This is a repository copy of *Introduction: Defining digital journalism studies*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/96078/

Version: Accepted Version

Book Section:

Eldridge, S. and Franklin, B. (2016) Introduction: Defining digital journalism studies. In: Franklin, B. and Eldridge, S., (eds.) The Routledge Companion to Digital Journalism Studies. Routledge . ISBN 9781138887961

This is an Accepted Manuscript of a book chapter published by Routledge in The Routledge Companion to Digital Journalism Studies on 28/10/16, available online: http://www.routledge.com/9781138887961

Defining Digital Journalism Studies.

Scott Eldridge II and Bob Franklin

This Companion brings together scholars from across the globe whose work is contributing to the emerging field of Digital Journalism Studies. In developing this book, we have set out to illustrate how Digital Journalism Studies has developed as a discrete and conceptually rich field of scholarly research with its own agenda of questions and modes of inquiry. We argue that 'digital' is no longer simply an adjectival descriptor or mere appendage to 'journalism' to be deployed when news and information move from paper to screen, nor is it merely a vague reference to the newest media technologies. As the chapters in this volume demonstrate, the theoretical richness of this field and the depth of its scholarship are evident in the ways it extends far beyond describing new technologies, or highlighting their place in our mediated world. For us and for the contributors to this volume, Digital Journalism Studies is a field devoted to exploring fundamental changes in the ways that journalism is produced, engaged with, and critically understood. While Digital Journalism Studies does point to the ways in which journalism has become closely interconnected with new digital technologies, and scholars have gone to great lengths to describe that shifting relationship, to understand its place in academic studies we have curated a collection of essays that discusses its theoretical, methodological, and professional and practical dimensions, but significantly also makes the case for the emergence of digital journalism studies, as a new field of scholarly inquiry. This emergent area of academic scholarship supersedes rather than merely complements journalism studies and is driven not solely, but largely, by journalists' and journalism's accommodation to the emergence of digital technologies.

It might be thought that any book length study of such a dynamic field risks being outdated before it leaves the press, but the contributions here tell a different story. The theoretical and conceptual challenges explored in section one (Conceptualizing Digital Journalism Studies), for example, point to fundamental areas of inquiry that define Digital Journalism Studies as a coherent academic field reaching across disciplines, revisited through exploring the issues and debates in section four (Digital Journalism Studies: Issues and Debates), where pressing concerns for journalism's changing landscape are interrogated. Furthermore, the geographic case studies in the penultimate section (Global Digital Journalism) remind us that not all matters 'digital' are universally prominent, while the methods explored in the section 'Investigating Digital Journalism' poke, prod and unravel the ways that new and immanent research methods and questions of analysis separate Digital Journalism Studies from other areas of academic inquiry. Elsewhere chapters unpack the ways we can make sense of new forms of content in vast spaces through analysis of web traffic and content, and in local and hyperlocal spaces where digital journalism has found strength, while others contend with new ways that a practicing journalist operates in a digital age.

For this opening chapter we revisited the work of the authors within this volume and of colleagues contributing to Digital Journalism Studies beyond these pages to shine light on Digital Journalism Studies' core demands. These include definitional debates concerning where the boundaries lie not only for digital journalism as a media form, but also for this academic field. It engages with the

complexities that underline its ongoing development and challenges in its future. If the mission of Digital Journalism Studies is to reach across cultural, journalistic, socio-economic and technological borders to paint a more holistic picture of the ways scholars and practitioners alike are grappling with changes emerging at a pace and scale previously unseen, then this chapter endeavors to trace the priorities that are defining this scholarly work. As the contributions in this collection make clear, this demands new approaches to research and prompts new questions about the journalism world.

The formation of a field

In the early part of this century, initial attempts to make sense of the internet and journalism, tended to focus acutely on the technological shifts that underscore digital journalism. Early forays into understanding journalism in online contexts looked at the internet as providing radical new means of communication and similarly radical ways of communicating. Concepts such as the 'Network Society' developed by Manuel Castells came to the foreground, and underlined views of digital spaces as more 'horizontal' or 'flatter', as 'decentralized' and plural online communities replaced more traditional, top-down, hierarchical journalistic organizations. The work of authors such as Dan Gillmor (2004) popularized the idea that digital platforms' low capital demands created greater access and opportunities for self-publishing, and journalism was declared to be a shared practice open to everyone. The early stages of journalism going online were reflected in discussions of newspapers and broadcasters moving to digital platforms. Early writing offered initial overviews of the ways journalism was taking advantage of digital opportunities. However amid this work, including notable contributions that have enriched our understanding – such as the work of Pablo Boczkowski, in his book *Digitizing the News* (2004) – in the early twenty-first century, proclamations of an internet 'revolution' were plentiful and the enthusiasm for new approaches to communicating online hard to ignore. What was missing, however, was a more critical and nuanced engagement with the complexities of these changes. The polarization between those optimistic about digital opportunities or pessimistic about the changes to 'legacy' journalism on occasion seemed to resemble the Manichaeistic "Boo-Hiss" shouts of the Victorian music hall audience; a sort of "internet good, old fashioned media (especially newspapers) bad". A mood captured neatly by Chyi, Lewis and Zheng's (2012) analysis of what they termed 'the crisis of journalism frame'.

