com/2013/02/wikileaks-rare-truth-teller-smearing-julian-assange-shameful.

Potter, Philip B.K. 2000. "Discourse Analysis." In *Handbook of Data Analysis*, edited by Melissa A. Hardy and Alan Bryman. 607-24. London: Sage.

Rusbridger, Alan. 2012. "Hackgate 'Reveals failure of Normal Checks and Balances to Hold Power to Account'. In *The Phone Hacking Scandal: Journalism on Trial,* edited by Richard L. Keeble and John Mair, 129-1144. London: Abramis

Schudson, Michael. 1995. *The Power of News*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Thomaß, Barbara. 2011. "Wikileaks and the Question of Responsibility within a Global Democracy." *European View* 10 (1): 17-23.

Tuchman, Gaye. 1978. "Professionalism as an Agent of Legitimation." *Journal of Communication* 28 (2): 106-13.

Van Dijk, Teun A. 1998a *Ideology and Discourse: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. London: Sage.

Van Dijk, Teun A. 1988b. *News as Discourse*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Hove and London.

Van Dijk, Teun A. 1998. "Opinions and Ideologies in the Press." In *Approaches to Media Discourse*, edited by Allan Bell and Peter Garrett. 21-63. Oxford: Blackwell.

Waisbord, Silvio. 2012. Reinventing Professionalism: Journalism and News in Global Perspective. Cambridge: Polity.

WikiLeaks. 2011."Press." Accessed at: http://wikileaks.org/Press.html.

Author Details:

Contact details:
Scott A. Eldridge II
Department of Journalism Studies
The University of Sheffield
18-22 Regent Street
Sheffield S1 3NJ
United Kingdom
email: s.eldridge@sheffield.ac.uk

Bio-Blurb:

Scott is a PhD candidate in Journalism Studies at The University of Sheffield. His research evaluates the reactions of traditional journalism to the rise of WikiLeaks, analysing overt and covert discourses of professional identity, boundaries, and concepts of belonging and confrontation. He is a doctoral research assistant on an AHRC/NWO-funded project with the universities of Sheffield and Groningen exploring role perceptions of journalism, and is Book Reviews Editor for the journal: *Digital Journalism.*