



Deposited via The University of Leeds.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/146980/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Book Section:**

Anderson, C and Schudson, M (2019) Objectivity, Professionalism, and Truth Seeking. In: Wahl-Jorgensen, K and Hanzitsch, T, (eds.) The Routledge Handbook of Journalism Studies (2nd ed). ICA Handbook Series. Routledge, Oxon. ISBN: 9781138052888.

---

© 2020 Taylor & Francis. This is an author accepted version of a chapter published in The Handbook of Journalism Studies. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

**Reuse**

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

**Takedown**

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

8-15-17

## OBJECTIVITY, PROFESSIONALISM, AND TRUTH SEEKING IN JOURNALISM

*C.W. Anderson and Michael Schudson*

In the past decade and a half, there has been a gradual rapprochement between the field of journalism studies and the subfield of sociology that examines professionalization and professional systems-- the sociology of the professions. It seems clear to us that the crisis in journalistic business models and occupational status has had much to do with this shift— for several decades prior to this, it would be fair to say that these two field have coexisted in a state of mutual indifference. And even today, few of the classic studies in the sociology of professions hazard even a guess as to journalism's professional status, preferring for the most part to focus on the traditional professions of medicine and law (see, for example, Bledstein, 1976; Dingwall, 1983; Friedson, 1970; Haskell, 1984). At a time when many of the most important scholarly questions about journalism revolve around issues of the occupation's power, authority, and professional status, there is still much to be gained from revisiting questions of journalism and professionalization from an explicitly sociological angle-- articulating a deeper understanding of journalism's troubled professional project, the relationship between the objectivity norm and that project, and the manner in which journalists attempt to forge a journalistic jurisdiction out of the link between their everyday work and their heavily qualified claim to possess a form of professionalized knowledge.

To draw these journalistic and sociological perspectives on professionalization into dialog, we begin this chapter with a brief overview of some of the current issues faced by boundary drawing journalists and the scholars who study them, including the status of fact-checkers, the current state of citizen journalism, the discussions around discursive constructions

8-15-17

of journalistic authority, and debates over fake news and post truth. This overview—which can do little more than touch on some of the most pressing developments in the field—is followed by a discussion of Weberian studies of the professions, carried out in the late 1970's and 1980's, including a discussion of Abbott's (1988) influential analysis of “professional jurisdiction.” We then examine the two major strands of scholarship that have emerged within the field of journalism studies. The first strand, coming from scholars working in journalism schools (for example, Weaver 2007), tends not to worry about whether journalism produces authoritative knowledge or possesses professional traits; for researchers in this line of work, the importance of journalism is self-evident and not dependent on its status in a hierarchy of occupations. It emphasizes measuring the degree to which journalism has achieved professional status, often through occupational surveys that ask journalists about their education levels or self-perception of professional norms . A second strand of work comes from the sociology of news organizations (Fishman, 1980; Gans, 2004; Schudson, 1978; Tuchman, 1978) and media studies (Zelizer, 1992) and focuses on the character of journalistic knowledge or claims to knowledge and thus probes the standing of journalism's “cultural authority,” to borrow Paul Starr's (1984) term. While the first strand suffers from its (probably unconscious) adoption of the “trait perspective” on the professions, the second strand confuses journalistic objectivity with journalistic professionalism per se. As Hallin and Mancini's (2004) work demonstrates, objectivity is not the definitive professional norm in many non-American media systems where professionalism, nonetheless, exists.

In our conclusion, we advance the argument that a productive mode of analysis of journalistic objectivity, professionalism, and truth seeking would continue to build on the best work of the two strands noted above while adopting a modified version of Abbott's (1988)

8-15-17

framework. For Abbott, the study of the professions begins with the study of professional work, and “the central phenomenon of professional life is thus the link between a profession and its work” that Abbott calls “jurisdiction.” Jurisdiction refers to the day-to-day manner in which a profession both concretizes and displays its base of “abstract knowledge” or, in the peculiar case of journalism, knowledge real and expert but by no means abstract. We seek to integrate Abbott's analysis with the two streams of research mentioned above, apply it to current controversies surrounding journalistic professionalism, and outline an agenda for future research.

## **LATEST DEVELOPMENTS**

There has probably been no greater field of struggle in the world of journalism than the struggle over the very terms of discourse that define this chapter. We might say that questions of journalistic professionalism are themselves tied into questions of what it means to be an objective journalist, which itself is related to an even more fundamental question about what it means to seek journalistic truth. Over the past decade since the first edition of this book has been published, scholars of fact-checking (Graves 2016; Graves et al 2016) have probed questions of what it means to claim to judge the truth claims of political actors. Other theorists (Carlson and Lewis 2015, Reich 2012, and Anderson 2018) have looked at the ways that journalists themselves create professional boundaries between journalists and non-journalists out of rhetoric, or material objects, or a combination of both. A third group of scholars is using public debates about the status of so-called “fake news” and “post- truth” to look at what it means to be an objective reporter of the news, and how objectivity can meaningfully correspond to external reality (Wardle and Derakhshan 2017).

8-15-17

In research on fact-checking, scholars have discussed not only the manner by which fact-checkers may or may not actually change citizen's opinions (Graves et. al. 2016) but also the more interesting manner by which fact-checkers are themselves enrolled in political debates about the nature of truth (Graves 2016). Fact-checkers, Graves contends, attempt to de-politicize the nature of facts but often find themselves subject to increasing partisan political pressures. One way to analyze the process Graves points to, but on a more generalizable scale is to turn to the work of scholars of journalistic boundary work, which explores how questions of "who is a journalist" relate to questions of journalistic truth. We think it is fair to say that this varied work (Carlson and Lewis [2015], Reich [2012]) represents some of the most generative research in journalism studies since the last edition of this book. In effect, these scholars argue that journalists construct discursive boundaries between themselves and non-journalists. Two interesting offshoots of this research strand complicate this narrative: Carlson (2017) makes it clear that journalistic authority depends on a process of mutual co-construction between journalists and audiences, and Anderson (2013) notes that journalistic boundaries are erected not simply out of words but out of material infrastructures as well.

