HANDBOOK OF JOURNALISM STUDIES

Dr. Shalini

Handbook of Journalism Studies

Handbook of Journalism Studies

Dr. Shalini

BOOKS ARCADE
KRISHNA NAGAR, DELHI

Handbook of Journalism Studies

Dr. Shalini

BOOKS ARCADE

Regd. Office:
F-10/24, East Krishna Nagar, Near Vijay Chowk, Delhi-110051
Ph. No: +91-11-79669196, +91-9899073222
E-mail: info@booksarcade.co.in, booksarcade.pub@gmail.com
Website: www.booksarcade.co.in

Edition: 2024

ISBN: 978-81-19923-66-3

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

EVOLUTION OF JOURNALISM STUDIES: FROM HISTORICAL FOUNDATIONS TO GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Dr. Shalini, Associate Professor
Department of General Management, Centre for Management Studies, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.shalinir@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

This study provides a comprehensive historical overview of journalism studies, exploring its evolution from a normative and theoretical focus rooted in German social theory during the 19th century to the emergence of empirical research in the early 20th century, primarily in the United States. The transition from normative to empirical approaches is highlighted, with a specific emphasis on the role of journalism education in driving empirical research. The study traces the global development of journalism studies, emphasizing shifts in focus from sociological and anthropological perspectives to global-comparative approaches in the late 20th century. The investigation underscores the impact of early American scholars, such as Willard Bleyer, in establishing journalism as a legitimate field of study, and the subsequent global diversification of journalism research. The study identifies significant shifts in research paradigms, from a focus on audiences and media impact to a more sociological examination of journalistic norms, practices, and cultural influences. Furthermore, the study highlights the global nature of contemporary journalism studies, acknowledging its diversity across different national traditions. Despite increasing international collaboration, the dominance of Anglo-American perspectives in major English-language journals is noted, raising concerns about representation and diversity in the field. In conclusion, the study offers a nuanced reflection on the current state of journalism studies, acknowledging its diverse trajectories across regions while calling for increased international collaboration and a more inclusive representation in scholarly publications. The exploration of historical shifts and contemporary challenges provides a valuable resource for scholars, educators, and practitioners in the field of journalism studies.

KEYWORDS:

Academic, Communication, Journalism, Media, Sociological.

INTRODUCTION

In the stage of academic study, journalism studies may be seen in some respects as both a novice and an experienced player. The majority of commentators argue that the advent of journalism as a profession and a social force in the early 20th century coincided with the start of academic study in the discipline. Some, meanwhile, have discovered far older precursors. Many of the original impulses for studying journalism and communication originated in Germany in the middle of the 19th century, as noted by Hanno Hardt and James Carey. Therefore, the work of critical German social theorists provides the "prehistory" of journalism studies study, emphasizing the normative impulses that gave the discipline its first push. In his now-classic book on Social Theories of the Press, Hanno Hardt outlined the similarities, differences, and affinities between early American and German press theorists. He identified the writings of Karl Marx, Max Weber, Ferdinand Tönnies, Karl Knies, Karl Bücher, and Albert Schäffle as having had a particularly significant impact on German thinkers of the 19th and early 20th centuries on their ideas about the social role of journalism.

Similarly, Löffelholz discovered that German writer and literary historian Robert Eduard Prutz's writings are the sources of modern journalism theory when tracking the history of journalism studies in Germany. Long before news-paper studies became a recognized subject of study, Prutz wrote The History of German Journalism in 1845. The majority of early German theorists believed that journalism was a skill practiced by relatively gifted people, therefore they viewed the field via historical and normative lenses. Scholars of journalism were less interested in the methods and frameworks of news creation and more in the question of what journalism should be in the context of social communication and political discussion. In many respects, German communication studies have continued to be engaged with journalism as seen from a macro-sociological perspective often at the cost of empirical research. Even though Max Weber asked for a thorough survey of journalists as early as 1910 in his presentation to the first annual meeting of German sociologists, the research wasn't conducted until the early 1990s [1], [2].

The Transition to Empiricism

Only in the framework of journalism training first and foremost in the United States did an interest in the procedures, organizations, and participants in the news industry start to surface. In this way, professional educators' desire to share information about their jobs is likely where empirical research on journalism began, as opposed to normative or theoretical research. It is undoubtedly true that journalism education in the US originated at professional schools and was often administrative. This new era of journalism studies was ushered in with the founding of Journalism Quarterly in 1924. Among other things, Willard "Daddy" Bleyer of the University of Wisconsin wrote an article in the inaugural issue that outlined important methods for doing newspaper research. As noted by Rogers and Chaffee, Bleyer played a key role in ushering in a new era of journalism research that treated journalism with respect as a field of study as well as a practical undertaking. Bleyer went on to establish a Ph.D. minor in political science and sociology inside doctoral programs that were already in place in the 1930s.

Journalism education was provided outside of academic institutions in other nations, such as the UK and Denmark, where journalists received training via skills-based short courses and apprenticeships inside news firms. Under such circumstances, journalism education was seen from a practical standpoint, leading to the inclusion of courses on journalism law and shorthand in the curriculum. A more reflective and scholarly approach was absent from this model due to the separation of journalism training from the academy. As a result, most scholarship on journalism has come from social sciences and humanities disciplines that have taken up journalism among many other interests in the countries where this has been the model for journalism training. This might be one of the main causes of journalism courses' traditionally multidisciplinary approach.

With the emergence of early communication research in the 1950s, the empirical study of journalism received a fresh boost in the United States. Leading lights in the fields of sociology, political science, and psychology, including Paul Lazarsfeld, Carl Hovland, Kurt Lewin, and Harold D. Lasswell, pioneered this study. The creation of knowledge about journalism was significantly impacted by its roots in the social sciences. This impact, in particular, strengthened the empirical shift, which uses techniques like surveys and experiments to comprehend how news media operate.

The majority of studies conducted during this time focused on audiences and the impact of media, but as journalism studies gained traction, they gradually began to focus on "news people" and their professional ideals in addition to editorial routines and structures. Theories

and concepts such as the professionalization paradigm, agenda-setting theories, gatekeeper model, and news values theory were developed by and grounded on empirical study. These researchers' groundbreaking work is among the select few studies in the annals of journalism studies that are universally acknowledged as "classics." They have produced legitimate ideas of journalism that are still significant and influential. Furthermore, even though many of their theories may seem antiquated and have been surpassed by more recent studies, they are nevertheless very relevant to the field and have helped to form key research traditions. The imagination is captured by these timeless studies, even if they "may not be the most advanced in either theory or method [1], [2]."

The Turn to Sociology

Sociology and anthropology had a greater impact on journal-ism research in the 1970s and 1980s, which may be considered a sociological shift in the area. The emphasis redirected to a critical examination of journalistic norms and practices, professional and occupational cultures and ideologies, interpretive communities, and news text concepts like framing, narrative, and storytelling, as well as the increasing prominence of the popular in the news. The use of qualitative approaches, particularly ethnographic and discourse analysis strategies, coincided with a rise in the focus on cultural concerns. In this tradition, sociologists such as Gaye Tuchman, Herbert J. Gans, Philip Schlesinger, and Peter Golding, as well as advocates of cultural studies like James Carey, Stuart Hall, John Hartley, and Barbie Zelizer, have had a lasting impact on journalism studies. Through descriptive work, this tradition of scholarship—which frequently concentrated on work in and from national and elite news organizations—paved the way for an understanding of the role that journalism plays in creating and upholding dominant ideologies while also facilitating a deeper understanding of the processes involved in producing news.

The Turn to Global-Comparative

Lastly, a global-comparative shift in journalism studies was seen during the 1990s: Even though Jack McLeod pioneered cross-cultural research in the 1960s, it wasn't until the last 20 years that the comparative study of journalism could establish a tradition of its own.1. New communication technology and political shifts have sped up the worldwide growth of international and comparative study. The end of the Cold War and growing globalization have made it feasible for journalism scholars to connect with colleagues throughout the world more often. In addition to making it considerably simpler to get financing for international research, new communication technologies have led to the emergence of formalized worldwide networks of scientists. The study of journalism is expanding internationally and collaborating with other countries as the field is getting more globalized.

Current Journalism Studies

Despite the continued progress of globalization, journalism studies remains a very diversified field of study. Because the area has drawn unevenly from the social sciences and humanities, it has been greatly influenced by many national traditions. Research in the UK and Australia has developed within a critical tradition inspired by British cultural studies, while US scholarship stands out for its strong empirical and quantitative concentration and use of middle-range theories. German scholarship, on the other hand, has a heritage of conceptualizing journalism on a macro scale, inspired by systems theory and other theories of social differentiation. French journalism study, on the other hand, is mostly invisible to the world academy and significantly leans on semiology and structuralism. As a result of their American education, a large number of journalism scholars in Asia have developed a strong American viewpoint. Conversely, academics in Latin America are presently realigning

themselves, shifting from an emphasis on US cases to a focus on Mediterranean nations, particularly Spain, Portugal, and France.

Despite the increasing globalization of the subject, Anglo-American researchers still have a dominant position in the major English-language journals, but with a continually rising percentage of foreign contributions. Scholarship from or about other nations is a conspicuous exception since Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, which was, until recently, the most significant home for publications in journalism studies, mainly relies on US contributions. With only two out of every eighty editors and board members hailing from outside the country, the editorial board's and the journal's editorship are dominated by Americans. Although JMCQ is produced by the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, many journalism and communication schools across the globe utilize the magazine heavily as a source and reference [3], [4].

However, several academic associations are actively working to increase the representation of scholars from around the world and to increase their visibility and international membership, such as the International Communication Association and the International Association for Media and Communication Research. By adding more national diversity to their editorial boards, new academic publications such as Journalism: Theory, Practice and Criticism, Journalism Studies, and Journalism Practice have consciously positioned themselves as having an international focus. However, researchers from outside the English-speaking world still make up a minority, with the majority of editors and editorial board members being headquartered in the US and the UK.

Overall, the data shows a distinct North American/European dominance in the contributions made by scholars. Nine out of 10 published papers in JS have an author who is located in the US or Europe, demonstrating this dominance. The bulk of papers in JTPC come from universities in North America, while the majority of publications in JS come from institutions in Europe. In JS, less than 10% of writers are from outside the US or Europe. Due to contributions from Australia and Asia, JTPC performs somewhat better, coming in at around three out of twenty. There hasn't been much contribution from academics from South American and African universities to either publication.

DISCUSSION

Cushion adds that more than a third of writers in Journalism Studies and almost half of all writers in Journalism originate from American colleges. Because the geographic origins of authors are highly predictive of the subject matter they write about, US news organizations' work is very well-documented, but our understanding of newsroom operations and media content in Africa, Asia, and Latin America is painfully lacking. The majority of the studies on journalists, their behaviors, and the writings they generate are published in these publications and other places. For instance, a review of articles published in the last ten years in three prestigious journals provides insight into the interests of academics studying journalism. While researchers worldwide are more likely to rely on discourse and textual analysis, most of the present study on journalistic texts in the US is driven by the framing research paradigm. Nonetheless, Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly has historically relied heavily on content analysis; as a result, this approach was used in 25% of papers published between 1975 and 1995. Still, compared to the other journals, JMCQ has a disproportionate amount of research on news audiences since it often publishes contributions based on experimental research that is shaped by the effects of tradition. A good deal of writing has been written on the third-person effect and how ideas like attribution and salience are used. Still, the bulk of contributions centered around the sociology and psychology of journalism.

We would be well advised to consider the following normative presumptions, which have a significant impact on the field of communication research despite the strength of an empirical tradition that has prevailed from the field's inception: As stated at the beginning of this chapter, we assume that media is a force for good in society, a necessary component of citizenship and that it serves as a "watchdog" by checking the abuses of power by the government. Because of this, we also believe that journalists see themselves as autonomous forces working for the welfare of society and as champions of free speech. Here, students of modern journalism studies of all persuasions share the same concerns that motivated the pioneering German philosophers' work.

Nevertheless, by relying on these presumptions, we fail to acknowledge the reality that the press has played a significant instrumental role in many regions of the globe outside of the liberal and often libertarian Anglo-American heritage. Totalitarian governments all over the globe have shown a deep awareness of the press's influence, as seen by China's "watchdogs on party leashes" and Nazi Germany's use of media to promote national socialism. It is also important to acknowledge that journalism has been used to incite hate, bigotry, and genocide, igniting war. This has a lot of recorded evidence, such as the examples of Sierra Leone, Liberia, and Rwanda. Lately, it has become clear that assertions of free speech universalism clash with cultural and religious sensitivities in a globalized society, particularly since the Danish daily Jyllandsposten published cartoons depicting the Prophet Muhammad provocatively.

Aware of these complexities, scholars studying journalism are becoming more and more interested in tracking the effects of significant changes brought about by globalization and advancements in politics, economics, society, and technology on journalism organizations, production methods, content, and audiences.

Overview ofThe Handbook Of Journalism Studies

Such preoccupations are evident in this handbook, which is organized around a critical engagement with important theoretical and empirical traditions, areas of study, and academic controversies in journalism studies. The book is divided into four thematic parts that provide scholarly material on news production and organizations, news content, journalism and society, and journalism from a global perspective. The book starts with four introductory chapters that highlight major themes in the subject. The book's structure reflects its goal of addressing the major areas of journalism studies: Firstly, in their chapter on journalism history, Kevin Barnhurst and John Nerone trace the similarities between journalism history studies and the history of journalism in a wider context. They contend that traditional histories of journalism create "journalism itself as a universal subject position, “emphasizing the experiences of white male professionals, and they "essentialize journalism, treating what journalists do as an un-problematical set of existing practices." The chapters by Barbie Zelizer and BeateJosephi depict the tense and always-changing interactions between and among academics, educators, and journalists. The disagreement between media and academia, according to Zelizer, "echoes a broader disjunction characterizing journalism's uneven and spotty existence with the world." The diversity of ways to educate journalism throughout the globe is outlined in Josephi's chapter, which shows that while the US model has dominated study, it does not adequately represent the range of experiences and educational models that are prevalent elsewhere.