However fevered, the emphasis on novelty and revolution lent itself to descriptive writing, and technological shifts and radical change were discussed from this 'novelty' perspective. Arguably this was a misleading focus that was insufficient for assessing the impact on journalism and journalism studies that accompanied the digital turn (Eldridge 2015). As James Curran writes in *Misunderstanding the Internet*, the enthusiastic view that the internet would "change the world" (2012: 34) was hard to ignore; that is until its egalitarian promise started to prove less-than-fulfilled (Domingo, Quandt, Heinonen, Paulussen Singer and Vujnovic, 2009; Fico, Lacy, Wildman, Baldwin, Bergan and Zube, 2013). While new language was being crafted to describe online opportunities such as 'Web 2.0', or commercial 'click and mortar' operations, in the early part of the twenty-first century there were few critical voices developing understanding beyond focusing on the potential of new technologies, including journalistic technologies. As Curran suggests: "The central weakness of this theorizing is that it assesses the impact of the internet not on the basis of evidence but on the basis of inference from internet technology" (2012: 8).

The attention paid to enthusiasm over analysis presented a challenging reality for scholars who were interested in journalism. For Digital Journalism Studies, as an emerging academic field, this is no less a challenge. Technological novelty continues to pose a challenge for scholars, as they face the dual demands of making sense of the dynamics of digital journalism as they emerge, while also describing an excitingly expansive range and variety of digital innovations. In order to construct the boundaries of this nascent field, this Companion grapples with both of these demands as it logs, archives, and critically assesses the fundamental shifts in all aspects of journalism, its professional practices, and products, and the audiences for these products.

While this might sound like a fraught balance between identifying change and understanding its impact on journalism, it has become clear that scholarship has progressed beyond identifying these intellectual dilemmas, and has moved towards building a rich theoretical engagement and understanding. In doing so, and through this Companion, we can register not only the core demands of the academic work explored by its scholars, but also define the points of reference for future work understanding digital journalism and digital journalism scholarship.

Taking the work of Boczkowski noted above, for instance, his recent book with Eugenia Mitchelstein – *News Gap* (2013) – explores not only content 'gone digital', but reorients that discussion towards understanding news media operating online from the people's perspective. Oscar Westlund, in this volume and in previous work (Westlund 2013), has introduced new avenues for understanding digital engagement from the 'personal' perspective as well, and does so by contending with newer and newer ways of going online and reaching audiences through mobile, smart, and tablet devices. Similarly, while in the early part of this decade Clay Shirky (2003) explored bloggers and questions of power in online communities, Tanja Aitamurto reorients our discussion of 'communities' and 'crowds' in terms of their sourcing and funding power in her chapter here. These are a few of the myriad approaches scholars are taking to move beyond Curran's warning of a skewed over emphasis on the technological. From these varied lenses, we argue a greater understanding is beginning to develop that defines the field of Digital Journalism Studies and its scholarship.

Conceptualizing an interdisciplinary field

Introducing the journal *Digital Journalism*, itself a locus for shaping this field and this Companion, the Editor noted how scholars and journalists alike have "become increasingly aware, across the last few years, of fundamental changes which have been restructuring all aspects of journalism and journalism studies" (2013: 1). This restructuring of course reflects the ubiquity of digital technologies and digital journalism, but it also focuses on the ways in which their prominence has been a disruptive development that poses an array of challenging questions. This has prompted new ways of thinking not only about journalism, but also about the relationships between journalists and organizations and the people and societies they communicate with. It is, in many ways, a field that can be marked in part by new points of reference and ways of describing its dynamics.

Our first priority is a conceptual one, and at its core we concern ourselves with defining what we are talking about when we refer to 'digital journalism' and Digital Journalism Studies. In many ways, Digital Journalism Studies can be understood through the way it has embraced unclear definitional boundaries around journalism as it has experienced radical change in the past few decades.