While earlier scholarship in concerned itself with questions of citizen media and "who counts" as a journalist in the digital age, recent work has been more interested in debates over fake news and whether or not we are living in a post truth era. It is our contention here that much of this work is rather presentist and concerned with issues of immediate importance such as the 2016 US Presidential election. We are not convinced, in short, that a real research agenda has emerged out of post-truth debates, though we expect this will no longer be the case by the time this handbook reaches its third edition. For now, Wardle and Derakhshan (2017) is a good

8-15-17

overview of the various issues at play and may point us to some additional important questions to ask in the years ahead.

All of these debates and developments demonstrate that there has been much knowledge gained in the past ten years as various scholars have probed questions of objectivity, journalistic professionalism, and truth seeking. That said, we continue to think a broader framework, grounded in the sociology of the professions is also essential to frame these somewhat scattered advances, and it is to the articulation of that framework that we now turn.

### **FROM OCCUPATIONAL TRAITS TO OCCUPATIONAL STRUGGLE**

The most productive era within the subfield of sociology dedicated to professionalization research begins with the widespread abandonment of the “trait approach” of occupational analysis, an approach that dominated the field for decades and whose more extreme normative tendencies defined a profession as a model of occupational autonomy and self-regulation worthy of imitation (Carr-Saunders & Wilson, 1933, Tawney, 1920). In the 1960s and 1970s sociologists abandoned the trait approach, passing “from the false question ‘Is this occupation a profession’ to the more fundamental one ‘What are the circumstances in which people in an occupation attempt to turn it into a profession and themselves into professional people’” (Hughes, 1963, p. 655). In the half century since Hughes' challenge, the study of the profession as an idealized structural-functionalist category has been replaced in much of sociology by the more Weberian study of professionalization and the “professional project.”

One of the first explicitly Weberian professionalization theorists, Magali Sarfatti Larson, argues in her analysis of the “professional project” that “ideal typical constructions do not tell us

8-15-17

what a profession is, only what it pretends to be.” We should ask instead, she argued, “what professions actually do in everyday life to negotiate or maintain their special position” (1977, p. xii). This Weberian theory of the professional project has remained at the center of the sociology of the professions for the past several decades. The concept represents a fusion of Eliot Freidson’s early, groundbreaking work on the medical field with Weber’s classic analysis of the attempts of occupational groups to link economic class and social status. For Sarfatti Larson, professions are neither naturally existing occupational categories nor the bearers of socially functional “traits”; rather, they are collective social actors who “attempt to translate one order of scarce resources—special knowledge and skills—into another—social and economic rewards.” (p. xiii).

Framed in this manner, certain aspects of the professional project assumed key roles in the Weberian analysis of professional struggle that prevailed in the late 1970's. These aspects included: a profession’s attempt to create organizational monopoly out of a socially useful body of abstract knowledge; the need for a market in which to transact the exchange of the technical utilization of that knowledge; the relationship between a profession’s monopolization of knowledge and its members’ social status; the mutual interdependency of the profession’s drive for social mobility and market control; attempts to convert economic power to social status (and vice versa); the ultimate dependence of this knowledge monopoly on the sanction of the state; and, finally, the need for a profession to “produce its producers” via schooling, credentialism, codes of ethics, etc. (Collins, 1979). Neo-marxist studies emphasized education’s place in training professionals to acquire cultural capital to justify their high standing in the social order (Bourdieu, 1984; Collins, 1979; Ehrenreich & Ehrenreich, 1979; Karabel & Halsey, 1977). Early criticism of the ideal of objectivity in U.S. journalism drew on this work or shared in the same

8-15-17

intellectual mood skeptical of the authority of professions and inclined to see claims to neutrality, detachment, or dispassion as a veil for power. (Debates over objectivity in U.S. journalism arising in the Vietnam war years are summarized in Schudson, 1978; a spirited defense of objectivity as a journalistic ideal is Lichtenberg, 1989.)

From this disciplinary reorientation, it follows that any investigation into issues of professionalism, objectivity, and truth seeking in journalism specifically should move from the question of whether journalism is or is not a profession to the more interesting analysis of the circumstances in which journalists attempt to turn themselves into professional people. This research agenda places the study of journalism within the sociological study of the professions, and can cast new light on many of the classic institutional histories of journalism, including those that ignore or discount a sociological lens.

## **PROFESSIONAL RESEARCH AND JOURNALISM**

How has this disciplinary transition from “traits” to “struggle” played out within the field of journalism studies? It would be an exaggeration to say that developments in sociology proper have had no effect on studies of journalistic professionalism. Arguably, however, the relationship has been indirect. Much of this can perhaps be attributed to the general decoupling, over the past two and a half decades, of sociology and media research tout court; on the side of journalism studies, as Zelizer (2004, p. 80) notes, “despite the auspicious beginnings of sociological inquiry into journalism, much contemporary work on journalism no longer comes from sociology *per se*.” The paradox is at least partially explained by the migration of sociologists to the burgeoning communications and media departments. Sociologists including Rodney Benson, Todd Gitlin, Michael Schudson, and Silvio Waisbord have primary or exclusive appointments in

8-15-17

communication departments or journalism schools rather than sociology departments. The work of these scholars has found an audience in communication and media studies more than in sociology. Some sociologists, to be sure – the work of Steven Clayman and his colleagues stands out – still speak primarily to an audience inside sociology, even if it is in the subfield of sociolinguistics and conversational analysis.

In the absence of work that explicitly links the sociology of the professions to journalism, two strands of analysis have emerged within journalism studies. The first, encompassing what might be termed institutional research, usually seeks quantitative data on journalists' employment, education levels, adherence to ethical codes, etc. Such research has most often been initiated by the news industry itself, or by academics with close ties to professional journalism. In the United States, the Annual Survey of Journalism and Mass Communication Graduates has provided regularly updated statistics on the employment prospects of recent journalism school graduates. In other countries (McLeod and Hawley 1964; Donsbach 1981), as well as in the United States, additional surveys and employment analyses have been conducted to “measure” the degree to which professionalization has occurred within journalism, at least along the axis of higher education credentialing. The data presents something of a mixed picture. In the U.S, for the twenty years from 1982 to 2002, the number of journalism and mass communication bachelor's-degree graduates who went into degree-related jobs declined from half to a quarter (Weaver et al., 2007, p. 37). At the same time American newspaper editors offer verbal support to the importance of a journalism or communications degree, and so while the value of a “journalism degree” may be open to question, the importance of higher education is not (see also Weaver and Wilnat [2016] for the most up to date statistics). The situation is similar in other countries with established media systems: a greater hiring emphasis is placed on higher

8-15-17

education in general than on the possession of specific “communication” degrees. In a 2015 survey update, journalism academic enrollments as a whole continued their steep decline (Gotleib et. al) while at the same time, the skill portfolio for entry level journalism continued to diversify into realms like computer science and quantitative methods.