The importance of comprehending journalists' labor is reiterated in the book's second section, which examines the news-producing environment. The first chapter in this section, "News Organizations and Routines," by Lee Becker and Tudor Vlad, argues that although research

on routines has been particularly thorough and interesting and has brought journalism's social construction of reality to our attention, we should go beyond this viewpoint and focus more on the creative processes that underpin ideation for stories. One of the earliest and most significant ideas in journalism, gatekeeping, is examined in more detail in the second chapter of this part. Though the theory dates back to the early 1950s, Pamela J. Shoemaker, Tim P. Vos, and Stephen D. Reese contend that it is still very relevant and is reemerging as a vibrant field, partly due to new approaches like field theory partly because of technological change within the profession.

The principle of impartiality is another element of journalistic strength that is examined in Michael Schudson and Chris Anderson's chapter. According to them, objectivity plays a crucial part in journalism cultures, functioning "as a group claim to possess a unique kind of professional knowledge, articulated via work and as both a solidarity enhancing and distinction-creating norm." In a similar vein, Daniel Berkowitz shows in his chapter on journalists and their sources that research on reporters and their sources must be conducted in a way that emphasizes their continuous "ability to shape ongoing meanings in a culture" throughout contact. However, Linda Steiner's chapter on gender in the newsroom cautions against essentializing claims about the nature of "feminine" news, arguing that instead, we can draw on feminist perspectives to think up new journalistic genres and newsroom cultures. This is even though several of the major approaches to understanding news production have overlooked questions of power. The chapter by Jane Singer and Thorsten Quandt, which contends that the emergence of journalistic convergence and cross-platform production has expedited the need to reevaluate scholarly perspectives in light of ongoing changes, echoes this call for a rethinking of methodological and conceptual tools [5], [6].

The third half of the book shifts the focus from news organizations to the material they create, examining the wide variety of theoretical and empirical viewpoints that have attempted to use all available theories to understand journalistic texts. This part begins with a chapter on agenda-setting by Renita Coleman, Maxwell McCombs, Donald Shaw, and David Weaver. This theory of mass communication is one of the few that has persisted throughout time across other social science disciplines. The authors draw attention to how difficult it is to discern between agenda-setting research and the more contemporary framing approach. But as JörgMatthes, Lynn Pellicano, and Robert Entman contend in their chapter on the subject, framing has spawned a rich culture of its own. They contend that the concept of framing has been used quite narrowly in political communication research and that researchers would be better served by extending the scope of the study of framing effects and relating them to more general issues in democratic theory.

Deirdre O'Neill and Tony Har-cup's chapter on news values further highlights the need for careful reconceptualization. They point out that while creating lists of news values has been a common practice among scholars in this field, this practice hides the reality that ideas about news values are constantly contested and vary dynamically over time and space. Other areas of journalism studies have long acknowledged the connection between news texts, power, and contestation: In his chapter on discourse, ideology, and news, Teun van Dijk shows how academics conceive the specific ways that the news is imbued with the prevailing ideology and aids in its upkeep and reproduction. This point of view is expanded upon in John McManus' chapter on the commercialization of news, which concludes that "relying on unregulated markets will not render the quality or quantity of news that participatory government requires to flourish." In the last chapter of this part, S. Elizabeth Bird and Robert Dardenne argue that a crucial issue for students of news narrative should be whose story is being presented. This brings questions of power within the commercial press to the fore.

The book's fourth part examines research on the interaction between journalism and society, using a more comprehensive approach. In his chapter on journalism and democracy, Brian McNair notes the current pessimism surrounding journalism's ability to promote citizenship, but he also argues that optimistic evaluations are warranted because, as he puts it, “the average citizen in the average mature democracy has access to more political journalism than at any previous time in history.” Drawing on academic discussions on the state of the public sphere, David Miller and William Dinan advocate for “a new synthesis of theories of communication, power, and the public sphere” that are based on Habermas' views.

Stephen Ward's chapter on journalistic ethics focuses on the "norms of responsible journalism." According to Ward, modern journalism necessitates a broader cosmopolitan ethics that carefully considers both local and global circumstances. Likewise, Kyu Ho Youm's chapter on journalism law and regulation shows that the variety of national traditions and histories that influence people's ideas of press freedom is a problem for researchers working in this field.

The audience is often ignored in journalism studies, which is another blind spot. In his chapter on journalism and popular culture, John Hartley makes the case that the disdain for the audience stems from the disparate communication strategies that are often used by popular activists and journalists alike. He contends that journalism studies "ignores the agency of the consumer" and "fetishizes the producer-provider." In his chapter on alternative and citizen journalism, Chris Atton makes a similar argument. These forms of journalism are often considered a vital counterbalance to the issues facing traditional media. He contends that while scholars of these genres have celebrated the involvement and empowerment they exemplify; they have not yet properly taken into consideration how audiences interact with them. Although "most research on news is ultimately concerned with its impact on society," as MircaMadianou notes in her contribution on news audiences, "the question of the news audience has often remained an implied category."

The fifth and last portion of the book places journalism studies in its worldwide perspective, paying homage to the current global-comparative trend in the field. This section begins with Simon Cottle's chapter, which suggests that by focusing on the dynamic processes that "conflicts and contention are strategically pursued and performed in the media by contending interests and across time," academics would do well to bring politics back into the study of globalization and journalism.

Howard Tumblr's chapter on reporting peace and war examines one kind of journalism that has always been focused on disputes and disagreement in a global environment. It illustrates how academics of journalism have reacted to evolving methods of covering war, creating strategies that reveal information about the ideologies and power dynamics of the societies that carry out and report on the war in addition to the work of war correspondents. Public service media are often seen to provide the essential balance, whereas commercial media frequently stress conflict and sensation. In their chapter on public service broadcasting, Hallvard Moe and Trine Syvertsen analyze the idea of public service in terms of "forms of political intervention into the media market to ensure that broadcasters produce programs deemed valuable to society" in light of this normative expectation [7], [8].

Even if public service broadcasting has played a significant role in Western Europe's media structure, it is crucial to examine journalistic methods in non-Western settings. Development journalism is one of the strategies that is especially important for less developed regions of the globe and that challenges a liberal press paradigm. In his chapter on this paradigm, Xu

Xiaoge shows how important this idea is in Asia and Africa while also demonstrating how little research has been done on the subject of development journalism techniques.

Silvio Waisbord contends that advocacy journalism is another significant paradigm that is not universally valued by journalists. According to him, advocacy journalism is a kind of "political mobilization that aims to make institutions more responsive to human needs and to increase the power of people and groups."

These chapters together demonstrate how inadequate the globalization of journalism study is still. The chapter by Thomas Hanitzsch emphasizes the significance of comparative study in the development of journalism studies as a genuinely global discipline. Even yet, although being used more often, it still lacks theoretical and methodological development, and its full historical potential has not yet been realized. As Herman Wasserman and Arnold de Beer contend in their chapter, the persistence of Western dominance in the discipline is another issue with international journalism research. The authors contend that the inequities in knowledge creation can only be corrected by a redistribution of economic resources. Cross-cultural research is still a laborious task for several reasons. The only way to overcome its inherent Western bias, lack of ideas that are applicable everywhere, difficulties proving equivalency and case selection issues is via international collaboration in research [9], [10].

CONCLUSION

This study provides a comprehensive overview of the evolution of journalism studies, tracing its roots from the 19th century to its current state in a globalized world. The narrative unfolds through distinct phases marked by shifts in focus, methodologies, and theoretical frameworks. Beginning with the prehistory influenced by German social theorists, the study highlights the normative impulses that initially shaped journalism studies. The transition to empiricism, particularly in the United States, marked a significant turning point as journalism education started to emphasize empirical research on the procedures, organizations, and participants in the news industry.

The study also underscores the enduring influence of classic theories like agenda-setting, the gatekeeper model, and news values, which have laid the foundation for contemporary journalism studies. The study concludes by acknowledging the normative presumptions inherent in journalism studies, such as the belief in media as a force for good and journalism as a watchdog for societal abuses. However, it cautions against overlooking the darker aspects of journalism's history, where the press has been used for propaganda, hate, and incitement of violence. As scholars increasingly focus on the effects of globalization and technological advancements, the field of journalism studies is called upon to address these complexities and strive for a more inclusive, diverse, and globally representative discourse. The handbook's thematic structure, encompassing news production, content, journalism and society, and a global perspective, reflects the multifaceted nature of contemporary journalism studies and sets the stage for future research and inquiry.

REFERENCES:

[1] S. Steensen, A. M. Grøndahl Larsen, Y. B. Hågvar, and B. K. Fonn, “What Does Digital Journalism Studies Look Like?,” *Digital Journalism*. 2019. doi: 10.1080/21670811.2019.1581071.

[2] S. A. Eldridge, K. Hess, E. C. Tandoc, and O. Westlund, “Navigating the Scholarly Terrain: Introducing the Digital Journalism Studies Compass,” *Digit. Journal.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/21670811.2019.1599724.

[3] T. Witschge, C. W. Anderson, D. Domingo, and A. Hermida, "Dealing with the mess (we made): Unraveling hybridity, normativity, and complexity in journalism studies," *Journalism*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1464884918760669.

[4] M. Carlson and S. C. Lewis, "Temporal reflexivity in journalism studies: Making sense of change in a more timely fashion," *Journalism*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1464884918760675.

[5] T. Witschge, M. Deuze, and S. Willemsen, "Creativity in (Digital) Journalism Studies: Broadening our Perspective on Journalism Practice," *Digit. Journal.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/21670811.2019.1609373.

[6] R. Mabrook and J. B. Singer, "Virtual Reality, 360° Video, and Journalism Studies: Conceptual Approaches to Immersive Technologies," *Journal. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/1461670X.2019.1568203.

[7] T. Hanitzsch, "Journalism studies still needs to fix Western bias," *Journalism*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1464884918807353.

[8] M. Deuze, "What Journalism Is (Not)," *Soc. Media Soc.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/2056305119857202.

[9] M. Ekström and O. Westlund, "The dislocation of news journalism: A conceptual framework for the study of epistemologies of digital journalism," *Media Commun.*, 2019, doi: 10.17645/mac.v7i1.1763.

[10] A. Wagemans and T. Witschge, "Examining innovation as process: Action research in journalism studies," *Convergence*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1354856519834880.

CHAPTER 2

COMPREHENSIVE EXPLORATION OF JOURNALISM STUDIES, PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

Dr. Salma Begum, Assistant Professor
Department of General Management, Centre for Management Studies, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- salma.begum@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

This study provides a comprehensive overview of the evolving landscape of journalism studies, tracing its historical development and examining its current challenges and potential future directions. The exploration begins with an analysis of journalism's role in shaping collective reality, its significance in fostering an "imagined community," and its intrinsic connection to democracy. The evolution of journalism studies is discussed through four distinct yet interconnected stages: normative research, empirical turn, sociological turn, and global-comparative turn. A critical aspect highlighted in this analysis is the need for journalism studies to expand its focus beyond elite news organizations, journalists, and Western perspectives. The study argues for a more inclusive approach, urging researchers to explore less glamorous journalistic workplaces, marginalized media practices, and neglected regions globally. Furthermore, the study calls for a shift in emphasis from media producers and texts to a more nuanced understanding of news viewers. It advocates for a holistic approach that considers the intricate connections between creators, content, and viewers, urging scholars to delve into the cultural, social, and organizational factors influencing news creation and consumption. In conclusion, the study underscores the necessity of bridging the gap between journalism studies, journalism practice, and journalism education. It advocates for more explanatory and longitudinal research to understand how journalism evolves within specific cultural, historical, and political contexts. Ultimately, the study encourages journalism studies to embrace its role in a complex global environment while remaining deeply rooted in diverse and dynamic settings, thus contributing to a more inclusive and reflexive understanding of journalism.

KEYWORDS:

Imagined Community, Journalism, Journalistic Workplaces, Newsroom.

INTRODUCTION

The goal of this guide is to provide an overview of our current understanding of one of the most significant political, social, and cultural institutions: journalism. "Since people realized they needed to share information about themselves with others," journalism has existed. On the other hand, journalism studies are relatively new. There are several justifications for why academics should pursue the study of journalism. Firstly, news affects our perceptions of the outside world, ourselves, and one another. The narratives told by journalists are what create and preserve our collective reality. Because of this, news has the potential to be a very significant social glue; the tales we read about both major and little current events unite us as an "imagined community" of other readers. We learn to comprehend and build ourselves as subjects within local, national, and increasingly global settings via the rituals of reading and debating journalistic texts. Specifically, journalism is seen to be inextricably linked to democracy. It has a significant impact on how we identify as citizens and facilitates the discussions and debates that are necessary for effective self-governance between people and

their representatives. News is "the stuff which makes political action possible," to put it simply. Not every academic has the same upbeat outlook on journalism's future in its professionalized and institutionalized form. Researchers continue to wonder about the "end of journalism" despite the declaration that journalism as we know it is "dead" and a "zombie institution" with the introduction of interactive communication technologies. For many theorists, normative worries stem primarily from the possibility that conventional political journalism may collapse because "its loss would rob us of the centerpiece of deliberative politics." But, to borrow a phrase from Mark Twain, reports that journalism is dying could be grossly overstated. Perhaps what we are seeing is the rebirth of journalism rather than its demise.According to Hartley, journalism is the main "sense-making practice of modernity" when it comes to textual forms. It serves as a repository for our communal memory and develops the main stories of modernity. Journalism writings may be seen as "the first draft of history." Historians and other observers of a given era mostly interpret descriptions of and responses to events and individuals via journalistic articles. Since news stories are the principal medium for expressing and enacting social consensus and disputes, they chronicle the continuous drama of the struggles between the prevailing ideology and its opponents [1], [2].

Studying journalism is crucial for anybody hoping to comprehend modern culture since it plays such a significant role in society. It is becoming more and more common to do this. The topic of journalism studies is expanding quickly in the communication discipline today. The establishment of numerous new journals in the field, such as Journalism: Theory, Practice and Criticism, Journalism Studies, and Journalism Practice, has contributed to the significant rise in the number of academics who identify as journalism researchers over the past few decades. Additionally, sections dedicated to Journalism Studies have been established in the last few years by the European Communication Research and Education Association, the International Association for Media and Communication Research, and the International Communication Association. Brazilian Journalism Research, Ecquid Novi: African Journalism Studies, and Pacific Journalism Review are just a few of the many regional journals that cover journalism studies. A sizable number of semi-trade journals also cover the field, including the British Journalism Review, Global Journalism Review, and American Journalism Review.