Definitions of journalism have been elusive (although certainly plentiful), and Ivor Shapiro has called our attention to scholars' tendency "to envision journalism in dramatically different ways" (2014: 555); he joins Asmaa Malik here to illustrate that definitional clarity continues to present both "a challenge and a promise". These include reoriented journalism-audience relationships, where we now speak of 'the people formerly known as the audience' (Rosen 2006), empowered by digital opportunities for both producing and using content as 'produsers' (Bruns 2007); such technologically driven opportunities also give rise to Mark Deuze's equivalent characterization of 'the people formerly known as the employers' (2009). Yochai Benkler describes this as a 'Networked Fourth Estate', and by doing so illustrates how the juxtaposition of digital ways of working have collided with normative understandings of journalism's societal role. This has shaken the primacy of traditional news media organizations, and orientations of media power have included up-from-below practices of 'citizen witnessing' (Allan 2013) and blurred entertainment and information in new ways (Bastos, this volume). In response to a wider array of media actors, traditional media see themselves confronted by bloggers engaged in 'black market journalism' (Wall 2004) and digitally native journalists seen as 'interlopers' (Eldridge 2014). All of this is to say, Digital Journalism Studies is confronted with an array of changing dynamics that texture the way we engage with media, news, and information in a digital world.

The conceptualization of Digital Journalism Studies goes beyond a new lexicon. Digital Journalism has changed binary relationships between producers of journalism and the people they purport to serve. Part of that challenge comes from the theoretical foundations that academics work with for exploring digital journalism, and their bases in cultural, political, sociological studies, communication, and other disciplines. For this we turn to the work of Laura Ahva and Steen Steensen, who mapped journalism research and its disciplinary approaches (Steensen and Ahva 2015) and in this Companion devote their attention to mapping Digital Journalism Studies as an interdisciplinary field. Embracing this argument, scholars have identified how prominent discourses that have shaped this field and debates between narratives of 'evolution' or 'revolution' and in many ways the maturation of Digital Journalism Studies is marked by work that has moved from debating these oppositional polarities of change (McNair 2009). The work of Henrik Bødker (2015) on digital cultures of circulation, Thomas Ksiazek and Limor Peer (2011) on civility online, Lea Hellmueller and You Li (2015) on participation, and Meredith Broussard (2014) on computational reporting represent just some of the vast interdisciplinary approaches to understanding digital journalism that extend beyond scales of change to provide a more nuanced exploration of shifts in patterns of engagement with digital content, audience behavior, and tensions around previously distinct communicative roles.

Within Digital Journalism Studies we trace troublesome questions concerning what makes a journalist a journalist. This is the focus of Eldridge's chapter in this volume and has been explored elsewhere, including recent publications by Matt Carlson and Seth Lewis (2015), Karin Wahl-Jorgensen (2013), and Mark Coddington (2014). Scholars approach these new dynamics by assessing how digital journalists position themselves in society, and how that rests on certain norms of authority, public interest and legitimation of information for fulfilling democratic priorities. In this we see scholarship focusing on new actors and forms of communicating engaging with the rich legacy of journalism research and its own threads through political theory, computer science, and sociological studies. Research within Digital Journalism Studies has made it clear that tensions over the primacy of journalistic identity itself forms an area of inquiry, apparent in Jane Singer's (2005)

writing more than a decade ago of 'j-bloggers', and still relevant for discussions of digital 'interlopers' nowadays (Eldridge 2014).

Martin Conboy in *Journalism Studies: the Basics* (2013) notes the tension that journalism organizations face as they try to balance information provision, entertainment, and commercial viability. As was true in the 'pre-digital' era, digital journalism and Digital Journalism Studies have been marked in part by the way this balance has been upended. Scholars tackling tensions between commercial imperatives are confronted with competing dynamics of openness and the accessibility of communicative avenues. While the popular notion that 'we're all journalists now' (Jardin 2004) might be under-realized, making sense of the way digital platforms offer diffuse information sources amid more traditional organizational constraints continues to present challenges. Digital Journalism Studies is at pains to understand these realities as they impact upon journalism's digital and analog sustainability. Merja Myllylahti in, her chapter here, unpacks the questions of profitability and paywalls – "clearly not saviors of the newspaper industry" (XX) – as news media wrestle with changing commercial realities in digital contexts. While addressing these questions has not produced 'saviors', it has provided a richer understanding for journalism and journalists in digital spaces, and adds to a growing wealth of research data. Robert Picard and Jonathan Hardy have also taken up this challenge, exploring digital journalism from commercial and political economy perspectives. While these arguments continue what has been a strong academic vein within journalism and media studies – in the work of Robert McChesney, James Curran, or Victor Pickard for instance – the disruption of digital technologies have drawn the political and the economic into a new lens. As Picard notes, journalists working in digital journalism need to understand the business of journalism more than they had to before. From a political economy stance, Jonathan Hardy draws out critiques of trying to replicate old business models online and points to blurred editorial/commercial divides, making the case for supporting digital journalism as a public good.