For journalism it is tempting to turn to talk of a “quasi”, “pseudo”, or “failed” profession and to echo Weaver and Wilhoit’s contention that journalism “is *of* a profession but not *in* one (Weaver and Wilhoit 1996).” More comparative nuance is shed on this question, however, when we turn to more comparative studies, particularly the Worlds of Journalism study, which to date has been comprised of two research waves (from 2007-2011 and from 2012-2016, respectively). Comprised of interview data from more than 27,000 journalists in 66 countries, the study makes clear that the jurisdictional struggles of journalists should not be generalized from the American case alone, but must be approached cross-nationally and contextually (see the 2017 special issue of *Journalism Studies* on the Worlds of Journalism project for more detail).

To conclude and to perhaps over-generalize: the first strand of journalism studies largely avoids the deeper questions surrounding journalism’s unsettled occupational status. Rather than placing journalism somewhere on the professional spectrum between plumbers and neurosurgeons, it would be far more productive to inquire why and how the occupations of reporting and news editing achieved the professional status they did and how journalism may be attempting (or not, as the case may be) to raise that status. This removes us by one step from the rather arid analysis of employment data and forces us to consider the history, theory, and practice of journalism. Such questions have been dealt with most explicitly by authors working within the relatively new communication subfield of journalism studies, a strand that we might label cultural histories of professional objectivity.

## CULTURAL THEORIES OF PROFESSIONALISM AND OBJECTIVITY

Schudson (1978, p. 151), in *Discovering the News*, identifies Walter Lippmann as “the most wise and forceful spokesman for the ideal of objectivity.” Journalists, according to Lippmann, should “develop a sense of evidence and forthrightly acknowledge the limits of available information; ... dissect slogans and abstractions, and refuse to withhold the news or put moral uplift or any cause ahead of veracity.” In short, Lippmann urged reporters to fuse their professionalism with claims to objectivity. The link between professionalism, objectivity, and truth seeking would come to be accepted, not only by journalists themselves in the form of an occupational ideology but by media researchers and journalism scholars as a related series of problems susceptible to historical and sociological investigation. Understanding the emergence of objectivity would, in short, provide the key to understanding the emergence of professionalism.

Synthesizing some of the most important social histories of the American press<sup>1</sup>, we can speak here of at least five orientations to this history of objectivity . *First*, progressive historiography, which closely tracked the development of journalism's own occupational ideology, has depicted journalism as moving inevitably toward social differentiation, occupational autonomy, and professional freedom. By this account, objectivity serves as a normative endpoint, one enabled by modernization and the growing social differentiation among politics, business, and journalism; it is seen not as a tool, or a claim, but as a goal, a “best

---

<sup>1</sup> Here we draw in part on work of Kaplan (2002) as well as the authors' own work in Schudson (1978 ; 2001 ) and Anderson (2018).

8-15-17

practice” made possible by historical progress. A *second*, related understanding of the relationship between objectivity and professionalism is the “technological” explanation for the emergence of objective journalism. This explanation sees objectivity as a literary form fostered by technological developments and the combination of this technology with the consolidation of newspaper markets (see Sambrook 2012 for an example).

A *third* strand of scholarship points to economic developments that fuel commercialism (and by implication, a misleading, ideological claim to impartiality called “objectivity”). Kaplan singles out Baldasty's *The Commercialization of News in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century* as an especially forceful, carefully documented, and ultimately wrongheaded argument about the relationship between commercialism and professionalization. “In Baldasty's theory, news content and indeed 'journalistic visions' followed from the [capitalistic] funding mechanism” (Kaplan 2002, p. 8) and produced a journalism that saw the public as consumers rather than citizens.

A *fourth* strand of research on the rise of journalistic objectivity in the United States begins with Schudson's *Discovering the News* (1978), which, along with his later work (2001), moved away from seeing the emergence of objectivity as an “inevitable outcome” of wide-scale social processes and changes – whether social, economic or technological – and linked the emergence of journalistic professionalism to questions of group cohesion, professional power, social conflict, and the cultural resonance of claims to occupational authority. Schudson's original move in *Discovering the News* was to seek the origins of professional objectivity in the nexus of developments that built a “democratic market society” rather than in technological developments or in a “natural” evolutionary progress. Schudson distinguishes journalistic beliefs of the 1890's—naïve empiricism, or a faith in “the facts” – from the more modern, early 20<sup>th</sup> century view of objectivity, which takes norms of objective reporting to be a set of defensive

8-15-17

strategies rooted in the “disappointment of the modern gaze”-- the understanding that true objectivity is impossible. Many authors-- primarily historians of journalism-- have followed Schudson in discussing the emergence of a professional class of reporters in the context of the development of professional objectivity (most notably Banning, 1999; Dicken-Garcia, 1989; Summers, 1994; Tucher, 2004). For these authors, and many others, objectivity continues to be the *sine qua non* of journalistic professionalization: explain the reasons behind the emergence of objectivity as an occupational practice, fix a date at which it first emerged, and you have gone a long way towards uncovering the “secret” of professional journalism.

A second wave of scholarly work on journalistic professionalism, much of it comparative in nature, has called into question the strong linkage this work implies between objectivity and professionalism. At the very least, objectivity cannot be seen as the *only* occupational norm to both emerge from and buttress the professional project, and in some cases, it may not even be the *most important* norm. Chalaby (1998) has called journalism as a “fact-based discursive practice” rather than a literary, philosophical, or political commentary on current affairs, an “Anglo-American invention.” Ramaprasad’s extensive surveys of non-Western journalism do not even include adherence to “objectivity” as a major characteristic of newswork in Egypt (Ramaprasad & Hamdy, 2006), Tanzania (Ramaprasad, 2001) or Nepal (Ramaprasad & Kelly, 2003), and the new notion of “contextual objectivity” has emerged to explain the editorial policies of non-Western cable news channels like al-Jazeera (Berenger, 2005). In their classic (though by now quarter-century old) study Donsbach and Patterson (2004) have argued that a commitment to objectivity still distinguishes American from European newsrooms. Their extensive survey of German, Italian, Swedish, British, and American journalists, both print and broadcast, finds that U.S. journalists almost uniformly report that their

8-15-17

political views have no relationship to the views of their employers. Italian and German journalists at national newspapers say that their political views are close to their papers' editorial position. Schudson also now argues that the journalism he took to be "modern" is more appropriately judged "American," and some of its distinctive features have more to do with American cultural presuppositions than a universal modernism. This is notably the case with the American invention of interviewing as a standard journalistic tool, one judged by many European observers at the time (the late 19<sup>th</sup> century) as a particularly rude and presumptuous way of doing journalistic work (Schudson, 1995, 2005).