With the development of journalism studies as a distinct subject, it has generated a unique corpus of theories and literature. Books geared for journalism scholars are becoming more and more prevalent in the marketplace. Recent books include Journalism: A Reader's Guide, Journalism: Critical Issues, Journalism, Key Concepts in Journalism Studies, and Social Meanings of News: With the development of an introductory textbook on journalism research as well as a companion to news and journalism studies, text readers have all contributed to the field's consolidation. However, the origins and subsequent development of this consolidating field are multifaceted and intricate. In this analysis, we distinguish four separate yet overlapping and coexisting stages in the development of journalism research history: Although the field originated from normative research on the role of the press in society conducted by German scholars, it gained prominence with the empirical turn, which was especially significant in the United States. It was then enhanced by a sociological turn that followed, which was especially significant among Anglo-American scholars, and it has now expanded its scope to reflect the realities of a globalized world thanks to the global-comparative turn.

This book aims to contribute to a discussion on the future direction of journalism research, in addition to providing an overview of how journalism is researched now. Every chapter

considers potential study avenues, emphasizing that media and society as a whole are experiencing significant change in this day and age. In light of these circumstances, we think that reflecting on the worldwide power connections that define journalism studies' concerns is one of the field's biggest present difficulties.

The inclination of anthropologists to "study down," or concentrate on the lives of comparatively weak and culturally remote communities, has drawn criticism from their peers.2. It might be countered that by giving elite people, news organizations, and texts a disproportionate amount of attention, journalism scholars have concentrated on "studying up" or doing "elite research." Which news articles and news texts are well-documented and which are overlooked has been significantly influenced by the process of researching. Studies on news organizations, for instance, have often concentrated on journalism produced in large, frequently national television and newspaper newsrooms in affluent countries. Analyses of news texts also tend to concentrate on either the everyday news processes or outputs of elite news agencies, or momentous events and tragedies. Nonetheless, we would want to propose that a thriving discipline of journalism studies has to start exploring outside this specific domain. This suggests that academics should expand their studies beyond elite countries, top news organizations, and well-known journalists, as well as outside mainstream media [3], [4].

For starters, journalism studies tend to overlook the work that is done in less glamorous journalistic workplaces, which are still dominating in terms of the amount of material produced, the viewers for the information produced, and the number of news professionals employed by such companies. This scientific disregard for much of the profession it purports to be studying is especially troubling since working circumstances for journalists vary greatly based on social, political, technical, and economic settings. The well-documented journalism cultures tend to serve as the standard and reliable explanations of what journalism is all about when there are no opposing viewpoints. For example, even though most journalists are employed by local or regional media, their professional behaviors have received disproportionate attention.

The political economy of publishing and academia can explain the focus on elite, national, or metropolitan media organizations in part. Scholars studying well-known, national, and elite news organizations are more likely to receive institutional approval and prestige, grant money, publications, and promotions from such studies than from studies of more marginalized media practices. Furthermore, generalizations and assertions of a "shared culture" may be more easily made about the relatively small number of prestigious national news organizations, but they are far more challenging to apply to the wide range of local, alternative, and specialty media practices.

This makes the marginalized journalistic methods' abandonment in the newsroom particularly concerning. Certain groups of news workers are often overlooked in research. Among other underrepresented groups, it primarily maps the professional cultures of privileged full-time news reporters over casualized, multi-skilled, and freelance journalists. This is true even if the workforce of journalists is becoming more and more dependent on freelancers and short-term jobs.

Researchers in journalism studies also overlook other types of journalism creation that take place outside of the newsroom, even though they could contribute significantly to the material that news organizations publish. This is especially true for specialized journalism, which usually sits at the bottom of the newsroom hierarchy and is cut off from the thrill of newsgathering. Consequently, there has been less focus on the work of journalists covering the arts, music, and features. Scholars have also overlooked the significant number of

journalists working in business journalism, a field that is expanding rapidly and whose success is correlated with broader societal trends like the globalization of money. Despite their wider appeal and creative story-telling techniques, popular types of journalism have also gotten little attention.

The growing significance of convergence emphasizes the need for journalism studies to investigate the boundaries of journalism by looking at online news aggregators, blogs, podcasts, free sheets, advertorials, talk shows, and user-generated content, as well as how these developments have affected our understanding of journalism. This is also known as "citizen journalism." Though these liminal journalism practices have often been overlooked since they represent disadvantaged news providers, as researchers become more aware of the seismic changes they signify, they are nonetheless becoming more prominent in journalism studies. With new communication technologies that fundamentally challenge established boundaries between information production and consumption and raise new concerns about journalism's identity and positioning in a mediatized society, scholars must reevaluate journalism's place in an increasingly globalized and mutually interconnected world.

In a similar vein, journalism studies might benefit from shifting their emphasis from media producers and texts to a more complex understanding of news viewers. Researchers may be ignorant of important and productive lines of inquiry by the tendency replicated here to divide production, content, and viewers. Scholars should model and study journalism as a complicated process including creators, content, and viewers to fully appreciate its significance. Scholars must establish a connection between the human, organizational, and social factors that impact news creation and the news content itself, as well as how news coverage affects these factors. It is necessary to reconsider traditional metaphors of journalism as an information-transmission process in light of the idea that journalism is a cultural activity that is fundamentally predicated on a public negotiation of meaning. If journalism is to be more reflexive about the power dynamics that underpin its practices, it must also produce more in-depth knowledge about the ideological frameworks that underpin the highly rationalized processes of news production and evaluate how these frameworks reproduce social and cultural inequality. Additionally, journalism must evaluate how alternative journalism can challenge or at least scrutinize these hegemonic frameworks.

Examining the experiences of journalists in understudied media, professions, and regions would also help to challenge the global power structures that are perpetuated in academic research. Journalism research, according to Pan, Chan, and Lo, "articulates with the social setting where it is conducted, drawing from it inspirations, resources, and insights, and reflecting, speaking to, as well as shaping the setting in specific ways," much like "any discursive system." Rather than being taken for granted, Western models and ideas should be questioned from a genuinely global viewpoint that does not give preference to anyone's local point of view.

More comparative, international research that takes cultural competence into account might lead to such a drastic globalization of the discipline. This trend is undoubtedly apparent in the work that the global-comparative shift represents, and if journalism studies are to realize its full potential, it should be pursued further. Thus, for journalism studies to be genuinely global, it has to focus more on areas of the globe that are still mostly ignored by scholars of journalism, such as sub-Saharan Africa, portions of the Middle East, Asia, and South America. Comparative study may also provide doors for academic engagement for scholars in less developed areas by giving them access to information that is unequally disseminated. It is much more crucial to internationalize the field of journalism studies as a pedagogical intervention: Many academics instruct current and aspiring journalists from regions where

journalism practices vary so much that there is nothing to be found in the body of extant literature. Sociology, history, linguistics, political science, and cultural studies are just a few of the social sciences and humanities fields that are included in the multidisciplinary field of journalism studies. Scholars of journalism have the chance to add to discussions that go beyond the boundaries of communication studies, media studies, and journalism.

Lastly, we should be aware of and thoughtful about the power dynamics that exist between journalism studies and the academic and professional domains that it is tied to. There hasn't always been an easy link between journalism studies and its surrounding areas, journalistic practice, and journalism education. At the crossroads of three distinct groups with sometimes conflicting objectives, journalism studies find themselves in challenging situations: journalists, journalism educators, and journalism academics. Their connection is so often characterized by unease and ignorance: Journalists argue that scholars and educators of journalism should not be discussing their problems; scholars argue that journalists and educators of journalism should be more theoretical; journalists claim that educators of journalism have their heads in the sand and scholars of journalism have their heads in the clouds [5], [6].

Therefore, the transfer of information generated by scientific investigation to the realms of journalism practice and education has to be given greater focus in journalism studies. Lastly, for journalism studies to completely realize its potential, more explanatory research that goes beyond simple description should be done, as well as more systematic, properly longitudinal research that pays close attention to how journalism evolves. Using this method will enable us to examine journalism within its cultural and historical context. Stated differently, our forecast for the field of journalism studies is that it will be seen as part of a complex global environment, but also as a discipline that is deeply ingrained in specific historical, political, economic, and cultural settings. We overlook the various power dynamics that exist in these varied and complicated situations where journalism is studied at our own risk.

DISCUSSION

Of fact, the word journal-ism is older than the phrase journalism history, which is a very new concept. However, the conversation that is now referred to as journalism history has a longer past that follows the emergence of news culture as a subset of media culture and print culture in turn. major styles of documenting news history emerged with every major development in news culture. The line that has historically divided journalism history from other types of media history has been brittle and impermeable. An identity issue that has plagued journalism history since the 1970s foreshadows, in many respects, the current crisis facing the field. The easiest method to trace journalistic history is to historicize them since they are so diverse. This tactic also has the added benefit of demonstrating how the endeavor to write journalism histories has been integrated into a broader endeavor to define and regulate news culture. Because history reveals the contingency and entanglements of professional journalism, it is an invaluable tool for many historians today.

The history of journalism originated from two origins. The first was a kind of broad philosophical curiosity about how communication tools have evolved. This interest can be traced by many researchers to Plato's Phaedrus, which addresses writing-related cognitive concerns. European enlightenment intellectuals paid close attention to how the printing press, followed by alphabetic literacy, led to profound structural transformations in social, cultural, and political life. A similar perspective was voiced by intellectuals from the 20th century including Marshall McLuhan and Harold Adams Innis. This perspective often manifests as a propensity to highlight the role that machines have had in influencing the development of

journalism in works of journalism history proper. The advent of new technologies, such as the steam press or radio, is often used by comprehensive histories as narrative turning points, and journalists' autobiographies frequently focus on the changes in newsroom equipment throughout their protagonists' careers.

More Vocational was the second source for journalism history. By projecting its identity backward into the past, new work created a history for itself as it evolved and became more professional. Thus, the history of journalism developed with it, and its understanding of the past is a characteristic of its real growth.

A Priori History

In Europe, printed newspapers first emerged around the start of the seventeenth century. They were an afterthought of the so-called printing revolution, which initially focused on expanding and duplicating the kinds of books that had previously been printed by hand before generating fresh forms that fully used the printing press's capabilities. Because printers and their customers did not quickly understand the purposes of newspapers, newspapers did not become established right away. However, as a result of the growing theological dispute that followed the Protestant Reformation, as well as the emergence of new economic institutions and the growth of the market society, journalists and businesspeople created newspapers as useful mediums. Newspapers in the past catered to particular audiences. These kinds of newspapers were widespread in Western European major cities by the mid-17th century. The first English-language newspapers were published in Amsterdam in 1620, making it a particularly significant site. Amsterdam was a leading city in both trade and religious freedom.

It wasn't until the seventeenth century that newspapers started to regularly target a wider audience with political issues. As the bourgeois public sphere grew, the newspaper became a vehicle for ongoing political discussion and debate rather than just a means of doing business or addressing religious disputes. Newspapers became become essential tools throughout the bourgeois upheavals. The American Revolution, the French Revolution, and the Glorious Revolution in England all produced vibrant news cultures and active warfare in print [7], [8].

Newspaper political behavior standards emerged as political systems in Europe and North America matured. The newspaper developed as a crucial component of a framework for expressing public opinion. Newspaper speech asserted a set of expectations for rational discourse consistent with the characteristics of the bourgeois public sphere, as defined by Jürgen Habermas, as it declared its rightful place in society. On the other hand, historians cannot agree upon whether these standards accurately captured the sociology of the news. The openness, impersonality, and rationality that Habermas attributes to public conversation in the eighteenth century are disputed by many. However, newspapers consistently referred to standards of universal rational monitoring, even though they were biased, passionate, and exclusive. The letters of Publius and Cato, which were reproduced often, were prime instances of this kind of journalistic debate. The Federalist Papers, a collection of letters written by three prominent political figures, are the result of their publication. Their nickname alludes to a Roman Republic figure, but its exact translation is "public man," or citizen, a rhetorical device used to highlight a nonpartisan concern for the common welfare.

A link between the media and democracy was established by the revolutions of the eighteenth century. Since the people's will, rather than blood or divine authority, now serves as the foundation for political legitimacy, the primary challenge facing effective governance is the ongoing creation of consent via public opinion. Public opinion was an issue that fascinated political theorists. They started actively commenting on the need for national communication

systems and promoting what we would now refer to as infrastructure development—the creation of postal systems and the transportation networks they required—after they had some experience with the workings of government.

News culture management and censorship were often seen as legitimate and essential until far into the eighteenth century. Print news was widely disseminated during and benefited from the Thirty Years' War, and it was closely linked to the protracted religious conflicts that ensued after the Protestant Reformation. The governments of Europe believed that preserving peace and legitimacy required control over public discourse. They created licensing and prohibition-based press control mechanisms with the Vatican. Meanwhile, patents and copyrights were developed in collaboration with printers and booksellers. Essentially, the state granted monopolies that guaranteed income and promoted moral conduct [9], [10].

One of the prevalent storylines in the history of early journalism was "freedom of the press." Stories of valiant propagandists and publicists fighting censorship during the Revolutionary era found their way into the public conversation around political disputes. A liberal canon would emerge over the next century or more, drawing thinkers such as Thomas Jefferson, John Milton, and Thomas Paine into extensive dialogue with one another. This mostly manufactured dialogue would become ingrained in the common history of journalism in the years to come.