Of course the field is not only defined by the scholars in this volume, and annual surveys by research centers including the Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism at Oxford University, the Pew Center in Washington, DC, and other studies produced globally have brought the discussion to more public audiences beyond the academy. However, we argue that scholars like Myllylahti, using methodological approaches advocated within this volume by Michael Karlsson and Helle Sjøvaag, and Annika Bergstrom and Jenny Wiik, allow us to carry our understanding beyond descriptions of data and usage practice towards more reflective and critical discussions of digital change, including what we can learn of journalistic practice and digital journalism's viability.

In exploring these facets of Digital Journalism Studies, there are clear threads that link the scholarship in Digital Journalism Studies to that of its predecessor Journalism Studies. While as a field we are similarly interested in understanding the practices of reportage, the content of journalism, and the theoretical bases for understanding that Journalism Studies has established, the dynamics of digital change and rupture make it impossible to see these as the same academic field. However, in the same way that a debate over digital 'evolution' or 'revolution' ill serves discussions of digital journalism, the development of Digital Journalism Studies has drawn on (rather than rejected) this earlier work.

We can look at the work of Murray Dick as one example that illustrates this allegiance between Digital Journalism Studies and Journalism Studies. Dick has pointed to infographics as long standing

visual/textual features of journalism (Dick 2015), and he writes of their pervasiveness online and of the popularity they engender. Similarly, while 'data' have always been a feature of journalism with its ever present emphasis on facticity (Conboy 2013), the scale to which it has taken prominence in digital journalism and has come to define digital society more broadly, presents a wholly unique area of inquiry for the field of Digital Journalism Studies.

Identifying Digital Journalism

If we can address conceptual challenges to define the underpinnings of Digital Journalism Studies, our second challenge seems to be on the one hand evidencing what makes digital journalism unique, both in terms of description – what does digital journalism look like? – and, more significantly, in terms of the fundamental demand of how we make sense of changing journalistic forms and the practices that lead to their creation. This is a wide-ranging set of demands, which we have broken down into several categories, including 'Developing Digital Journalism Practice' (section 5), and 'Digital Journalism Content' (section 8).

The focus on 'Big Data' evident in discussions of infographics, computational journalism, and algorithms poses new questions for digital journalism research around its social, cultural, and technological dimensions, as Seth Lewis explores in this volume. It has become an obtrusive component of journalistic practice as well, with coding and algorithms factoring into everyday routines – John Pavlik (Chapter 26) writes this has played out in the shifting practices of journalists in data-driven environments. Where digital journalism might be dismissed as an unnecessarily new categorization, the rise of computer-assisted and 'robot journalism' suggest otherwise. Making sense of the data as a journalistic source, Nick Diakopolous, argues data and digital possibilities are enabling journalists and organizations to develop new tools including media. Matt Carlson, on the other hand, suggests (Chapter 22) that data and in particular the way they can enable automation of some journalistic work, points to a hybrid journalism in the future. Juliette De Maeyer (Chapter 30), however, cautions us that the impact of dynamic technological innovation on journalistic routines has long featured in discussions of digital journalism practice, yet the exact roles and structure of some of these digital artifacts, including hypertext, remain unclear.

How this all plays out for users forms an interesting discussion within this field, as well as the ways we look at traditional forms from new digital perspectives, and informs our approach to understanding digital futures. David Dowling and Travis Vogan, for example, make a compelling and critical assessment of transitioning genres of journalism as long-form stories move online, identifying the opportunities and missteps made as outlets embrace new forms of multimedia digital storytelling. In a different light, Tanja Bosch explores how social media have enabled new connections between audiences and journalists working on more traditional platforms like radio. These and other contributions show that our foci within Digital Journalism Studies can explore not only what is new but also how traditional media have adapted to these digital opportunities, as Jose García-Aviles, Klaus Meier, and Andy Kaltenbrunner attest. They can also make sense of globally-relevant questions within focused cases, whether looking at expansive online networks that connect audiences in interactive fora, as Neil Thurman and Aljosha Karim Schapals write in their study of journalists live-blogging, but also the way internet technologies have enabled 'hyperlocal' journalism within small communities, assessed by Kristy Hess and Lisa Waller. This has registered fundamental

changes to journalism culture, as Folker Hanusch explores, as well as shifts in the previous boundaries of genres and forms, including with digital radio and podcasts, the focus of Guy Starkey's contribution.