It is Hallin and Mancini, however, who make the strongest case for severing the link between objectivity and professional standing in the world of journalism. For them, professionalism is defined less in terms of educational barriers to entry, a lack of state regulation, or the ideal of "objectivity"; rather, it is viewed primarily in terms of "greater control over [one's] own work process" (Hallin & Mancini, 2004, p. 34), the presence of distinct professional norms (p. 35), and a public service orientation (p. 36). Different media systems vary in their levels of professionalization, they argue. The Mediterranean model of journalism maintains a fairly weak level of professionalization; the North Atlantic model (America and Britain) and North / Central European model (Germany, Scandinavia) are both highly professionalized. However, being a "professional" in the democratic corporatist countries does not necessarily mean being committed to objectivity or being free from political party ties. Rather, journalists in democratic corporatist states (generally speaking, northern European countries) judge journalistic autonomy to be compatible with active and intentional intervention in the political world. In these terms, journalists in Germany are as "professional" as those in the United States. The social bases of their professionalism, however, and the specific content of their values are different.

8-15-17

In a later argument that amounts to an elaboration and generalization of his thesis in *Discovering the News*, Schudson (2001) has contended that the “objectivity norm” in American journalism ultimately provides some sort of benefit to the group that articulates it, either by stimulating social cohesion (in a Durkheimian sense) or social control (in a Weberian one). Ethics and norms exist for ritualistic reasons, helping to provide internal solidarity and cohesion to a particular group; they also can also represent a way of defining a group in relation to other groups. Weberian explanations for the emergence of occupational norms, on the other hand, imply that they provide a measure of hierarchical control over social groups. The needs of superiors (editors) to control their subordinates (reporters) within large organizations mandates the adoption of a kind of “overt ethical reinforcement” that helps steer individuals in a rational, predictable manner.

Schudson’s essay focuses on the social functions of the objectivity norm in American journalism, but it acknowledges that “a variety of moral norms could achieve the ends of providing public support and insulation from criticism” (p. 165). If, as Hallin and Mancini argue, professionalism implies the existence of an occupational autonomy undergirded by distinct professional norms, professional journalism might have different bases cross-culturally, historically, and even in the future. The end of objectivity, even if it arrives, may not signal the end of professional journalism. Indeed: objectivity may not end, even in the United States. Further work by Fink and Schudson (2013), Barnhurst (2014), Graves (2016) and Anderson (2018) point to what we might call the “rise of objectivity 2.0.” We might also call it “contextual,” “analytical” or “interpretive” journalism, journalism that is less insulated from values that it had once been but which is nonetheless regularly defended by journalists as providing the necessary background for understanding events of the day. In these cases,

8-15-17

journalism responds to a variety of challenges to journalistic commitments by *raising* the professional bar for what it means to be an objective journalist. Rather than simply quoting both sides of a controversial issue, for example, journalism weighs in with its own professionally grounded but nuanced opinion about *what* is exactly true and why. We can see these developments most clearly in Graves (2016) work on the American fact-checking movement, for example.

*Fifth* and finally, we should not overlook contingency in the development of objectivity in the United States; it can be seen, in part, as a product of the distinctive shape of the U.S. “public sphere.” Previous theories of the rise of objectivity in American journalism are insufficient, because they ignore the role played by political contention in American history. These theories often assume, incorrectly, that a social consensus around notions of political liberalism and economic capitalism has been the driving force in press history. In Kaplan, we find the argument that Progressive Era politics, including the weakening of the authority of political parties through primary elections and other reforms helped propel a vision of public service among publishers, editors, and reporters via impartial and independent reporting.

We have seen, in these various cultural histories of journalistic objectivity in the United States, a productive focus on the manner in which journalists “turn themselves into a profession and themselves into professional people” (Hughes 1963, 655). Informed by comparative studies of journalism, the best of these studies recognize that a variety of professional norms might provide public support and critical insulation for professional projects in journalism in other countries, while the most recent historical surveys have usefully re-interrogated the relationship between professional norms, journalistic style, and the authority conferred to journalism in the public sphere. Scholars of journalistic professionalism are at least indirectly rediscovering a key

8-15-17

insight articulated by Hughes and advanced initially by the Weberian professionalization theorists—that journalism’s authority, status, occupational norms, and claims to expertise can be analyzed as facets of a professional project, an inter- and intra-group struggle.

A large question remains: what exactly is the nature of this struggle? What, exactly, is the object over which this struggle is waged? And further: what are the dynamics of conflict and cooperation through which this struggle unfolds? In sketching out the answers to these questions we argue, first, that professional expertise (or rather, an odd form of specifically journalistic expertise) and the linking of this expertise to work serves as a lever by which occupational jurisdictions are created and seized by contending occupational groups. Secondly, we contend that the dynamics of this struggle are marked out by an odd fusion of overlapping networks and sharply defined boundary lines, and that a primary tactic in the struggle to define “who is a journalist” is to simultaneously sharpen and blur the lines between professional “insiders” and paraprofessional “outsiders.”

### **BOUNDARY WORK, JURISDICTION, NETWORKS, EXPERTISE, AND AUTHORITY**

Over what social markers would we expect to see occupations struggle as they advance their “professional project”? For Sarfatti Larson, groups seeking professional status must organize themselves to attain market power-- they must fight to first constitute and then control the market for their services. They must, as marketers of human services, “produce their producers” through training and education; they must attain state sanction for their occupational monopoly; they must ratify this monopoly through “the license, the qualifying examination, the

8-15-17

diploma” (1977, p. 15).