CONCLUSION

This study has provided a comprehensive exploration of the multifaceted landscape of journalism studies, acknowledging its historical roots, evolutionary stages, and the challenges it faces in the contemporary global context. Beginning with the acknowledgment of journalism as a sense-making practice integral to modernity, the study delves into the various dimensions of journalism studies, highlighting its role in shaping collective reality, fostering democratic engagement, and chronicling the continuous drama of societal struggles. The study emphasizes the evolving nature of journalism, challenging the notion of its demise and proposing a rebirth. It traces the development of journalism studies through distinct stages, from normative research to empirical and sociological turns, ultimately expanding its scope to reflect the realities of a globalized world. The establishment of dedicated journals and academic associations attests to the growing significance of journalism studies in the field of communication. Furthermore, the study advocates for a shift in focus from media producers and texts to a more nuanced understanding of news viewers. It encourages scholars to explore the intricate connections between creators, content, and viewers, considering journalism as a complex cultural activity. Additionally, the study underscores the need for reflexivity within journalism, prompting a deeper examination of power dynamics, ideological frameworks, and the reproduction of social and cultural inequality within the field. The study concludes by addressing the historical roots of journalism and its evolution, emphasizing the need for a more thorough, explanatory, and longitudinal research approach. It advocates for a global perspective in journalism studies, urging scholars to engage with underrepresented regions and cultures, and fostering a more comprehensive understanding of the discipline. Finally, the study recognizes the complex relationships between journalism studies, journalistic practice, and journalism education, urging for greater collaboration and information transfer.

REFERENCES:

[1] A. Paíno-Ambrosio and M. I. Rodríguez-Fidalgo, “A proposal for the classification of immersive journalism genres based on the use of virtual reality and 360º video,” *Rev. Lat. Comun. Soc.*, 2019, doi: 10.4185/RLCS-2019-1375en.

[2] F. Stalph, “Hybrids, materiality, and black boxes: Concepts of actor-network theory in data journalism research,” *Sociol. Compass*, 2019, doi: 10.1111/soc4.12738.

[3] K. Ketriyawati, “ANALISIS BENTUK DAN FAKTOR PENYEBAB PERUBAHAN MAKNA PEYORASI DAN AMELIORASI DALAM BERITA KRIMINAL,” *Diksi*, 2019, doi: 10.21831/diksi.v27i2.25317.

[4] F. Hanusch and E. C. Tandoc, “Comments, analytics, and social media: The impact of audience feedback on journalists’ market orientation,” *Journalism*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1464884917720305.

[5] V. Malila, “Beyond Watchdog Journalism: Media and Social Accountability in South Africa,” *African Journal. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/23743670.2019.1621918.

[6] M. Konow-Lund, Y. B. Hågvar, and E. K. Olsson, “Digital Innovation During Terror and Crises,” *Digit. Journal.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/21670811.2018.1493937.

[7] S. VanCour, “Radio and Sound Studies,” in *Cinema and Media Studies*, 2019. doi: 10.1093/obo/9780199791286-0312.

[8] S. Kozyryatska, “Hate speech in Ukrainian internet space: religious context,” *Obraz*, 2019, doi: 10.21272/obraz.2019.3(32)-87-97.

[9] R. M. Perloff, *The Dynamics of News*. 2019. doi: 10.4324/9781351233514.

[10] A. Hoag and J. Grzeslo, “Awareness of and experience with online outsourcing journalism labor markets: A benchmark study of freelance journalists,” *First Monday*, 2019, doi: 10.5210/fm.v24i1.9581.

CHAPTER 3

SHAPING PUBLIC OPINION: A HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF THE EVOLUTION OF JOURNALISM AND ITS IMPACT ON DEMOCRATIC SOCIETIES

Dr. Sarangapani Nivarthi, Associate Professor
Department of General Management, Centre for Management Studies, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.sarangapani.nivarthi@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

This study delves into the historical evolution of journalism, tracing its roots from the age of revolution to its contemporary forms. It explores the complex relationship between partisan journalism, press freedom, and the emergence of professionalization in Western nations. The study further examines the global dissemination of journalistic models and ideologies, including the influence of communism on media systems. It also discusses the challenges faced by journalism in the post-modern era, characterized by globalization, digital technologies, and shifting paradigms of news consumption. By analyzing various genres of journalism history, the study provides insights into the construction of journalistic norms, the representation of diverse voices, and the role of journalism in shaping cultural narratives. The conclusion reflects on the ongoing challenges and opportunities for journalism as it continues to adapt to contemporary demands.

KEYWORDS:

Democratic, Journalism, Market, Public Opinion.

INTRODUCTION

The Age of Revolution suggested that public opinion produced via a debate forum guided by standards of fair, reasonable speech should serve as the foundation for democratic rule. However, the reality of the political uses of the newspaper always posed a challenge to this hypothesis. The dubious legality of the instruments of party rivalry, such as the press, was a major source of heat throughout the early stages of party politics in all the new democracies.

In most Western nations, a blatantly partisan kind of news culture had taken hold by the start of the nineteenth century. It is only at this moment that the term journalism is used. It was originally used to describe the opinion journalism that was so popular in the years after the Revolution and is French in origin. By 1830, the phrase had made its way into English, but it still denoted party disagreement over matters of public concern and had a pejorative meaning as an indication of dysfunction in politics.

Partially justified, although never quite respected, biased journalism progressively gained credibility. As democratic rule spread, the sight of political struggle began to look beneficial. Prominent observers contended that political debate functioned to advance a broad societal good, much like the rivalry of the marketplace. Additionally, when press regulations were loosened in much of Western Europe and North America in the early to mid-1800s, political journalism and a more open newspaper market combined to produce something like a marketplace of public opinion.

Risk Arises

The first publications of what would eventually be known as journalism history came around this time. Early chronicles that documented the development of printing, including

newspapers among other media, are examples of precursors. These mostly joyous narratives of the press's ascent were often also patriotic, tinged with a feeling of the victory of democratic governance and press freedom. The books were part of what historians have referred to as the Whig conception of history, a grand narrative centered on the inescapable struggle between liberty and authority that emphasized liberty's gradual advancement. Even if ideas about journalism and press freedom drastically evolved over the 20th century, the Whig model of journalism history would continue to rule the field. Whig history was more biographical. As a result of its reliance on the development of a distinctly liberal interpretation of freedom, the model often portrayed powerful people as agents of change. Personifications of news organizations were also common. Newspaper publishers' early biographies are among the examples. A devoted former assistant would establish a precedent for extolling the virtues of the publisher in a well-read autobiography, and that opinion would persist in background biographies written by writers unrelated to the well-known person or in later, expanded editions of the book. This pattern was created in the United States by Parton's biography of Horace Greeley, and it was subsequently adopted by authors for press magnates such as Edward Scripps, James Gordon Bennett, Joseph Pulitzer, and William Randolph Hearst [1], [2].

A mass press began to emerge in the United States and Europe in the middle to late nineteenth century, country by nation. The emergence of the press was correlated with the continued existence of taxes or other press regulations. In contrast to the previous, mostly political publications, this commercialized press was more dependent on advertising money and, as a result, catered to a wider readership. By dividing these more diverse readerships into gender, age, and class categories, newspapers were able to create targeted readerships that could then be marketed to sponsors. More event-oriented news, particularly criminal news, as well as more reporting on social and cultural issues—also known as human interest stories—were included in the mass circulation press's content.

Around the same period, journalism started to set itself apart from its "other," and as a result of feeding readers spectacular tales, the popular press gained a reputation for being on the periphery of society and came to represent news reporting in its contemporary meaning. Yellow journalism was a multinational phenomenon that was dubbed after the inexpensive paper made possible by the new wood pulp technology, or more likely after the yellow covers of previous cheap crime fiction. Additionally, illustrated news gained popularity—first in Britain, then directly down the line in France and Spain, and finally in North America and other European nations. The rise of the popular press coincided with the emergence of a politics of news quality. The influence of journalism on public morality and intelligence was a source of complaint for both reformers and conventional elites. While the widespread thirst for controversy and sensation appeared to coarsen public mores, the episodic nature of newspaper material was supposed to hinder the people's capacity to engage in prolonged or nuanced thinking or discussion.

Thus, the duty of elevating and regulating news culture fell to journalism. Public leaders, who desired more civility in news culture, saw this objective to be in line with their goals. One result of this dynamic in the US was the identification of an implicit constitutional right to privacy. The involvement of other parties reinforced the journalists' mission to sanitize the story. To shield themselves from a public that was beginning to see the press's power as a threat, publishers sought to improve their reputation. Conversely, news personnel wanted to improve the standing of their jobs.

A specific sociology of news work coincided with the endeavor to improve journalism. There are three main categories of news workers: reporters who gathered news from beats and

recorded meetings and other news events; editors who compiled news and wrote opinion pieces; and correspondents who wrote lengthy letters from far-off places and generally had a voice and expressed attitudes. The endeavor to elevate journalism facilitated improvements to this sociology. Combining the roles of reporter and correspondent and erecting walls of reified separation between them and editors and business managers resulted in the emergence of a proto-professional type of journalism. The emergence of muckraking in the United States and other forms of exposing journalism abroad was indicative of the enhanced autonomy that resulted from this redefining of journalism [3], [4].

Advanced Study

The Western journalism profession was prepared to embark on a professionalization initiative at the start of the twentieth century. The process was evident in well-recognized phenomena such as the establishment of journalism schools, press clubs, organizations, and codes of ethics. In some regions, credentialing systems were created by governments, while journalists formed unions in other locations. The most industrialized parts of the news system, particularly urban newspapers, and wire services, gave rise to monopolistic components in all developed nations, supporting the forms of control that an independent profession would impose.For the professionalization initiative, a somewhat different version of journalism history was needed. The goal of the new journalism schools was to create a teachable past that would serve as a moral role model for future journalists. Once its mavericks were removed, the old Whig histories were rather informative.

Raising awareness of the business environment was also necessary while teaching about the journalism industry. The nations with more commercial news outlets, particularly the US, introduced a story about market redemption. The majority of history textbooks used in journalism schools in the United States saw independent journalism as a product of the market that transcended political affiliations. This viewpoint was represented not just in textbooks but also in seminal articles that would go on to become classics in the history of journalism: Walter Lippmann's Two Revolutions in the American Press and Robert Park's Natural History of the Newspaper, both written in the United States. For several reasons, this belief in the power of market forces appears strange. It seemed to call for a deliberate erasure of the mass market press, which at the end of the 1800s had provided the professionalization movement with its immediacy. Additionally, it seemed to hide the monopolistic circumstances in the wire services and the emerging broadcasting medium, which fueled public fear of media dominance and served as a means of enforcing norms on news culture. Furthermore, it seemed to argue against the professionalization project's main tenet, which called for a "wall of separation" between the newsroom and the counting room.

DISCUSSION

In the 20th century, the majority of Western nations organized journalism using the professional model. The endeavor to establish journalism schools, ethical rules, licensing requirements, and unions has been credited with fostering the so-called high modernism of journalism. The professionalization of news was strengthened by the emergence of broadcast journalism, particularly when it was linked to oligopolistic commercial systems or monopolistic national broadcast authorities. The conflicts of the 20th century had a significant role in stoking concerns about the influence of propaganda and instigating the development of precautionary ideas about media accountability. Furthermore, the emergence of the corporate ownership structure promoted professionalization.

There were differences in the West when it came to the formalization of professional journalism. Three paradigms, or "media systems," have been recognized by Daniel Hallin and

Paolo Mancini: market-based systems in the North Atlantic, social democracy in northern Europe, and partizans in southern Europe. However, all three systems were mindful of the need to protect professional journalism from both business and political pressures, as well as from the authority that already exists.

In the meanwhile, press freedom and the independent journalism model were transferred to the east and south. In the eighteenth century, partisan journalism gained traction in the Americas with national liberation movements; nevertheless, at that time. The partisan style of investigative journalism was supplemented and in some instances replaced by another model introduced by the United States after World War II, particularly during the 1970s. The idea of independent journalism had a significant role in the early nationalist movements of the early twentieth century in Asia, particularly in China.

Options

The media networks of the communist regimes of the twentieth century were influenced by the radical political thought of the nineteenth century, which offered an alternative interpretation of journalism and a distinct definition of professionalism. The independence of the intellectual domain was contested by materialisms such as Marxism. Put succinctly, these ideologies see communication as a kind of material creation, particularly mediated communication. Class power in capitalist society is reproduced and incorporated into capitalist communication networks. Class power is mystified by journalism as a habit and as an alienating profession. Thus, the goal of post-capitalist media systems should be to reveal class power and subsequently subvert it. Two distinct ways in which such technologies may reimagine journalism exist. Either a vanguard takes up journalism as its duty, or journalism falls into the realm of common citizens. In the first scenario, journalism would become ingrained in people's everyday lives, whereas in the latter, journalism would become quite professional. Ironically, the media landscapes of the former communist nations moved toward Party vanguardism.

This interpretation of journalism offered an alternative account of the emergence of Western journalism, which was a component of the ideological machinery that maintained capitalist hegemony and a hallmark of the bourgeois class system. The brave reporters were not the heroes of journalism; rather, it was the partisans with integrity who called out institutions from the margins. Karl Marx was one of these reporters. He mostly supported himself during his protracted exile in London by working as a European affairs reporter for Horace Greeley's New York Tribune [5], [6].

A new global order that emerged after World War II favored a vague kind of liberalism. All new national constitutions recognized the concept of sovereignty based on the consent of the governed, which was expressed in the UN Charter. The freedom of speech and the right to communication are guaranteed under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. However, there was a wide variety of potential systems and interpretations encompassed by these formulations. The interpretation of the freedom to communicate that Hallin and Mancini refer to as the North Atlantic or liberal paradigm allowed for the growth of American-style news media, particularly the wire services that provided support for them. Others understood the freedom of communication to relate to people's rights rather than the media's "social responsibility" to uphold these rights. The Hutchins Commission report effectively represented the concept of social responsibility in the United States, echoing a worldwide debate on press accountability, despite its complete omission.

Another influential framework for journalism history based on a comparative media systems approach was prompted by post-war international circumstances. The book Four Theories of

the Press, which created a simplified schema based on philosophical assumptions about the nature of truth, the state, and mankind, is the most significant example of this method. Numerous opponents have called attention to this approach's inadequacies, pointing out that it implicitly presents a natural history that leads to a neoliberal model and incorporates liberal presuppositions without question as well as its disregard for non-Western histories, particularly those of the global south.