The work of researchers looking in these new areas reminds us as well that practice and content in digital journalism pose challenges far beyond cataloguing new forms of journalism. This includes social media, how it is used by journalists (as Agnes Gulyas, and Alf Hermida explore), as well as the way its prominence has changed the status of journalism in different parts of the world, an area Joyce Nip focuses on in a case study of Weibo use in China. An emphasis on data poses challenging questions around individual agency, while compelling debates about morality and ethics are present throughout new forms of understanding and communicating as we explore our increasingly digital societies. For a field that tangles with the technological, human, political, and commercial nature of journalism, Digital Journalism Studies engages directly with these challenges in the questions about government surveillance as more and more activity permeates digital spaces (see the contribution by Arne Hintz, Karin Wahl-Jorgensen, and Lina Dencik). For practice, the risks of intrusion for uses are more acute for sources working within digital technologies, or with journalists around digital dynamics; Einar Thorsen is instructive on this in his chapter on whistleblowing. In practice, this has had an effect not only on the way we talk about digital journalism but in the way journalists interact online in some of the more fraught, if not repressive and even life threatening environments which Celeste González de Bustamante and Jeannine Relly explore in their discussion of journalists' uses of social media while reporting along the U.S.-Mexico Border.

Just the same (but brand new).

Journalism's normative dimensions have been an aspect of journalism studies previously, and we have found their continued presence in the development of Digital Journalism Studies. Familiar in terms such as 'the Fourth Estate', or journalism as a 'watchdog' with authority over information is evident in concepts like gatekeeping and agenda setting which have not disappeared in the digital contexts. Peter Bro unpacks the latter two dimensions in his chapter, and examines how these stalwarts in journalism's normative dimensions are being challenged by the development of new digital forms that minimize their prominence (Bro 2008). Martin Eide, looking at norms of transparency and accountability, argues that certain normative underpinnings when discussed in the digital context have – if not new – increased importance for trust in digital journalism. This presents an extant challenge when it comes to journalistic ethics, as Stephen J. A. Ward discusses here, where "a widely accepted digital journalism ethics does not exist" (XX). Though new ideas continue to emerge, the way that digital journalism draws both organizational and professional ethics into discussion with personal ethics extends to the way we 'look' at the world, either as ironic spectators (Chouliaraki 2013), or 'witnesses (Allan 2013). Both Lilie Chouliaraki and Stuart Allan engage with the ways new actors are contributing to digital journalism in considering dynamics of 'witnessing'. Lilie Chouliaraki discusses the way digital journalism has borne witness to death and destruction globally, an argument that centers our attention on questions of agency as both subjects and objects of 'spectatorship' but also on the powerful images produced using digital technologies. This question of visual 'witnessing' and its digital aspects is no longer the sole domain of the journalist moreover as

Stuart Allan explores in his chapter on citizen photojournalism here and in his 2013 book *Citizen Witnessing*, where he argues that the role of new users has challenged (if not changed) the professional boundaries around photojournalism in a digital space.

Academic fields of study are at their best when they prioritize big questions (and the pursuit of big answers) while being sure to answer questions about 'how' those answers are developed. Perhaps because of its technological threads, Digital Journalism Studies has not developed with any such absence. The work of Thomas Lansdall-Welfare, Justin Lewis and Nello Christianini, picking up on previous research they conducted with Ilias Flaounas, Omar Ali, Saatviga Sudhahar, Sen Jia, and Nick Mosdell, have shown us that computer science can enrich our understanding of digital journalism in unique ways through massive, and previously inconceivable, automated analysis of digital content. The road they've paved has allowed us to consider new methods for analyzing social media content, which made waves as part of the study of Twitter with Farida Vis' research on 'Reading the Riots' (Vis 2013), and continues to strengthen our understanding of the ways digital content and social media form part of our journalistic world, as scholars have now applied these techniques to analyze as many as 1.8 billion Tweets for their news function and to make sense of geopolitical conflicts (Malik Forthcoming 2016*)*. Drawing threads from Journalism Studies through to Digital Journalism Studies, Tom van Hout and Sarah van Leuven take the concepts of 'churnalism' first explored by Justin Lewis, Andy Williams, and Bob Franklin (2008), to show how software and digital affordances offer new ways to map the production of news content out of public relation material 'live'. As methods for understanding digital journalism and its social, cultural, and technological dimensions, we've expanded our understanding significantly of the way people interact with digital content, and research including the work by Irene Costera Meijer and Tim Groot Kormelink in their chapter here and their previous research studies which have introduced exciting explanations of the ways people engage with digital content. When we broaden our explorations to ask what this means for our understandings of audiences, the work of Wiebke Loosen and Jan-Hinrik Schmidt reorient familiar discussions of news 'proximity' within Digital Journalism Studies.