Sociologist Andrew Abbott’s (1988) work in *The System of the Professions* shares much with Sarfatti Larson’s, but is a substantial refinement. In addition to criticizing Larson for her over-emphasis on economic power as the ultimate basis of journalistic authority (rather than seeing professional power as emerging from a mixture of economic control, political power, social status, and cultural authority), Abbott’s most important advance over the 1970’s work is to argue that study of the professions must begin with a focus on professional *work* rather than the *occupational group* and the structural markers of professionalism as a distinct object of analysis. The key aspect of professional struggle, argues Abbott, is the struggle over jurisdiction, or the struggle over the link between knowledge and work. Abbott views the professional field as a terrain of competition, though in this instance as a competition over jurisdiction rather than the structural emblems of professionalism. As it claims jurisdiction, a profession asks society to recognize its cognitive structure (and thus the authority conferred by that recognition) through exclusive rights. “Jurisdiction has not only a culture, but also a social structure,” Abbott argues (p. 59), a structure emerging out of this societal recognition. Doctors and lawyers, for instance, not only claim jurisdiction over specific areas of work but gain enforceable legal and political rights through state intervention. Even journalists, who lack many of the structural advantages granted to other professional groups, have achieved some level of juridical recognition via shield laws, for example, and privileged access to political leaders.

For Abbott, establishing professional jurisdiction requires more than simply labor; instead, the jurisdictional process refers to the day-to-day manner in which a profession both concretizes and displays its base of “abstract knowledge.” According to Abbott, what differentiates professional knowledge from mere occupational knowledge in general is “a

8-15-17

knowledge system governed by abstractions, a knowledge system that can redefine its problems and tasks, defend them from interlopers, and seize new problems” (p. 93). At the same time, this knowledge must be displayed via work. Or as Fournier (1991, p. 74) describes the link between knowledge and work in Abbott’s theoretical scheme:

Abbott uses [the] notion of cultural work to refer to the strategies that the professions deploy to manipulate their systems of [abstract] knowledge in such a way that they can appropriate various problems falling under their jurisdiction ... Abbott’s suggestion that professions engage in cultural *work* to establish their exclusive claim of competence over a particular ‘chunk of the world’ emphasizes the active work that professionals have to put in to maintain the boundaries defining their jurisdiction.

By shifting his focus from “the structure(s) of professionalization” to an analysis of jurisdictional disputes concerning the relationship between abstract knowledge and work, Abbott expands our discussion of knowledge-based occupations outside the “traditional” professions, and also helps us to conceive of a new way in which occupational groups struggle over social and cultural status.

Conveniently for us, Abbott devotes substantial space to a discussion of journalists. In Abbott’s account, journalism, at least in the United States, has claimed jurisdiction over the collection and distribution of qualitative, current information about general events. Journalism in general, and U.S. journalism in particular, also displays an internal differentiation in which journalists who cover politics or other topics that bear on political democracy have the highest professional standing and an especially marked cultural authority. This close link to democratic politics gives journalism its closest relationship to recognition by the state, but a paradoxical recognition in that the First Amendment prohibits state regulation rather than requiring it (as in the case of state-regulated licensing of lawyers and doctors and a number of other professional occupations). U.S. journalism’s claim to objectivity—i.e., the particular method by which this

8-15-17

information is collected, processed, and presented—gives it its unique jurisdictional focus by claiming to possess a certain form of expertise or intellectual discipline. Establishing jurisdiction over the ability to objectively parse reality is a claim to a special kind of authority.

In sum, journalistic objectivity operates as *both* an occupational norm and as object of struggle within the larger struggle over professional jurisdiction. “Expert” professionals-- in this case, journalists-- seek, via occupational struggle, to monopolize a form of journalistic expertise, which itself is discursively constructed out of various journalistic practices and narratives, including the claim to professional objectivity. This is an idea which increasingly finds elaboration in the journalism studies literature itself, particularly in the work of Lewis (2012), Carlson and Lewis (2015), Reich (2012), and Anderson (2013). These studies of “boundary work,” now a fairly common framework for discussion in the journalism studies literature, can be said to adopt a framework largely drawn from Abbott.

This notion of journalistic expertise makes journalism an unusually fascinating case within the sociological analysis of the professions. The very notion of journalistic expertise is doubly problematic. Professions, argues Abbott, are “somewhat exclusive groups of individuals applying somewhat abstract knowledge to particular cases.” (Abbott 1988, 8). Yet most segments of the journalism profession are not exclusive (and with the arrival of citizen journalism, becoming progressively less so); nor is journalistic knowledge abstract. Journalism seems to simultaneously make a grandiose knowledge claim (that it possesses the ability to isolate, transmit, and interpret the most publicly relevant aspects of social reality) and an incredibly modest one (that really, most journalists are not experts at all but are simply question-asking generalists). Abbott’s framework, with its focus on knowledge and jurisdiction, helps us see immediately what makes journalism a sociologically anomalous profession.

8-15-17

If professional struggles are, in part, struggles over a definition of and jurisdiction over particular forms of expertise, what, exactly, is the nature of this struggle? Several answers common to both the sociological and journalism studies literature suggest themselves, each of which place an emphasis on the drawing of boundary lines and the creation of insiders and outsiders. In an influential 1983 essay, Thomas Gieryn advanced the concept of “boundary work,” the process by which divisions between fields of knowledge are delimited, attacked and reinforced. Specifically addressing the separation of religion from science in 19<sup>th</sup> century England, Gieryn argued that the emerging distinctions between “science” and “non-science” were partially constructed, and stemmed from the self-interested rhetorical maneuvers of scientists. In effect, the very act of answering the question “what is science” helped to shape the modern notions of science, defining it by both what it is and what it is not. For Gieryn, the struggle over the definition of scientist was a rhetorical struggle over boundaries.