Conditions after the war also highlighted the emergence of a global information system. The international wire services' histories were published. The political movement for a New World Information and Communication Order was sparked by criticism of an uneven information flow. It began at UNESCO in the 1970s and peaked with the MacBride Commission report in 1980. However, it was overthrown by a counteroffensive from Western nations and moved to other organizations, such as the GATT in the 1980s and the WTO in the 1990s. These processes were addressed in critical histories of the geography of information, the most significant of which were written by David Harvey and Manuel Castells.

International coverage is often overlooked by historians of journalism. While some excellent works juxtapose national histories, the majority remain within national boundaries. This also applies to media history in general. Due to their deep integration into political life, national media systems are sometimes overlooked by academics, who see them as the political organism's nervous system. Furthermore, national financing is often used for the support of studies and the acquisition of archive assets.

In the contemporary West, the high modern moment began to erode by the close of the 20th century. Previous models of autonomous journalism have been undermined by globalization, the end of the Cold War, the emergence of new digital technologies, the eclipse of public service models of broadcasting and telecommunications, and the waning of traditional cultural support for monolithic national identities. The rise of the 24-hour television news service, the emergence of new "personal" media such as talk radio and the blogosphere, the rise of hybrid journalism and tabloid journalism, particularly in Scandinavia, and a new pattern of partisan media power linked to the post-Soviet media explosion in Eastern Europe and the broadcast entrepreneurs Silvio Berlusconi and Rupert Murdoch in the West are some recent trends in the news industry. proposals for a new public journalism or citizen journalism as well as proposals to reconsider the press's institutional role in the political process arose with the decline of high modernism.

Scholarly Methods

The history of journalism chronicled advancements in media and historical studies with the history of journalism itself. The legal and political environment as well as trends in mainstream historical studies are some of the influences from other disciplines that journalism historians are influenced by.

Possibly the most venerable and well-established academic discipline affecting journalistic history is the history of law and policy. In addition to the press freedom issues already discussed, political and legal changes have solidified journalism's professionalization effort. Professional journalists have adopted the practice of studying the history of journalism as the intentional actions of independent persons, a tendency that has been embraced by lawyers and legal academics. One result of this way of thinking is that journalism has gained legal status. As a specific profession or practice, credentialed journalists obtained rights beyond those of regular citizens before and during court procedures, as well as privileges in policy to allow their presence near government actions. All interactions that have an impact on the political

system fall under the umbrella of communication; nevertheless, due to the emergence of political norms and unique rights surrounding journalistic activity, journalism, and communication are now seen as distinct legal entities.

In some contexts, it has been harder to defend the line dividing journalistic history from the larger history of media and communication. For example, the history of technology suggests that the same factors driving other media activities also influence journalistic practices. One example is communication using telegraphs. It is well known that the telegraph created cooperative newsgathering while also altering the nation-state's space-time matrix. The outcome was a distinct journalistic style that was distinguished by its succinctness and, in the end, its use of the inverted pyramid to structure news tales. A traditional journalism history narrative often emphasizes the transformative power of technology: all thorough histories of journalism touch on the camera and the steam press, and many also touch on the telephone, the typewriter, and the more modern digital technologies. In these histories, agency is not inherent in conscious person actors but rather arises from technology [7], [8].

A distinct drive emerged in the 1970s from the social history movement. Although social history has taken numerous forms, they are all opposed to "great man" history and event-centered history. A common trait among social historians was their commitment to studying history "from the bottom up." This persuasion used a wide range of techniques, starting with the idealistic idea that common people create history most notably articulated in E. From the impersonal histories of the lengthy movements of civilizations and regions in the writings of French Annaliste historians like Fernand Braudel to P. Thompson's Making of the English Working Class. These impulses were mediated via academics such as Michael Schudson, William Gilmore-Lehne, and Robert Darnton for journalism historians. Newsroom ethnography and social history both questioned the philosophical foundations of journalistic practice and the distinctiveness of journalism history, leading some to declare that "there is no such thing as journalism history."

Genres

However, it is clear that journalism history still exists today. It has also split into several genres as a result of the academy becoming more specialized and commercial, as well as the pursuit of marketable formulae by academic publishing. The majority of historical journalism may be divided into four categories: biographical, comprehensive, event-focused, and image-focused. Three of these categories are limited, while one is wide. The biographical genre is the oldest and most likely to remain popular today. There are two real benefits to concentrating on a single actor, whether it is a news company or a journalist. These performers often generate organized sets of original materials, and their personal histories lend themselves to well-written chronological narratives. Numerous biographies have been written about the leading national news outlets in any nation, such as the Times of London or ilCorrieredella Sera in Italy.

The tradition of press biography dates back almost as far as the genre of major journalistic histories. They are almost usually of a national nature. As previously said, the nineteenth century saw the emergence of the first thorough history as well as journalism as a positively recognized field. Compiled to provide the profession with a distinguished past, in-depth histories later evolved into essential instructional resources for journalism programs. These works of professional history often provided progressive narratives that inspired aspiring professionals by demonstrating the increasing autonomy and legitimacy of the field. These histories, which often concentrate on exceptional practitioners, sometimes resemble communal biographies. Critical narratives have been presented by more recent

comprehensive historians. Concentrating on a certain explanatory theme is a typical strategy, as shown by Michael Schudson's analysis of objectivity as a characteristic of a democratic market society.

A third popular category is histories that are event-oriented. An effective hook for examining news coverage may be found in any specific crisis or controversy. The first in this category emerged from journalistic practice; two journalists studied how newspapers covered World War I. Popular histories of significant events are still being produced by journalists from the standpoint of journalistic practice. While this genre often favors simple tales with point-counterpoint, it may also provide academics a chance to investigate the strengths and weaknesses of a press system in a diagnostic manner.

By looking at bigger collectivities, the image-oriented genre aims to broaden the scope of journalism history beyond media executives and businesses. Similar to event-oriented histories, image-oriented histories have drawbacks and opportunities. Studies of images of things like a country or religion, or groups like women or ethnic minorities, are often flat and apparent, but they can reveal and unravel the cultural activity of the press.

Updates

Every one of these popular histories of journalism tends to essentialize journalism, seeing the work of journalists as an unquestionably accepted body of norms. Another approach to journalism history views the issue as how journalism is constructed. The field's agenda has been defined lately by the construction-of-culture presidency. James W. Carey demanded a history of the "form of the report" many years ago. While this history hasn't been documented yet, several recent works have looked at how newspaper format encourages readers to take part in civic rites.

The examination of news format offers an alternative method for addressing the issue of press power. The conventional narratives of journalism history say that the press is powerful to the extent that it can influence public opinion by presenting audiences with accurate facts and compelling arguments. Scholarly understandings of the power of today's media, which highlight agenda-setting, framing, and priming as ways the media reproduce hegemony all issues that traditional journalism history denies do not align with this historical understanding of the press's power. Additionally, conventional journalism history often views journalism as a universal topic. Once again, studies of contemporary media often find certain racial, ethnic, gender, and class valences in media activity. This goes against the consensus. To put it bluntly, conventional journalistic history tries to include women and non-Whites, but it is still mostly White. Although several stories in more or less conventional genres hint at a history of the gendering and race of journalism, no excellent history of these topics has been produced so far [9], [10].

These histories will examine how gender and ethnicity play a role in news reporting. The idea that journalism subjects are laborers has a strained connection with its past. Journalism history's early generations aimed to present its heroes as independent professionals—not the kind of laborers who would have to sign up for unions or bargain over pay and work hours. There have been requests to place the notion of labor at the core of journalistic history for more than ten years. This is a labor-intensive endeavor in and of itself, made simpler in nations with strong central journalistic unions. It needs to be a global history as well. Journalism history is a historical discipline that adapts to the needs of its times, just like any other. However, like other historical disciplines, it makes an effort to position itself as a preservationist and to meet the needs of journalists and journalism education while also

keeping up with the fads and styles of professional historians. The history of journalism will probably keep doing so in the future.

CONCLUSION

The evolution of journalism reflects a dynamic interplay between political, economic, and societal forces, shaping the contours of democratic discourse. From its partisan beginnings to the professionalization initiatives of the 20th century, journalism has played a pivotal role in mediating public opinion. The study underscores the importance of understanding journalism as a multifaceted entity, encompassing biographical, comprehensive, event-focused, and image-oriented genres. As the high modern moment gives way to a rapidly changing media landscape, marked by globalization and digital innovations, journalism faces new challenges and opportunities. The future of journalism hinges on its ability to navigate these complexities, embracing inclusivity, addressing historical biases, and adapting to the evolving needs of diverse audiences. This study contributes to a nuanced understanding of journalism history, emphasizing its continuous evolution and resilience in the face of transformative global shifts.

REFERENCES:

[1] A. Dür, "How interest groups influence public opinion: Arguments matter more than the sources," *Eur. J. Polit. Res.*, 2019, doi: 10.1111/1475-6765.12298.

[2] F. Hashmi, "Shaping Public Opinion and Community Mobilisation: The Role of Urdu Language Media in India," *Soc. Cult. South Asia*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/2393861719845157.

[3] A. Adamczyk and Y. C. Liao, "Examining Public Opinion about LGBTQ-Related Issues in the United States and Across Multiple Nations," *Annual Review of Sociology*. 2019. doi: 10.1146/annurev-soc-073018-022332.

[4] H. Sánchez, J. Aguilar, O. Terán, and J. Gutiérrez de Mesa, "Modeling the process of shaping the public opinion through Multilevel Fuzzy Cognitive Maps," *Appl. Soft Comput. J.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.asoc.2019.105756.

[5] J. Lundälv, "The Challenges of Writing Opinion Pieces in Social Work: A National Online Survey of Swedish Social Workers' Experiences of Influencing Public Opinion," *Br. J. Soc. Work*, 2019, doi: 10.1093/bjsw/bcz058.

[6] J. Weitzman and M. Bailey, "Communicating a risk-controversy: Exploring the public discourse on net-pen aquaculture within the Canadian media," *Aquaculture*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.aquaculture.2019.04.025.

[7] E. A. Buddle and H. J. Bray, "How Farm Animal Welfare Issues are Framed in the Australian Media," *J. Agric. Environ. Ethics*, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s10806-019-09778-z.

[8] R. Found, "Cognition, emotion, personality and the conservation and management of wild ungulates," *Anim. Sentience*, 2019, doi: 10.51291/2377-7478.1459.

[9] M. Repnikova and K. Fang, "Digital media experiments in China: Revolutionizing persuasion under Xi Jinping," *China Q.*, 2019, doi: 10.1017/S0305741019000316.

[10] R. Ventura, X. R. Rodríguez-Polo, and C. Roca-Cuberes, ""Wealthy Gay Couples Buying Babies Produced in India by Poor Womb-Women: Audience Interpretations of Transnational Surrogacy in TV News," *J. Homosex.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/00918369.2017.1422947.

CHAPTER 4

JOURNALISM'S AMBIGUITIES: A COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION OF ITS ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL LANDSCAPE

Ms. Minerva Das, Assistant Professor
Department of General Management, Centre for Management Studies, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- minerva_das@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

This study delves into the multifaceted relationship between journalism and academia, dissecting the existential uncertainties that underlie their coexistence. The research explores the historical evolution of journalism's study, highlighting the discord surrounding its definition and role within the academic domain. With a focus on the conflicting perspectives of journalists, journalism educators, and journalism scholars, the study seeks to address the fragmented nature of journalism studies and proposes recommendations for enhancing the mutual awareness and productivity of this complex partnership.

The study contends that journalism, omnipresent yet understudied, suffers from a lack of cohesive scholarly representation, leading to fragmented and partial analyses. It highlights the role of journalists, educators, and scholars as distinct interpretative communities, each shaping perceptions of journalism according to its unique goals. Furthermore, the study scrutinizes journalism education, tracing its historical development and the persistent divide between humanities and social sciences. It illuminates the challenges faced by journalism educators in reconciling practical skills with academic rigor, leading to a qualitative/quantitative divide. The research sheds light on the impact of academic compartmentalization, which has hindered the comprehensive definition of journalism and limited the variety of news in academic discourse.

The study posits that journalism academics must bridge the gap between disciplinary communities and foster a holistic understanding of journalism. It calls for a re-evaluation of journalism's portrayal in academia to encompass its diverse facets, ultimately contributing to a more nuanced and comprehensive comprehension of the profession.

KEYWORDS:

Academia, Communities, Education, Journalism, Media.

INTRODUCTION

The academic study of journalism is fraught with several unspecified difficulties. The subject of journalism's study has evolved along an uneven path full of isolated pockets of disciplinary knowledge as the familiar forms of journalism take on new dimensions to meet the changing circumstances in which journalism operates.

As a consequence, there is little agreement among us about the two crucial phrases that are the subject of our discussion. We also disagree somewhat regarding the definition of journalism and the proper role of the school in it. This chapter explores the several existential uncertainties that underlie journalism's cohabitation with academia and provides some recommendations to improve the mutual awareness and productivity of their unequal but often mutually beneficial partnership.

Structure and analysis of journalism

In a time when journalism is studied in fields as diverse as communication, literature, business, and sociology, and it can range from individualized blogs to satirical late-night television, reevaluating journalism's place in academia may seem like an unnecessary effort to raise concerns about the sustainability of a phenomenon that appears to be everywhere. But although journalism is omnipresent, its study is nowhere. On the one hand, the evolution of journalism has led to a long history of recurring and unsolved complaints about whether one form, practice, or convention is more appropriate than another to be considered a newsmaking convention. However, research on it has not kept up with the diverse and often unexpected ways in which it has changed throughout time [1], [2].

The conflict that exists between journalism and academia is a reflection of a larger conflict that characterizes media's erratic and patchy presence in society. Critics accused George Orwell of "turning what might have been a good book into journalism" when he used newspaper quotes in his debut book. His collected works were gathered decades later and published under the straightforward title Smothered under Journalism, 1946. Literary greats including Charles Dickens, Samuel Johnson, John Dos Passos, Andre Malraux, Dylan Thomas, and John Hersey all have similar journalistic backgrounds. Such reactions are commonplace despite our deep dependence on journalism to both place us about the greater collective and serve as a springboard for more complex ways of perceiving the world and ourselves.