Conclusion

For many years now we have seen the word 'digital' appended to all types of technologies and it has not been absent in discussions surrounding journalism. Digital content has become commonplace, we talk about audiences of digital 'natives' who also populate universities and are now entering the workplace, while journalism itself has seen rapid and widespread change as digital newsrooms and digital journalists become the norm; journalists working in 'non-digital media' have become an endangered species in the global north. One of the unique struggles of trying to make sense of digital journalism, a field very much defined by the scale and pace of steady change, is remaining comprehensive when change is ever-present. In shaping this companion, we have balanced the demands of remaining broad in range and deep in scholarly analysis of the relevant dynamics of Digital Journalism Studies. In foregrounding the innovative studies and themes that are defining Digital Journalism Studies as a field, the concerns of chapters and their thematic and scholastic approach favor work 'at the edge'. Within these pages, the *Routledge Companion to Digital Journalism Studies* offers a collection of essays addressing these and other key issues and debates which shaping the field of Digital Journalism Studies. With the proliferation of digital media,

journalism has undergone many changes, which have driven scholars to reassess its most fundamental questions. In the face of digital change we ask again: 'Who is a journalist?' and 'What is journalism?', and in exploring the many facets of these questions in a digital era have continued to map new areas of inquiry, and explore new aspects of journalism. This companion seizes on the developing scholarly agenda committed to understanding digital journalism and brings together the work of those seeking to address key theoretical concerns and solve unique methodological riddles.

Within Digital Journalism Studies, we have embraced these new challenges and developed new ways of understanding these shifts. As scholars, the authors here have recalibrated the way we make our observations of the digital world, and through the work of the contributors here and our colleagues in the field we can focus less on the digital patina of new forms of journalism and develop new understandings. This has also allowed us to be innovative, and critical, and to develop theoretically rich work to develop in ways previously unknown. Within this volume we have embraced scholarship at the leading edge of research, but to a contributor we are all keenly away that in this nascent field there are ever more exciting dynamics on the horizon. As editors, we are equally aware that the contributors we have gathered here are pushing beyond the limits they've outlined in their chapters and will soon be asking new questions, joined by new researchers who have embraced this field with equal enthusiasm.

We are content to be offering a first set of answers, but eager to address further questions about the future of Digital Journalism Studies in the certain knowledge that there is so much more to come.

Structure

In this *Companion* you will find a collection of invited essays from academics across the globe to explore what makes Digital Journalism Studies unique. Reflections on the changes that have faced the practice, the product, and the study of digital journalism are addressed by those invested in making sense of these substantive changes.

Part 1 focuses on the need to explore the ways in which key themes and ideas, which have been central to journalism studies, require theoretical reconsideration in the context of digital media and change. This requirement includes detailed consideration of bedrock questions such as 'What is journalism?' and 'Who is a journalist?', as well as how the interdisciplinary tenets of Digital Journalism Studies have taken shape. This section also addresses the need to reassess fundamentally the nature and role of journalism ethics in the digital age, alongside considerations of the possible redundancy of traditional concepts such as gatekeeping, their metamorphosis in the new digital setting for journalism, along with the moral questions that confront our increasingly digital world.

Part 2 offers a collection of essays exploring the necessity for innovative research design and methodological approaches to enable research based scholarly studies of the changes in digital journalism's products and practices. Chapters address the hitherto unseen challenges of analyzing digital and changeable content, observing journalistic production, managing copious amounts of data, and assessing user and audience activity. However they also highlight the affordances of

technologies for researching digital journalism, for tackling large data sets in real time and for developing understandings that were previously inconceivable.

Part 3 considers the new business models and emerging financial strategies established to resource and sustain a viable and democratic as well as digital journalism. Chapters re-assess journalism's business models, and the changes to its traditional revenue streams, but go further to look at new forms of reaching audiences and monetizing content, as well as those tools such as aggregators which can prove a hindrance as well as local markets with their unique dynamics. Sustainability extends to capture questions of political economy, as well as the trials (and sometimes errors) of journalism organizations adapting to online change.