A decade later, Zelizer (1992) echoed Gieryn’s notion of boundary-work in her discussion of journalism. Specifically rejecting the paradigm of professionalization, Zelizer instead identifies journalists as an “interpretive community” whose authority stems from discursive sources operating both inside and outside the professional sphere. In her case study of media coverage of the John F. Kennedy assassination, Zelizer details how one emerging group, TV journalists, imposed themselves on the profession via both their coverage of Kennedy’s murder and, just as importantly, the stories they later told one another about the killing. Zelizer argues that journalists use narrative to strengthen their position as an “authoritative interpretive community,” consolidating their “truth-telling” position *vis-à-vis* other interpretive groups and maintaining internal group coherence (p. 197). As Zelizer emphasizes, the process of journalistic legitimization is primarily rhetorical, carried out through strategies such as synecdoche,

8-15-17

omission, and personalization:

The ability of journalists to establish themselves as authoritative spokespersons for the assassination story was predicated on their use of narrative in deliberate and strategic ways. Journalists' claims to legitimacy were no less rhetorically based than their narrative reconstructions of the activities behind the news [...] *While all professional groups are constituted by formalized bodies of knowledge, much of journalists' interpretive authority lies not in what they know, but in how they represent their knowledge.* (p. 34, original emphasis)

The claim that journalistic professionalism is established as much by the *representation* of knowledge as by the actual *possession* of knowledge would not, in and of itself, be a controversial theoretical claim; indeed, arguments about the constructed nature of professional expertise predate the post-structuralist critique and can be found in sociological scholarship as far back as Eliot Freidson . What is important and original is the emphasis on the rhetorical dimension of constituting the cultural authority of journalists. Where Zelizer's *Covering the Body* falls short is in its almost exclusive focus on the rhetorical dimension. Eyal's (2005, p. 16) critique of Gieryn is applicable to Zelizer as well:

The first, and obvious [problem with Gieryn's notion of boundary work], is the fact that boundary work is limited to rhetoric. The social mechanisms that limit the number of authoritative speakers, that assign their statements with differential values, that close off certain topics and devices from non-expert inspection, that characterize something as "calculable" or "not calculable," etc., these mechanisms are far more robust than mere rhetoric. Rhetoric alone would never have been able to produce the relational reality of science or the economy, or politics, etc.

It is possible that journalists define themselves rhetorically more than do other professions – their rhetoric is not only about their work, it *is* their work. And this focus on the *boundaries of journalism*, in the years since the publication of the first edition of this chapter, marks perhaps the greatest rapprochement between journalism studies and the sociology of the

8-15-17

professions. Carlson and Lewis' work on boundaries (2015) is foundational here, as is the examination of related concepts like "journalistic metadiscourse" and "meta coverage." A comparison between the differences between doctors and lawyers, on the one hand, and journalists, on the other, helps sharpen this point. Whereas doctors and lawyers have, with government assistance, considerable control over the gates of entry to their fields, and hence have market power, journalists have no such autonomy in their work. They are almost always hired hands, not independent operators.

Struggle over the journalistic jurisdiction, then, includes, but cannot be limited to, "rhetorical" conflict. Once again, this key line from Abbott: "Jurisdiction has not only a culture, but also a social structure." (Abbott 1988, 59). Zelizer's conception of journalistic authority, almost entirely cultural, is important but incomplete. How else might the struggle over journalistic expertise be framed, in a way that more productively incorporates the profession's social structure, as well as the "external" structures that affect the profession itself?

One possibility, gaining a following in recent years, would be to rethink journalism as a journalistic "field" in the terms of Pierre Bourdieu. Bourdieu envisions modern society as highly differentiated, composed of different spheres or "fields," each relatively autonomous and operating to some degree by a logic of its own. These fields include domains of art, politics, academia, and, most importantly for our purposes, journalism. Among communications scholars, Rodney Benson and Eric Neveu (2005) have led the way in applying Bourdieu's field concepts to journalism. In the same volume, Kleinenberg has spoken of alternative youth media attempts to "channel into the journalistic field," and field theory has become an established paradigm through which to explore concepts to explore the relationship between professional and non-professional media systems (Benson 2006; Vos et. al 2012; Benson 2013).

8-15-17

Nevertheless, as Chris Atton (2002) notes, it is difficult to fit alternative media into Bourdieu's conceptual frame since, almost by definition, alternative media claim journalistic status by challenging mainstream journalism's norms and practices. The field concept may theorize well about highly structured and fairly unchanging social-cultural constellations (fields) but is less supple at explaining the spaces between fields, the competition between fields, and the edges of fields. When Bourdieu himself wrote about journalism as a field, he expressed alarm that it might subordinate itself to the political or economic fields. But full autonomy from these other fields is scarcely conceivable and perhaps not even desirable (Schudson, 2006); the political and the economic are incorporated inside journalism. If this were not so, the inclination of journalists to solipsism rather than to engagement with a large democratic public might prove irresistible. The concept of "field" does not seem to offer leverage for analyzing fringes, spaces, or competition.

Consider the difficulty in conceptualizing blogging in relation to journalism. Boundary lines between "insider and outsider," "professional and non-professional," "journalist and blogger" are blurred today and growing ever more fuzzy. Instead of a sharply defined boundary line we might better imagine a thick, poorly defined "border zone" made up of proliferating hybrids, shifting social and occupational roles, and networks of expertise (Eyal, 2005). Bloggers, once interlopers whose claim to journalistic jurisdiction mainstream journalist rejected, now receive press credentials. Longtime *Philadelphia Inquirer* reporter Dan Rubin goes from being a journalist to full-time (paid) blogger to journalist again. Vast numbers of amateurs with camera phones are spread across the world, far outnumbering professional news photographers, and so have access to many events of the moment the professionals do not – a subway commuter, for instance, provided key photos of the 2005 London subway bombings that news organizations

8-15-17

around the world printed.

The boundary-maintaining problem this creates for journalism is apparent when an organization like World Press Photo, an international organization of professional photojournalists based in the Netherlands, selected its best photos of the year in 2005 – choosing to eliminate from competition the photos at Abu Ghraib or photos of the devastation caused by the 2004 Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunami because, even though they appeared in mainstream news publications, they were produced by amateurs (Livingstone, 2007). In an era of cell phone, camera phone, and blog, jurisdictional questions are legion. Meanwhile, other developments in portable and efficient information transmission alter the character of how journalistic claims to authority are articulated. In television, the growing use of live “two way” interactions between a studio-based news presenter and a field-based reporter lend a growing air of informality to on-air discourse, a style that affords the reporters in the field leeway to distance themselves from a commitment to the factuality of their pronouncements, as Montgomery observes. Montgomery (2006), in a study of the BBC, sees an increase in reporters’ use of terms like “probably” and “perhaps,” “certainly” and “actually” and “I think” or “my instinct is,” introducing a personal rather than institutional voice into the discourse of news. In a sense, this style of work maintains journalistic authority by removing it from its pedestal (See also the work of Cushion 2011).