This is interesting since journalism forms a large portion of our situational knowledge. Without journalists, where would history be? How would literature appear? How might we comprehend how the political system functions? Even if journalism is a phenomenon that extends in many ways across all of the ways that we come together as a group, the adage "it's just journalism" endures.

The cohabitation of journalism and academia depends on several existential ambiguities that arise from this conflict. The most evident ambiguity arises from the practical concerns that underpin the profession of journalism, which is defined differently every time alleged intruders blogs, citizen journalists, late-night comedians, or reality TV—approach its perceived boundaries. A secondary origin of ambiguity stems from the educational aspects related to journalism and higher education. There are many different ways to address the issue of how we teach what we believe we know, especially when journalism's boundaries shift. However, rather than being ahead of its quickly changing boundaries, those who teach what counts and does not qualify as journalistic practice and convention tend to lag. Lastly, one of the most important sources of ambiguity relates to the conceptual aspects of the relationship—that is, what journalism scholars research. Because scholars have used a range of lenses to examine journalism over the years—including its technology, performance, impact, and craft they haven't yet created a scholarly portrait of the field that integrates all of these lenses into a cohesive representation of what journalism is and can be. Rather, the study of journalism is still fragmented, imperfect, and partial, which leaves practitioners unsure of what it means to consider journalism in its broadest sense.

By addressing these sources of ambiguity, this chapter considers several significant issues that the study of modern journalism must contend with. It makes an argument for a place for reflection on the background conditions surrounding journalism practice and research as well as the extent to which the underlying presumptions of journalism align with the overall context of modern journalism. What aspects of journalism and its study have received special attention, and what has been neglected? When considering journalism studies in a global

setting, where variation has not been as much acknowledged or accommodated as it exists, these problems become even more crucial.

A View of Journalism and Interpretive Communities

The way academics think and who they think influence what they believe, and nowhere has this been more established than in the sociology of knowledge. The idea that research relies on creating common paradigms that identify and define issues and processes in ways that the community can recognize is one with which Thomas Kuhn is most closely associated. In the process of reaching a consensus, proponents of divergent viewpoints quarrel about definitions, frames of reference, and limits on inclusion and exclusion. Once a consensus has been reached, new occurrences are often categorized along already established categories. Put another way, our way of thinking is predestined and prioritizes community, solidarity, and power.

This idea extends well beyond Kuhn's writings; scholars such as Emile Durkheim, Robert Park, Michel Foucault, Peter Berger, Thomas Luckmann, and Nelson Goodman have all made the case in varying degrees that the social group is essential to developing worldviews. The concept of interpretative communities, first put out by Stanley Fish and then expanded by Zelizer, Berkowitz, and others in conjunction with journalism, aids in placing the methods used in information sharing as essential to the knowledge that is produced. Understanding that communities with common perspectives on the evidence offer light on how important problems are resolved and reframed makes the individuals, groups, institutions, and disciplines of study involved in journalism analysis essential to comprehending the nature of journalism. Therefore, inquiry is not just an intellectual but also a social act, as the anthropologist Mary Douglas observed, "True solidarity is only possible to the extent that individuals share the categories of their thought."

This raises an opportunity to consider the factors that affect journalism and how it should be studied. In this sense, no one voice in the study of journalism is superior to or more authoritative than the others, and there is also no one cohesive definition of journalism. Instead, a variety of perspectives provide a deeper and more comprehensive understanding of what journalism is, since each has developed alongside its own set of beliefs about what counts and how.

Journalism has always been a relatively unfeasible field of study. The common concern for journalism, which is fundamental to each of the three communities that these people represent—journalists, journalism educators, and journalism scholars has not stayed at the forefront of their joint efforts. Rather, the importance and viability of journalism have been undermined by complaints that others don't see what matters most. For example, journalists argue that academics and educators shouldn't be discussing sensitive topics like dirty laundry, scholars argue that journalists and educators don't know enough about theory, and educators argue that journalists have their heads in the sand and academics have their heads in the clouds.

The concern for journalism has often been pushed aside as everyone has become obsessed with trying to be heard above the cacophony of competing voices. Tensions concerning who can best assert their right to speak over others and who is best positioned to defend it have thus underpinned the capacity to talk about journalism. Each of the several perspectives in journalism research forms a kind of interpretative community. Each has established ways for thinking about journalism in line with its own goals, having defined it following those goals [3], [4].

Journalists

Journalists are people who work in a wide variety of fields related to news reporting, such as "reporting, criticism, editorializing and the conferral of judgment on the shape of things," according to Stuart Adam. The importance of journalism has never been questioned, and although there has been constant discussion about it, both in defense of and in opposition to its performance, no one has ever suggested that it is irrelevant. Instead, the demands of the modern world have emphasized the importance of journalism and the vital role it can play in assisting people in making sense of their everyday lives as well as their connections to the greater political system.

But in reality, not all of journalism's promise has materialized. Journalists in the modern era have faced several challenges. In the current economic climate, the news is always being forced to operate as a precarious for-profit venture across a growing number of sources due to declining revenues, fragmentation, branding, and bottom-line constraints. These channels haven't always resulted in more comprehensive coverage, and many journalists are now multitasking stories in ways that would be unrecognizable to those of earlier generations. Every media outlet in the US is losing readers, except for the ethnic press: broadcast and cable news, mainstream newspapers, and the alternative press. Modern journalism has entered a "new era of shrinking ambitions," and it is no longer a stable business.

The political climate has undermined the journalist's ability to operate in traditional ways, and both the left and the right have attacked journalists politically by arguing for differing conceptions of what constitutes "journalistic performance." While in more stable political regimes the conflicting and contradictory demands from the left and right have frozen portions of media's performance, the collapse of the nation-state in many parts of the globe has created more problems about how best journalism can function. All of this has led to an untenable situation for journalists, who have been involved in several dubious alliances with the military, local interests, and the government. In the US, journalists have tended to cover stories that appeal to "safe" political spaces, resulting in news that is marked by an increased emphasis on localization, personalization, and oversimplification. Journalists have been trained to adhere to several practice paradigms, none of which have been entirely appropriate for the complexity of the current international political contexts and not necessarily with deliberate consideration.

The blogosphere and other platforms have presented journalists with new technical problems that have called into question the very success of news reporting. Along with the fact that news is covered, the significance of how journalists report it has diminished. With journalism "becoming a smaller part of people's information mix," alternative websites like late-night television comedies, blogs, and online publications like Global Voices have taken the lead in gatekeeping. In that sense, it has been believed that viewers of websites such as Comedy Central's The Daily Show are more knowledgeable about current affairs than viewers of conventional media.

Finally, there have been several moral scandals involving journalists. Events involving Judith Miller or Jayson Blair in the US or the Gilligan Affair in the UK have all called into question the moral character of journalists, opening the door for a push for citizen journalism, or "handmade media," in which the role of journalists is being increasingly assumed by private individuals. The public's increased awareness of journalism's shortcomings has also contributed to the argument that news media outlets in the US are "less accurate, less caring, less moral, and more inclined to cover up rather than correct mistakes."

All of this indicates that journalists have not done as well as they might have in conveying to the global community the significance and centrality of journalism. Concerns about shifting notions of what constitutes a journalist remain: Does the Weather Channel or Sharon Osbourne count? The question of whether technologies are legitimate tools for news production is likewise fraught with questions. For example, can mobile phones and reality television qualify? And lastly, there is no definitive response to the central question of journalism's purpose. Does it serve only as a source of knowledge, or does it actively combine community and public citizenship? The answer to this issue has become more challenging due to the differences in how journalism functions throughout the globe, such as the differences between partisan models that are popular in Southern Europe and developmental journalism that is common in parts of Asia [5], [6].

This has resulted in part from the fact that journalism's self-definition is based on several competing visions. Is it a trade, a career, a group of people, an industry, an organization, a company, or a way of thinking? Given that it likely combines elements of all of these, it is important to better understand how they complement and sometimes conflict with one another. This is crucial since there has never been a true advertisement for journalism's instruments, nor is their importance given equal weight. One area of journalism that has been poorly handled is images, in particular. Pictures often appear with no credits, no descriptions, and no clear connection to the sentences that accompany them. However, the tendency to resort to pictures during times of crisis—that is, to use more, bolder, bigger, and more prominent images—has not been well matched to the unequal standards that images use to communicate news. There were 2.5 times as many pictures on the front pages of a newspaper like the New York Times after the September 11 terrorist attacks and the start of the US war in Iraq than there were during normal times. The absence of a well-defined set of guidelines is concerning since images have become more important in journalism, despite their inadequate attention. Furthermore, since their purportedly "correct usage" has not been sorted out, the way the image is presented has become a free-for-all, with individuals yelling at any news picture that bothers them. This implies that others—politicians, lobbyists, concerned citizens, grieving parents, and even militia members—have been able to make the calls in place of journalists because of the latter's reluctance to carry out its mandate.

DISCUSSION

The extent to which crisis has taken over as the standard setting for a large portion of journalistic activity has also gone unappreciated. The evolution of crisis as the norm rather than the exception of journalism suggests a need to be more explicit about how such impulses play into newsmaking since there has been a lot more in the news that arises from improvisation, pure good or bad luck, and ennui than is usually acknowledged. Because catastrophe has been excluded, journalism has seemed to be a lot more predictable and controllable than it is. Because of all of this, journalists are now a little disconnected from the public, criticism, and themselves. Certain factors, such as the audience's requirements, the evolving nature of journalism, or the things that are marginalized in the newsroom but still need attention, like inspiration and creativity, have not received enough attention. Thus, it should come as no surprise that journalists consistently get the lowest ratings in almost all public opinion surveys conducted in the United States.

Journalism Interests

The requirement to introduce beginners to the journalistic trade has united the field of journalism educators. Even while vernacular education has varied depending on the place, it has often shown similar patterns. Around 1900, the teaching of a vernacular trade started in

the humanities in the United States. Newswriting and journalism history were transferred from English departments to the nascent stages of a journalism curriculum, which later encompassed ethics and the law. In an attempt to create a science of journalism, other initiatives emerged in the social sciences in the late 1920s. These initiatives placed craft, often known as "skills" classes, as one-fourth of a curriculum that included courses in public opinion, psychology, economics, and survey research. As a result, disagreements about what kind of research might best prepare journalists to be journalists ensnared journalism educators in the crossfire between the humanities and social sciences. This division still exists for many, as seen by the so-called qualitative/quantitative divide in journalistic methods.

The long-standing practice of apprenticeship education in the United Kingdom and the widely held belief that journalism's "technical elements" were "lacking in academic rigor" presented challenges for journalism education. Practical journalism was not included in the curriculum until 1937, and it wasn't until sociology and political science—thanks in large part to Jeremy Tunstall's efforts—arrived in the late 1960s that it was considered a setting worthy of scholarly study. First, there was a clear academic interest in the social sciences in Germany and Latin America, which drove journalism education toward sociology and professional concepts.

Initially providing an old-fashioned apprenticeship, journalism educators eventually came to address journalism by dividing it into technologies of production, separating newspapers, magazines, television, and radio from each other. In each case, the academic interest among educators helped link journalists to the outside world, but it also did enormous damage to the craft, leveling it down to what James Carey called a “signaling system." This was a location where journalism as a whole, composed of many different pieces, might be lost. Furthermore, according to Carey, the resulting curriculum often lacked "historical understanding, criticism, or self-consciousness." In this sense, teaching journalism led to disseminating ideas across the university curriculum. It became recognized as a component of "the vernacular, the vulgate" in the humanities. It became recognized in the social sciences as a means of influencing public opinion rather than as a significant entity in and of itself.

Journalists and Scholars

The last group of people that journalism is interested in is journalism academics, who haven't yet produced a comprehensive definition of the field despite a vast body of literature on the principles, methods, and effects of journalism. Nevertheless, journalism is taught in every university course. Academic endeavors in communication, media studies, and journalism schools, as well as the less apparent goals of composition sequences, history, sociology, urban studies, political science, economics, and business, have all come to include journalism. This indicates that the academy has seen firsthand a great deal of what has been outlined so far in terms of developing a unique and distinct interpretative community. Because academics often work within the constraints and restrictions of disciplinary communities, the viewpoints that these groups espouse often influence the subjects that they investigate. These fields, which resemble interpretative communities, have contributed to the definition of what constitutes evidence and how. In a similar vein, they have rendered decisions about the categories of study that are excluded.

What role has journalism played in the curriculum? A definition of journalism has been thwarted by this compartmentalization, which has focused on the component functions of journalism rather than its overall structure. Journalism has been studied in pockets, each of which has separated elements of the phenomena from the rest. As a result, the field of journalism study has found itself at odds with itself, with humanistic journalism scholars and

journalism educators at odds with social science scholars, and a plethora of independent academic endeavors occurring across numerous disciplines without the shared knowledge essential to scholarly inquiry. Journalists have traditionally opposed attempts to look closely at their workplace alongside these initiatives.

There have been negative effects of this. One is that the variety of news has been reduced. Because academics haven't created a corpus of work that encompasses all of journalism, they have essentially defined it in ways that favor one kind of hard news over another. Thus, a growing divide between "the realities of journalism and its official presentation of self" has been pushed by the metonymic bias of academic studies. Long-term absentees include copy-editors, graphic designers, online journalists, journals of opinion, camera operators, tabloids, and satirical late-night shows. Put differently, the school has promoted specific vantage points for thinking about journalism that fails to take into consideration the wide range of aspects that make up journalism. Most of the variety in the news has vanished [7], [8].

The journalistic profession has encountered a like fate. The academy's push to professionalize journalism—which was primarily motivated by its sociological investigation—has persuaded journalists that they must become professionals whether they want to or not, raising the stakes of the profession and often harming those who want to pursue it. This has had concrete effects in that conventional ideas of craft have disappeared. For example, the imposition of codified rules of entry and exclusion has led to a position of anti-professionalization among many European journalists: in the UK, there has been a failure to accommodate the increasing number of recently educated journalists; in France, investigative reporting has become overly aggressive.

Yet craft, itself the defining characteristic of journalism, has faded to the background of what is necessary to know. As longtime British correspondent James Cameron put it, "It is fatuous to compensate for our insecurity by calling ourselves members of a profession; it is both pretentious and disabling; we are at our best craftsmen."