Part 4 addresses some of the key debates which have characterized the emergence of Digital Journalism Studies including: The significance of mobile news for digital journalism, the impact of social media on breaking and sourcing news and considers the 'networked' character of these spaces. We also explore the acceptability and role of 'actants', data, and of robots in the processes, and with these the growing significance of transparency and accountability tools in evaluating the digital news environment. These debates are not limited to concerns of production, and the audience is brought into these debates in assessing online comments and the expression of free speech, the complex nature of citizen journalism, whether it is effective, and the ways citizen journalists contribute to news agendas.

Part 5 explores the notable changes which have occurred across all aspects of journalism practice, especially journalists' relationships with sources, their uses of hypertext and an assessment of its emergence, as well as a more nuanced analysis of the impact of web analytics on journalists' editorial autonomy and the development of wholly new editorial formats and practices such as live blogging.

Part 6 focuses on the radical reshaping and recasting of relationships between journalists and their audiences along with the fundamental scholarly reappraisal and rethinking of that relationship in Digital Journalism Studies. Chapters explore new conceptual understandings of this relationship via discussions of seminal ideas that revisit the uni-directional relationship between news media and audiences, the emergence of concepts such as audience repertoires, as well as news 'on the move' and the changing dynamics of proximity and distance. This revisiting of the audience engages with the shifting vocabulary and changed relationships between audiences as consumers, readers, and citizens, to capture the changing reading practices that characterize audiences' wide-ranging habits in the digital journalism setting.

Part 7 considers the broad social, political and journalistic implications of social media for traditional theorizing of the key concept of the public sphere. Chapters analyze the role of various social media (Twitter, YouTube and Facebook) as sources for journalists as well as the changing understanding of citizens as reporters or breakers of news, but also consider journalists' differential uses of social media and the extent to which their uses of social media has been 'normalized' into journalists' routine professional practice.

Part 8 examines the content of digital journalism with a focus on how traditional/legacy media have adapted to the digital revolution via convergent and multi-platform working. Particular chapters deal with the metamorphosis of newspapers to online platforms and broadcast journalism's increasing

production of podcasts. Other chapters examine the dynamics of change for specific content such as infographics considering their prevalence, and popularity, digital photojournalism and changing amateur/professional boundaries, and the impact of new and digital ways of telling stories for long form narrative journalism online.

In *Part 9,* scholars whose work in Digital Journalism Studies focuses on Africa, Australia, China, India and Latin America explore developments in the journalism industry and journalism practice in their particular regional setting with its unique patterns of media organization and ownership, contending with relations between state, media and non-state actors. The difference in the ways Digital Journalism manifests in these areas is explored, as well as the impact on journalism practices, roles, cultures and histories. The concern is to assess the degree to which the transition to a digital journalism is occurring across diverse global communities and unpacks both the promise engendered by digital journalism in countries around the world, as well as its limitations and the risks that come with hyper-connected societies.

In *Future* Directions, a final set of chapters point to the problematic challenges in digital journalism's contemporary and near future that remain on research agendas. With the reach of digital technologies, new risks have been introduced which have had an effect on the nature of journalism and whistleblowing, as have issues of surveillance and government intervention when access to the same infrastructure that makes digital journalism intriguing also poses uncertainty. We close with a conventionally, but perhaps too gloomily, titled, *Epilogue* exploring the ecological and ethical implications of digital journalism and digital approaches to making sense of the world, emphasizing what we miss when we lean on dominant understandings of digital change.

References

Allan, S. (2013) *Citizen Witnessing,* Cambridge: Polity

Benkler, Y. (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.

Boczkowski, P. (2004) *Digitizing the news: Innovation in online newspapers.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Boczkowski, P. and Mitchelstein, E. (2013) *The News Gap*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bødker, H. (2015) "Journalism as Cultures of Circulation." *Digital Journalism* 3 (1): 101-115.

Broussard, M. (2015) "Artificial Intelligence for Investigative Reporting: Using an expert system to enhance journalists' ability to discover original public affairs stories." *Digital Journalism* 3 (6): 814-831.

Bruns, A. (2007) "Produsage", *Proceedings of the 6th ACM SIGCHI Conference on Creativity & Cognition*, Washington, DC: 99-106.

Carlson, M. and Lewis, S (Eds) (2015) *Boundaries of Journalism: Professionalism, practices and participation*, Abingdon: Routledge.

Castells, M. (2000) *The Rise of the Network Society*, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Chouliaraki, L. (2013) *The Ironic Spectator,* Cambridge: Polity.

Chyi, I. Lewis, S. and Zheng, N. (2012) "A Matter of Life and Death? Examining how newspapers covered the newspapers 'crisis'" *Journalism Studies* 13(3) pp305-24

Coddington, M. (2014) "Defending judgment and context in 'original reporting': Journalists' construction of newswork in a networked age." *Journalism* 15(6): 678-695.