This does not deny that social actors still find a *rhetorical* value in fixing their own borders. Journalists, bloggers, citizen journalists, activist reporters all find it useful to define themselves and others as insider or outsider, as part of “our” or “the other” group. This is where the Bourdieuean notion of the field is valuable, perhaps not as a description of actually existing social reality, but at least as a term that points to the cultural construction of boundaries to which

8-15-17

conventional journalists and their various competitors are emotionally invested. With the categories flexible and challenged, the rhetoric defining insider and outsider in flux, the deployment of the rhetoric of professionalism is both strategic and essential to the identity of the various social actors involved.

## CONCLUSION

We have argued, building on earlier work (Schudson, 2001) that objectivity acts as both a solidarity-enhancing and distinction-creating norm and as a group claim to possess a unique kind of professional knowledge, articulated via work (Abbott, 1988). This knowledge claim, in the case of journalism, is an odd one: unlike most scientific or legal claims to possess the occupational ability to discern the “objective truth” about reality, journalists do not argue that they possess esoteric or uniquely complex expertise. Rather, journalism makes a claim that has been simultaneously grandiose (jurisdiction over the collection and distribution of information about current events of general interest and importance) and modest (in the U.S. case, gathering information less on the basis of expertise than of attitude, a capacity to and willingness to subordinate the views of the journalist to the voices of their sources).

The question of the manner by which objectivity (or other journalistic norms and knowledge claims) function within a larger occupational, political, and economic social structure is more complicated and difficult to discern. On the one hand, professional claims obviously serve to draw boundary lines between those on the “inside” and “outside” of the profession. On the other hand, several decades of science studies have warned us to be wary of assuming that the *rhetorical* claims made about boundaries, claims often put forth by occupational groups themselves mirror the actual reality by which professional power, knowledge, and authority

8-15-17

operate. In short, claims to knowledge and professional power are often contradictory and incoherent.

We have not tried to formulate any grand theoretical statement regarding the operation of professional power, authority, and expertise. For now, the following simple propositions are worth keeping in mind: any empirical investigation into the status of journalism should be sensitive to the importance of journalistic expertise (in the form of objectivity claims and in other forms) along with the contradictory nature of that claim; simultaneously, any analysis of journalism should keep in mind the complex and, once again, contradictory nature of claims to be “inside” and “outside” an occupational system of power.

### **References:**

- Abbott, A. D. (1988). *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Anderson, C.W. (2013). “What Aggregators Do: Toward a Networked Concept of Journalistic Expertise in the Digital Age.” *Journalism: Theory, Practice, Criticism*. 14(8): 1008-1023
- Anderson, C.W. (2018) *Apostles of Certainty: Data Journalism and the Politics of Doubt*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press
- Atton, C. (2002). *Alternative Media*. London : SAGE
- Banning, S. A. (1999). The professionalization of journalism: A nineteenth-century beginning. *Journalism History*, 24 (4), 157-60.
- Barnhurst, K. (2014). “The Problem of Realist Events in American Journalism.” *Media and Communication*. 2(2): 84-95
- Becker, L, Vlad, T., Kamininsky, H., & Coffey, A. (2003). *2003 Annual Survey of Journalism and Mass Communication Graduates*. James M. Cox Jr. Center For International Mass Communication Training and Research. Athens, GA. Accessed 6/07/2006, from <http://grady.uga.edu/annualsurveys>.
- Becker, L, Vlad, T., & Coffey, A. (2004). *2004 Annual Survey of Journalism and Mass Communication Graduates*. James M. Cox Jr. Center For International Mass

8-15-17

Communication Training and Research. Athenx, GA. Accessed 6/07/2006, from <http://grady.uga.edu/annualsurveys>.

- Benson, R. (2002). The political/literary model of French journalism: change and continuity in immigration news coverage, 1973-1991. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 10, 1, 49-70.
- Benson, R. (2003). Commercialism and Critique: California's Alternative Weeklies. In: N. Couldry & J. Curran (eds.), *Contesting Media Power: Alternative Media in a Networked World* (pp. 111-127). New York, NY: Rowan & Littlefield.
- Benson, R. (2004). Bringing the Sociology of Media Back In. *Political Communication*, 21, 275-292.
- Benson, R. (2013). *Shaping Immigration News: A French-American Comparison*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
- Benson, R. & Neveu, E. (2005). *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field*. Cambridge, MA: Polity.
- Benson, R. & Saguy, A. (2005). Constructing Social Problems in an Age of Globalization: A French-American Comparison. *American Sociological Review*, 70, 233-259.
- Berenger, R. (2005). Al Jazeera: In Pursuit of 'Contextual Objectivity,' *Transnational Broadcasting Studies Journal*, 14, Accessed 6/07/2006, from <http://www.tbsjournal.com/Archives/Spring05/ReviewsBerenger.html>.
- Bledstein, B. J. (1976). *The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America*. New York: Norton.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992). *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Carlson, M. and Lewis, S. (2015). *Boundaries of Journalism: Professionalism, Practices, Participation*. London, UK: Routledge
- Carlson, M. (2017). *Journalistic Authority: Legitimizing News in a Digital Era*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Carr-Saunders, A. M. & Wilson, P. A. (1933). *The Professions*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Chalaby, J. (1998). *The Invention of Journalism*. London: MacMillan.
- Collins, R. (1979). *The Credential Society*. New York: Academic Press.