International journalism has encountered a variety of limiting fates. The great bulk of research has concentrated on journalism in US contexts, even though the profession has evolved to take on distinct forms in the many places it has been practiced. This has left ignored certain forms of journalism conducted outside of journalism's Western core since a large portion of the research has been US-centered, serving as a very narrow yet prestigious gold standard for a broad variety of journalistic practices adopted around the globe. Furthermore, it has not addressed the many unresolved questions about journalism that abound in the world.

Furthermore, even if the history of the nation-state has shaped a large portion of journalism's past, it is difficult to maintain that this connection still holds in the modern global world. Even if the importance of the nation-state has been weakened as a result of globalization, what other motivation should drive the new media structure it produces? Here, the opposing examples of capitalism and religious fundamentalism serve to illustrate how these movements have redrawn the boundaries between what is and is not acceptable. As a result, the question of what journalism is for has changed, with a tendency toward unethical journalistic practices that prioritize the dissemination of supposedly free information.

These events together imply that journalism academics have not gone far enough in nurturing the connections that keep them connected to journalism in all of its manifestations. This is crucial because there is a body of information about journalism that primarily speaks to the converted rather than fostering a common understanding of the profession's goals or methods of operation [9], [10].

CONCLUSION

The exploration of journalism's cohabitation with academia reveals a tapestry woven with intricacies and conflicts. From the challenges faced by journalists in an ever-evolving media landscape to the divergent perspectives of journalism educators and scholars, this study underscores the pressing need for a more cohesive understanding of journalism's essence. The fragmented nature of journalism studies, marked by disciplinary divides and inconsistent definitions, impedes a comprehensive comprehension of the field. To foster a more nuanced and inclusive discourse, bridging the gaps between practitioners and academics is imperative. This study advocates for a re-evaluation of journalism's position in academia and the cultivation of a shared foundation that embraces the diverse facets of this vital societal institution.

REFERENCES:

[1] A. Nadler, “Nature’s Economy and News Ecology: Scrutinizing the news ecosystem metaphor,” *Journal. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/1461670X.2018.1427000.

[2] X. Zeng, S. Jain, A. Nguyen, and S. Allan, “New perspectives on citizen journalism,” *Glob. Media China*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/2059436419836459.

[3] J. Tong, “The Taming of Critical Journalism in China: A combination of political, economic and technological forces,” *Journal. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/1461670X.2017.1375386.

[4] A. Nadler, “Nature’s Economy and News Ecology,” *Journal. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/1461670x.2018.1427000.

[5] E. Borges-Rey, “Has the Sociology of Data Journalism Reached its Zenith?; Apostles of Certainty – Data Journalism and the Politics of Doubt; Data Journalism and the Regeneration of News,” *Digit. Journal.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/21670811.2019.1697627.

[6] J. Magnusson and M. Zackariasson, “Student independence in undergraduate projects: different understandings in different academic contexts,” *J. Furth. High. Educ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/0309877X.2018.1490949.

[7] E. K. Morris, “Inversion, paradox, and liberal disintegration: Towards a conceptual framework of trumpism,” *New Polit. Sci.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/07393148.2018.1558037.

[8] M. H. Shah Hassan and S. N. Shaari, “Analisis Kesalahan Penggunaan Bahasa dalam Rencana Akhbar,” *J. Pengaj. Media Malaysia*, 2019, doi: 10.22452/jpmm.vol21no2.3.

[9] “Foreign Propaganda in the Electronic Press about the Syrian Crisis A Comparative Study of the Sites of Russia Today and Alhurra - A research drawn from a Master Degree thesis,” *AL – Bahith AL – A a,LAMI*, 2019, doi: 10.33282/abaa.v11i44.284.

[10] T. Ue, “Writing Place: Mimesis, Subjectivity and Imagination in the Works of George Gissing, by Rebecca Hutcheon,” *Vic. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.2979/victorianstudies.61.3.16.

CHAPTER 5

EXPLORING THE MULTIFACETED LANDSCAPE OF JOURNALISM STUDIES: A CROSS-DISCIPLINARY INQUIRY

Dr. Sumbul Samreen, Assistant Professor
Department of General Management, Centre for Management Studies, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.sumbul_samreen@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

This study explores journalism through five primary areas of academic research: political science, linguistic studies, sociology, history, and cultural analysis. Each framework provides a distinct perspective on why journalism matters, with sociology, in particular, shaping the default framework for understanding how journalism operates. The historical study of journalism has played a vital role in assessing its durability and practice, while linguistic studies have focused on language pragmatics, formal study, and informal study to understand the communicative aspects of news. Political science has delved into the interdependence of politics and journalism, while cultural analysis has aimed to uncover the symbol systems journalists use and examine assumptions underlying journalism's self-perception. The analysis reveals that each framework offers a unique perspective on journalism, necessitating more explicit cross-frame communication. The study emphasizes the need for greater clarity in defining key aspects of journalism, adopting multiple perspectives, and fostering cross-disciplinary collaboration within academia to overcome existing ambiguities. Prospective remedial actions include integrating research, education, and craft into the curriculum to enhance the understanding of journalism.

KEYWORDS:

Ambiguity, Communication, Culture, Journalism.

INTRODUCTION

The study concludes by addressing the existential ambiguity of journalism and proposing remedial actions. It emphasizes the importance of placing journalism at the center of diverse scholarly viewpoints and acknowledging its role in both social sciences and the humanities. The need to recognize opposing viewpoints as valuable but incomplete lenses on journalism is highlighted. The study advocates for an open-ended inquiry into what is known about journalism and how consensus has been reached. Integrating research, education, and craft into the curriculum is proposed to create a more inclusive environment for engaging with journalism.

Questions Types

Five primary areas of academic research have been studied in journalism: political science, linguistic studies, sociology, history, and cultural analysis. These are not the only disciplines that have addressed journalism; they were primarily proposed as a heuristic device that indicates greater mutual exclusivity than exists in actuality. However, the viewpoints they provide give an idea of the variety of approaches that journalism might take. The underlying presumptions that every frame imposes on its analysis of the journalistic world reveal a lot about how many lenses on journalism have produced an image that is, at most, incomplete [1], [2].

The question of why journalism matters is approached differently in each frame: sociology has examined the subject; history has examined the subject through the lens of verbal and visual tools; language studies has examined the subject through those lenses; political science has examined the subject through the lens of ought to; and cultural analysis has examined the subject through a different lens. How each of these responses bears on the more general issue of why scholars need to be studying journalism in the first place has been lost here, or at least subsumed into the background of the research environment.

The default framework for thinking about how journalism operates has been provided by sociology. Sociological research has largely produced an image of journalism that focuses on people rather than documents, relationships, work routines, and other formulaic interactions across members of the community who are involved in gathering and presenting news. This image is largely based upon a notable body of work known as the ethnographies of news or the newsroom studies of the 1970s. The idea that journalists are sociological entities with norms, practices, and routines, that they operate in institutional, structural, and organizational settings, that their actions have consequences, and that they invoke something akin to ideology in their news work has been established by sociology.

Sociology has shaped the image of journalism from which much other research stems, primarily because it has prioritized the study of dominant behaviors over deviant ones and has analyzed specific moments in the news-making process rather than the whole phenomena. Though not very successful, the focus on pattern over transgression, behavior and impact over meaning, and the group over the individual has helped develop the idea of journalists as professionals. In that early canonical work has not yet addressed in its whole the more recent tendencies toward conglomeratization, corporatization, standardization, personalization, convergence, and the many characteristics of journalistic labor in its more current manifestations, this work has remained somewhat trapped in the past. Furthermore, the majority of this work's structure was developed within the parameters of US sociology, and its depictions of mostly mainstream American news institutions have come to represent our conception of journalism in a global way.

The study of history and journalism has developed significantly since the first academic programs focused on journalism were expanded. The history of news has played a pivotal role in determining the durability of journalism and journalistic practice by using the past—its achievements, lessons, and tragedies—to comprehend modern journalism. Within this framework, the things that have endured have often attracted scholarly attention. But the image has been painted quite narrowly.

The study of history, which mainly relies on documents rather than people, can be broadly classified into three categories: journalism history writ small, which includes memoirs, biographies, and organizational histories; history writ midway, which is structured around temporal periods, themes, and events, such as "the penny press" or "war journalism"; and history writ large, which focuses on the relationship between the nation-state and the news media. Based on the nation under consideration, each varies significantly, according to research from Australia and France. A deliberate twinning of the role that history writing plays for journalists and the academy has been absent from this discussion the histories of journalistic practice published primarily in US journalism schools, which sought to legitimize journalism as an academic discipline, do not accurately represent the generalized, so-called objective histories that were modeled after German historicism. There hasn't been enough work done to figure out how to mix the two more effectively. The very rich and diverse development of journalistic practice throughout the globe has also been overlooked in favor of an emphasis on US history in this instance. It should come as no surprise that a large

portion of this study has struggled with the issue of historical plurality. For those doing historical research, the question of "whose journalism history" still presents a significant obstacle.

The assumption behind the study of journalism's language is that speakers' created activity results in messages that are neither clear nor straightforward. This region has developed mostly during the last 35 years or more, with a distinctly European and Australian flavor. Verbal language, sound, still and moving images, and patterns of interaction are now all included in the combination of formal language aspects like grammar, syntax, and word choice with less formal ones like storytelling frames, textual patterns, and narratives.

There have been three types of language study: the study of language pragmatics, which looks at how language use in the news is influenced by rhetoric, framing, and narrative and storytelling conventions; formal study, which includes sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, and critical linguistics; and informal study, which uses language as a backdrop without thoroughly examining its features, such as content analysis and semiology. This investigation has taken many turns; the framing has mostly concentrated on the political dimensions of news language and narrative, while the storytelling has targeted its cultural dimensions, especially those of alternative media like new zines or tabloids. Due to its emphasis on language's structure as well as its function in broader social and cultural contexts, this mostly microanalytic approach is not very applicable to other types of research. However, its assumption from the outset—that language is ideological—challenges both conventional mainstream news scholarship and journalistic assertions that news is a mirror of reality [3], [4].

For a considerable time, journalists have piqued the normative curiosity of political scientists, who ask how journalism "ought" to function under ideal circumstances. This investigation is driven by the notion that politics and journalism are interdependent and is interested in studying journalism via a political lens. As a result, several academics have defined how journalism might benefit its audiences. Research in political science has covered a wide variety of topics, including the classic Four Theories of the Press and extensive analyses of the media's function in various political systems, as well as studies of political campaign behavior, journalistic models and roles, and the sourcing habits of officials and reporters. The wealth of literature on public journalism is also pertinent.

Mostly US-focused, though some parallel research has been conducted by political scientists in the UK, Latin America, and Eastern Europe, this research has taken into account journalism's broader "political" role in news production, which includes journalism at its highest levels publishers, boards of directors, managing editors rather than at the individual, lower-ranking journalistic levels. Numerous of these studies have been driven by normative impulses and have concluded that journalism is and ought to be in step with broader political impulses in society as a whole.

Lastly, journalism's cultural analysis has a history of seeing itself as the "bad boy" of the community. According to its definition, it aims to investigate the cultural symbol systems that reporters use to make sense of their work, as well as to probe the assumptions that underlie journalism's sense of self. This investigation has largely followed two strains, which are evident in models of US and British cultural studies the former focusing on problems of meaning, group identity, and social change, the latter on its intersection with power and patterns of domination. These strains assume a lack of unity within journalism in news-gathering routines, norms, values, technologies, and assumptions about what is important, appropriate, and preferred. The work has examined a wide range of topics that have not been

covered in other areas of inquiry, including worldviews, practices, breaches, forms, representations, and audiences. However, the focus has always been on determining how something comes to mean, which has made it necessary to take into account the hazy boundaries that exist between various types of networks, including tabloid and mainstream, mainstream and online, and network and non-news world. However, the field's inherent ambivalence regarding journalism's veneration for facts, truth, and reality all of which have become subjects of negotiation and relativization when seen through a cultural lens has called into question the validity of some of this work.

It has become clear that every framework for studying journalism offers a unique and distinct perspective on the news, necessitating more thorough and explicit cross-frame communication. Such sharing would not only counteract the nearsightedness with which most journalism studies have been established, but it would also assist foster an appreciation for journalism at the time of its development. More clarification is needed on several areas, including how academics often define news, newsmaking, journalism, journalists, and the news media; which explanatory frameworks they use to examine these problems; and which disciplines of study they draw inspiration from to form their presumptions. Adopting many perspectives is important not just because journalism study hasn't developed a corpus of knowledge that encompasses all aspects of journalism, but also because it hasn't produced a body of academics who are aware of the work being done in other fields of scholarly research. There isn't enough agreement between journalism and the academic community that analyzes it. As a consequence, the connection between journalism and academia is characterized by a pragmatic, pedagogical, and intellectual ambiguity that feeds into existential doubt [5], [6].

Prospective remedial actions

The existential ambiguity of journalism may be addressed in several ways. It is crucial to place journalism in the center of a variety of scholarly viewpoints from which it may most successfully thrive. Similar to how acknowledging journalism's influence ties directly into the social sciences, acknowledging journalism as an expressive act has a direct bearing on the humanities. These opposing viewpoints must be made clear as valuable but incomplete lenses on journalism. It is also crucial to keep that inquiry open-ended so that it may be examined not just what a large number of us know about journalism, but also how we have come to that consensus. In a similar vein, integrating research, education, and craft into the curriculum would improve our understanding of journalism. From this perspective, the goal of journalism studies is to create an environment that welcomes many forms of involvement with the field, including those who practice the profession, those who instruct others in its practice, and those who encourage others to consider the profession critically. All of this is not new; Everett Dennis called for something similar more than 20 years ago, and the Carnegie-Knight Initiative on the Future of Journalism Education and the European Erasmus Mundus program in media and journalism are based on the same principles.

There has already been a considerable push in some regions to modify the study's grounding in journalism. The establishment of Journalism Studies and Journalism: Theory, Practice, and Criticism, two concurrent academic publications, in the late 1990s, was motivated by the need for a focused forum to discuss issues about journalism that emerged from scholarly investigation. There are now many research centers dedicated to journalism studies and the examination of certain facets of journalism performance, such as internet journalism, trauma, and religion. And lastly, to bring together journalism theory, research, and instruction, the International Communication Association has formed a Journalism Studies Interest Group.