Conboy, M. (2013) *Journalism Studies: The Basics*, Abingdon: Routledge.

Curran, J. (2012) "Reinterpreting the internet" in: James Curran, Natalie Fenton and Des Freedman (Eds) *Misunderstanding the Internet*, Abingdon: Routledge (pp. 3-33).

Deuze, M. (2009) "The People Formerly Known as the Employers" *Journalism* 10(3) pp315-19

Dick, M. (2015) "Just Fancy That: An analysis of infographic propaganda in The Daily Express, 1956–1959", *Journalism Studies* 16(2): 152-174.

Domingo, D. Quandt, T. Heinonen, A. Paulussen, S. Singer, J. Vujnovic, M. (2009) "Participatory Journalism Practices in the Media and Beyond: An International Comparative study of Initiatives in Online Newspapers" in Franklin, B. (ed) *The Future of Newspapers* London: Routledge, Taylor and Francis, pp203-218.

Eldridge, S. (2015) "Change and Continuity: Online media through history's lens" in: Martin Conboy and John Steel (Eds) *The Routledge Companion to British Media History,* Abingdon: Routledge (pp. 528-538).

Eldridge, S. (2014) "Boundary Maintenance and Interloper Media Reaction: Differentiating between journalism's discursive enforcement processes." *Journalism Studies* 15(1): 1-16.

Fico, F. Lacy, S. Wildman, S. Baldwin, T. Bergan D. and Zube, P. (2013) "Citizen Journalism Sites as Information Substitutes and Complements for United States Newspaper Coverage of Local Governments *Digital Journalism*, 1(1) pp152-168.

Flaounas, I., and O. Ali, T. Lansdall-Welfare, T. De Bie, N. Mosdell, J. Lewis, and N. Cristianini (2013) "Research Methods in the age of Digital Journalism: Massive-scale automated analysis of newscontent – topics, style and gender" *Digital Journalism* 1(1): 102-116.

Franklin, B. (2013) "Editorial", *Digital Journalism* 1(1): 1-5.

Gillmor, D. (2004). *We the Media; The Rise of Citizen Journalists*. Sebastopol, CA: O'Reilly Media.

Ksiazek, T. and Peer, L. (2011) "YouTube And The Challenge To Journalism: New standards for news videos online", *Journalism Studies* 12(1): 45-63.

Hellmueller, L. and Li, Y. (2015) "Contest over Content: Longitudinal Study of the CNN iReport Effect on the Journalistic Field", *Journalism Practice,* 9(5): 617-633.

Jardin, X. (2004), "We're All Journalists Now", *Wired,* 8 November 2004, at: http://archive.wired.com/culture/lifestyle/news/2004/08/64534.

Lewis, J., Williams, A., and Franklin, B. (2008) "A Compromised Fourth Estate?" *Journalism Studies* 9(1): 1-20.

Malik, M. (*Forthcoming*) "A macroscopic analysis of news content in Twitter" *Digital Journalism X(X): DOI*

Rosen, J. (2006) "PressThink: The People Formerly Known as the Audience", at: *archive.pressthink.org/2006/06/27/ppl_frmr_p.html*

Shapiro, I. (2014) "Why democracies need a Functional Definition of Journalism now more than ever" *Journalism Studies*, 15(5): 555-565.

Shirky, C. (2003). "Power laws, weblogs and inequality," in: Jon Lebkowsky and Mitch Ratcliffe (Eds) *Extreme Democracy,* Lulu.com (pp. 46-52).

Singer, J. (2005). "The political j-blogger: 'normalizing' a new media form to fit old norms and practices." *Journalism* 6(2): 173-198.

Steensen, S. and Ahva, L. (2015) "Theories of Journalism in a Digital Age", *Journalism Practice*, 9(1): 1-18.

Vis, F. (2013) "Twitter as a Reporting Tool for Breaking News: Journalists tweeting the 2011 UK Riots" *Digital Journalism* 1(1): 27-47.

Wahl-Jorgensen, K. (2013) "Is WikiLeaks challenging the paradigm of journalism?: Boundary work and beyond." *International Journal of Communication,* 8: 2581-2592.

Wall, M. (2004) "Blogs as black market journalism: a new paradigm for news." *Interface: The Journal for Education, Community and Values* 4(2) at: http://bcis.pacificu.edu/journal/2004/01/edit.php

Westlund, O. (2013) "Mobile news; A review and model of journalism in an age of mobile media" *Digital Journalism* 1(1): 6-26.