8-15-17

- Couldry, N. & Curran, J. (2003). *Contesting Media Power: Alternative Media in a Networked World*. New York: Rowan & Littlefield.
- Dicken-Garcia, H. (1994). *Journalistic Standards in the 19th Century*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Dingwall, R. & Lewis, P. (eds.) (1983). *The Sociology of the Professions: Doctors, Lawyers, and Others*. New York: St. Martin's.
- Donsbach, W. & Patterson, T. E. (2004). Political News Journalists. In F. Esser & B. Pfetsch (eds.), *Comparing Political Communication: Theories, Cases, and Challenges* (pp. 251-270). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ehrenreich, B. & Ehrenreich, J. (1979). The Professional-Managerial Class. In P. Walker (ed.), *Between Labor and Capital* (pp. 5-45). Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Eyal, G. (2005). *Spaces Between Fields*. Paper presented at the conference on “Bourdieuian Theory and Historical Analysis”, at The Center for Comparative Research, Yale University, April 28.
- Fink, K. and Schudson, M. (2013) The Rise of Contextual Journalism, 1950s-2000s, *Journalism: Theory, Practice and Criticism*, 15, 1, 3-20.
- Fishman, M. (1980). *Manufacturing the News*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Fournier, V. (1999). The Appeal to ‘Professionalism’ as a Disciplinary Mechanism. *Social Review*, 47, 2, 280-307.
- Freidson, E. (1983). *Professional Powers: A Study of the Institutionalization of Formal Knowledge*. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.
- Gans, H. J. (2004). *Deciding What's News: A Study of CBS Evening News, NBC Nightly News, Newsweek, and Time*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Gieryn, T. (1983). Boundary Work and the Demarcation of Science From Non-Science: Strains and Interests in Professional Ideologies of Scientists. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 781-795.
- Graves, L. (2016). *Deciding What's True: The Rise of Political Fact-Checking in American Journalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Graves, L., Nyhan, B., and Reifler, J. (2016). “Understanding Innovations in Journalistic Practice: A Field Experiment Examining Motivations for Fact-Checking.” *Journal of Communication*. 6(1): 102-138.

8-15-17

Hallin, D. & Mancini, P. (2004). *Comparing Media Systems: Three Models of Media and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haskell, T. L. (1984). Professionalism versus Capitalism: R.H. Tawney, Emile Durkheim, and C.S. Peirce on the Disinterestedness of Professional Communities. In T. L. Haskell (ed.), *The Authority of Experts: Studies in History and Theory* (pp. 180-225). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Hughes, E. C. (1963). "Professions". *Daedalus*, 92, 655-58.

Kaplan, R. (2002). *Politics and the American Press: The Rise of Objectivity, 1865-1920*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lichtenberg, J. (1989). In Defense of Objectivity. In J. Curran & M. Gurevitch (eds.), *Mass Media and Society* (pp. 216-231). London: Arnold.

Livingstone, S. (2007). The "Nokia Effect": The Reemergence of Amateur Journalism and What It Means for International Affairs. In D. D. Perlmutter & J. M. Hamilton (eds.), *From Pigeons to News Portals: Foreign Reporting and the Challenge of New Technology* (pp. 47-69). Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press

Macdonald, K. M. (1995). *The Sociology of the Professions*. London & Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Montgomery, M. (2006). Broadcast News, the Live 'Two-Way' and the Case of Andrew Gilligan. *Media, Culture & Society*, 28, 233-259.

Ramaprasad, J. (2001). A Profile of Journalists in Post-Independence Tanzania. *Gazette*, 63(6), 539-555.

Ramaprasad, J. & Kelly, J. (2003). Reporting the News from the World's Rooftop: A Survey of Nepalese Journalists. *Gazette*, 65(3), 291-315.

Ramaprasad, J. & Hamdy, N. (2006) Functions of Egyptian Journalists: Perceived Importance and Actual Performance. *Gazette*, 68(2), 167-185.

Reich, Z. (2012). "Journalism as Bipolar Interactional Expertise." *Communication Theory*. 22(4): 339-358.

Sambrook, R. (2012). *Delivering trust: impartiality and objectivity in the digital age*. Working paper. Oxford: Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, University of Oxford.

Available

at: [http://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/fileadmin/documents/Publications/Working Papers/Delivering Trust Impartiality and Objectivity in a Digital Age.pdf](http://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/fileadmin/documents/Publications/Working_Papers/Delivering_Trust_Impartiality_and_Objectivity_in_a_Digital_Age.pdf)

8-15-17

Sarfatti-Larson, M. (1977). *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Schudson, M. (1978). *Discovering the News: A Social History of American Newspapers*. New York: Basic Books.

Schudson, M. (1995). *The Power of News*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Schudson, M. (2001). The Objectivity Norm in American Journalism. *Journalism: Theory, Practice & Criticism*, 2(2), 149-170.

Schudson, M. (2005). Four Approaches to the Sociology of News. J. Curran & M. Gurevitch (eds.), *Mass Media and Society* (pp. 172-197). London: Arnold.

Schudson, M. (2006). Autonomy From What?. In: R. D. Benson & E. Neveu (eds.), *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field* (214-223). Cambridge & Malden, MA: Polity.

Starr, P. (1984). *The Social Transformation of American Medicine*. New York: Basic Books.

Summers, M. W. (1994). *The Press Gang: Newspapers and Politics (1865-1878)*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Tawney, R.H. (1920). *The Acquisitive Society*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company.

Tucher, A. (2004). *Reporting For Duty: The Bohemian Brigade, the Civil War, and the Social Construction of the Reporter*. Revised version of a paper presented to the Organization of American Historians, March 2004.

Tuchman, G. (1978). *Making News: A Study in the Construction of Social Reality*. New York: Free Press.

Tumber, H. & Prentoulis, M. (2005). Journalism and the Making of a Profession. H. de Burgh (ed.), *Making Journalists* (pp. 58-74). London: Routledge.

Vos, T., Craft, S., and Ashlkey, S. (2012). "New Media, Old Criticism: Bloggers' Press Criticism and the Journalistic Field." *Journalism: Theory, Practice, Criticism*.

Warlde, C. and Derakhshan, H. (2017). *Information Disorder: Toward an Interdisciplinary Framework for Policy Making*. Council of Europe. Online at <https://firstdraftnews.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/PREMS-162317-GBR-2018-Report-de%CC%81sinformation-1.pdf>. Last accessed August 10, 2018.

Weaver, D. H., Beam, R. A., Brownlee, B. J., Voakes, P. S., & Wilhoit, G. C. (2007). *The American Journalist in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Weaver, D. H., & Wilhoit, G. C. (1996). *The American journalist in the 1990s*. U.S.

8-15-17

News people at the end of an era. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Zelizer, B. (1992). *Covering the Body: The Kennedy Assassination, the Media, and the Shaping of Collective Memory*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Zelizer, B. (2004). *Taking Journalism Seriously: News and the Academy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.