These initiatives have, in every instance, offered a remedy for the shortcomings of journalism's investigation within its current parameters.

All of this is to argue that, to maintain journalism at the forefront of our imagination, we need to find out how to simultaneously make it more of the world. We must stay ahead of journalism's evolution by predicting its future directions and conceiving of expansive and innovative approaches to achieve them, to provide a more transparent framework for the reciprocal interaction of media and academia. Journalism is too vital to ignore the concerns brought forth in these pages, yet its future is still uncertain if it does not confront these difficulties head-on.

DISCUSSION

The Curriculum Question

The definition of "state of the art" in journalism informs any assessment of what constitutes "state of the art" in journalism education. Many people believe that state-of-the-art journalism is uncommon, which leaves plenty of opportunity for journalism instructors and critics to fill the void. However, modern journalism as seen by university-based instructors often conflicts with the goals of the media, hence maintaining the rift between the two sectors.

Although news journalism originated mostly in the United States, it's fascinating to note that the US and the UK approached journalism education quite differently. In actuality, the debate over the condition of journalism education may be said to have moved within the bounds of the historically selected paths of the two nations. The curriculum is "one of the most contentious and problematic issues" in journalism education since there are "those who advocate a singular focus on vocational training and those who would have journalism students follow a much broader program of study" in academia.

Nobody questions the need to teach skills, which are described as interviewing, reporting, researching, sourcing, writing, and editing. However, some people, particularly prospective employers, have questioned the importance of studying the history and customs of journalism. Their argument is not against journalists with a university education; rather, it is against their getting a degree in another field and having their education focused on journalism or communication studies. As a result, journalism is taught as a postgraduate degree in many Western nations in addition to previous courses in business, economics, politics, history, and law. Therefore, creating undergraduate courses that comprise a journalist's whole education is a unique difficulty; yet, graduate courses also provide challenges.

The postgraduate journalism program at Columbia University in New York is one of the most well-known. The extremely public argument surrounding the search for a new vision for that institution serves as an illustration of how little the issue of teaching skills or knowledge has been settled. Lee Bollinger, the president of Columbia University, revealed the new mission for the institution in April 2003.

A top university's journalism program should always maintain a certain distance from the industry. Journalism schools need to preserve their unique viewpoint on the field and the world, much as journalism does concerning the broader public. They are the devoted critics of the profession, among other things. The mental habits that are formed in the engaged, reflective academic environment will unavoidably permeate the educational process, giving certain facets of professional life more weight than others.

The president of Columbia University made a strong decision to support reflective learning for its graduate students, notwithstanding Bollinger's assertion that "a professional school must instill certain basic capacities in its students." Most researchers have also done so, regardless of whether they are creating journalism courses for undergraduates or graduate students [7], [8].

The relative importance of skills and knowledge in various curriculum recommendations varies. The integrated curriculum developed by Skinner, Gasher, and Compton "emphasizes that journalism is a complex professional practice and refuses to accept journalism as a simple technique." Their recommendations are compiled under the title "Journalism as a practice of meaning production," which states that understanding the signifying power of language and the fact that journalism is more than just "a transparent stenography of the real" is "fundamental." Students learn "how to deal responsibly in their work with alternative values, belief systems, social systems, traditions, and histories" via "journalism within its broader cultural context," according to Edward Said, who "assigns journalists an 'intellectual responsibility' for the depictions they produce." Journalists must "become more than uncritical recorders," according to "Journalism as a practice of knowledge production." The underlying assumption of these curricular recommendations is that better journalism would result from equipping journalists with knowledge, empathy, and "virtue."

The discourse around the current condition of journalism education is mostly, but not exclusively, focused on Western industrialized countries. Model curricula for poor nations and rising democracies have been released by UNESCO; they must be considered the most organized attempt to date to provide comprehensive, cutting-edge curricula for journalism education.The topic of technique in journalism education often becomes bogged down in debates about how to balance academic and practical issues. Few examine the fundamental premise that journalism, and by extension journalism education, is a crucial component of democracy. However, we should not take this for granted.

A survey of European history throughout the 20th century, for instance, reveals several examples of how journalism schools were utilized to teach journalists to work for dictatorships. Since press freedom is seen as either partially or completely restricted in more than half of the world's countries, versions of this instrumentalization may be observed in many of them nowadays. Thus far, there has been little discussion of the standards and principles that drive journalism education in those nations.

The "American model of fact-based, neutral professionalism [...] and the libertarian, market-based model of organizing journalism" dominate the discussions, according to James Curran, who attributed this to American dominance in journalism scholarship. He further noted that while alternative models exist, they rarely have a chance of being acknowledged. Paolo Mancini painstakingly highlights the very different expectations of Italian journalists in article after article, and ultimately in his book Comparing Media Systems with Daniel Hallin:

The ability to forge consensus on clearly defined ideas supported by the newspaper or television channel one works for, as well as devotion, and political and ideological loyalty, are what matter most in journalists. One becomes a professional journalist at the invitation of a political party or individual who has direct control over a newspaper or significant influence over its management. This demonstrates that the range of ideologies, from the ideology of objectivity to the ideology of allegiance, even exists within democratic nations—few nations can claim to have as many elections as Italy. It is essential to differentiate between voluntary and involuntary loyalty while discussing the latter.

Bonnie Brennen concluded in her review of American journalism textbooks, "that all of these books address the practice of journalism from an identical ideological perspective." What unites all of these texts is the unwavering conviction that journalists uphold the Fourth Estate by serving as an essential check on other branches of government. Investigative reporting is the most admired kind of journalism in US journalism school textbooks because of the focus on the watchdog role; yet, this is done with little regard for how it could maintain the status quo. The true function that journalists "play in the late industrial capitalist society is never questioned," according to Brennen's conclusion.Most countries in the world have some form of loyalty ideology, both voluntary and involuntary. In some cases, these ideologies coexist in interesting ways, with the ideology of objectivity serving as a cover for loyalty (as it did in the US after 9/11) or accommodating investigative reporting (as in the case of China).

market awareness has turned journalism school into a testing ground for tolerance to authority, according to Yu et al., who describe the developments in China's journalism education as "characterized by gradual movement towards the market without seriously violating traditional norms of propaganda." There is, however, a "disconnection between classroom teaching and real-world needs," as their poll also indicates that what occurs in the classroom does not always translate to the newsroom. This "disconnection," which is prevalent throughout many nations, particularly those whose media systems are deemed "transitional," can also be seen positively: concepts can be discussed in class even if they are only partially implemented in the newsroom, which in China has led to the emergence of what Zhou has dubbed "Watchdogs on Party Leashes."

Africa, where political media predominates, is more aligned with the notion of allegiance than objectivity. Nevertheless, this enables the media to "execute an important function as an interpreter of events, and in disseminating information to the public." Even if journalism education is becoming more popular in Africa, to affect change, the continent's institutional and organizational media cultures and practices must also evolve.

Since South America is both a part of the US and has inherited the partisan, clientelistic institutions of media from Spain and Portugal, it perhaps has the most varied blend of objectivity and loyalty philosophies. Investigative journalism's growth, according to Waisbord and Alves, is evidence that Latin American journalists are evolving from lapdogs to watchdogs. This illustrates a generational divide that is similar to that described by Barrera and Vaz for Spain: the younger group places more emphasis on impartiality and leans toward factual journalism that is more likely to criticize power structures, while the older group is characterized by a more devoted ideological outlook and tends toward an interpretative kind of journalism.

While the two philosophies may coexist as the foundation for journalism education in transitional nations, Western democracies will always view with mistrust any devotion to the government, whether it be to a party, a council of clerics, or the monarchs. This begs the question of whether journalism and democracy are inextricably linked, as well as how journalism education and journalism should be seen in non-democratic nations [9], [10].

Industry Versus Academy

More and more postsecondary schools worldwide are offering journalism education, which is seen as both a prelude to and a remedy for journalism. Its dual function is both a strength and a weakness. It not only distances post-secondary journalism education from business but also strengthens the mistrust that exists between academia and the media sector. Similar to how Cunningham regrets that journalism schools' intellectual capital is at odds with business, Skinner et al. point out that "media owners and managers do not generally welcome critical

perspectives on media practices, especially if they are contrary to commercial considerations." Cunningham further notes that "they are not think tanks for their profession, unlike law and business schools."

This disconnect between academia and industry can be largely explained by Deuze's assertion that many journalism programs operate "with the philosophical notion of journalism as an act of individual freedom and responsibility, rather than a social system located in and managed by corporate media." Nevertheless, this assertion is unlikely to end the competition for influence in journalism. In addition, the playing field is not level. Even though journalism schools make an effort to change how journalism is conducted, its effectiveness is determined "by the kind of jobs graduates can land and the number of internship opportunities it affords." Put differently, journalism schools rely on the business, but the industry itself is not quite persuaded of the worth and use of journalism degrees.

Nevertheless, the fact that journalism education enhances journalists' working conditions is one of the most compelling justifications for it. Many nations may relate to what has been observed about Portugal: "Journalism has not historically been a prestigious profession." It was a low-paying and low-qualified profession due to censorship and the lack of precise academic requirements. While there are certain nations, like the United States, where the compensation for journalism is sufficient, many other nations, particularly in the developing world, provide inadequate compensation and working conditions for journalists.

With "No Sign of a Better Job: 100 Years of British Journalism," Delano had to conclude that Britain, which until recently supported on-the-job training for journalists, was not a good fit. Why, Delano asked, had journalists not been "able or ready to use the power that they can wield outside of their professional world within it?" However, compared to the United States, Britain has just lately accepted postsecondary education for journalists, and the unsatisfactory professional standing of British journalists may actually be used as support for the idea that journalists should attend universities.

Future Research Areas

Even if the "dramatization of journalism" is happening quickly, it should be noted that only a quarter to a third of students who pursue journalism majors in the field end up working in the field. To fully understand the dynamics that create journalism, research on journalism education must thus go beyond higher education and include training obtained in settings other than newsrooms or the media sector. Researchers also need to be aware of changes in global geopolitics. The media is no longer exclusively American. 75 of the top 100 newspapers in circulation are Asian, according to a list. Asia surpasses all other continents in terms of viewership. It follows that the greatest number of journalists are produced in Asia, namely in China and India. However, Asian journalism education has not been much discussed so far.

American discourses have prevailed in journalism and journalism education for historical reasons. This has given rise to the idea that journalism education is supported by a single, legitimate kind of journalism. Future literature on journalism education will need to have a wider view of journalism, nevertheless. Adding the British model of journalism noticeably broadens the perspectives on journalism, even while remaining in the dominant language of the discourse—English. Compared to the American, wholly commercial model, the British approach, with its two strands of public service and commercial media, provides components that are significantly more internationally adaptable. One example is the Qatari station Al Jazeera, which was primarily founded on the standards and procedures of the BBC. Journalism education research cannot be limited to democratic nations alone. The book by

Splichal and Sparks demonstrates how journalism education may be seen as a force for change, and it is important to examine the features of journalism education in both partially and fully free societies. Scholarship in journalism education can only enhance efforts toward an informed and deliberative society by delving deeper into the global picture.

CONCLUSION

The study calls for a proactive approach to anticipate journalism's future directions and encourages innovative strategies to ensure a transparent framework for the interaction between media and academia. In the discussion section, the study examines the curriculum question, exploring the contentious issues surrounding the definition of "state of the art" in journalism education.

It highlights the divergence between university-based perspectives on journalism and the goals of the media industry, particularly in the U.S. and the U.K. The discourse on the importance of skills versus knowledge in journalism education is analyzed, emphasizing the need for a comprehensive understanding of journalism's role in democracy.

The study concludes by addressing the industry-academy disconnect, noting the dual function of journalism education as both a prelude to and a remedy for journalism and suggesting areas for future research, including a broader examination of global journalism education and its role in societies with varying degrees of press freedom.

REFERENCES:

[1] S. Steensen, A. M. Grøndahl Larsen, Y. B. Hågvar, and B. K. Fonn, “What Does Digital Journalism Studies Look Like?,” *Digital Journalism*. 2019. doi: 10.1080/21670811.2019.1581071.

[2] S. A. Eldridge, K. Hess, E. C. Tandoc, and O. Westlund, “Navigating the Scholarly Terrain: Introducing the Digital Journalism Studies Compass,” *Digit. Journal.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/21670811.2019.1599724.

[3] S. Robinson, S. C. Lewis, and M. Carlson, “Locating the ‘Digital’ in Digital Journalism Studies: Transformations in Research,” *Digit. Journal.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/21670811.2018.1557537.

[4] T. Witschge, C. W. Anderson, D. Domingo, and A. Hermida, “Dealing with the mess (we made): Unraveling hybridity, normativity, and complexity in journalism studies,” *Journalism*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1464884918760669.

[5] M. Carlson and S. C. Lewis, “Temporal reflexivity in journalism studies: Making sense of change in a more timely fashion,” *Journalism*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1464884918760675.

[6] K. Wahl-Jorgensen and T. Hanitzsch, *The handbook of journalism studies*. 2019. doi: 10.4324/9781315167497.

[7] R. Mabrook and J. B. Singer, “Virtual Reality, 360° Video, and Journalism Studies: Conceptual Approaches to Immersive Technologies,” *Journal. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/1461670X.2019.1568203.

[8] J. L. M. Sánchez, M. J. U. Ruiz, and J. M. H. de la Casa, “Journalistic innovation and digital society: An adaptation of journalism studies,” *Rev. Lat. Comun. Soc.*, 2019, doi: 10.4185/RLCS-2019-1402.

[9] A. Wagemans and T. Witschge, "Examining innovation as process: Action research in journalism studies," *Convergence*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1354856519834880.

[10] M. Ekström and O. Westlund, "The dislocation of news journalism: A conceptual framework for the study of epistemologies of digital journalism," *Media Commun.*, 2019, doi: 10.17645/mac.v7i1.1763.

CHAPTER 6

NAVIGATING THE CROSSROADS: EXPLORING THE EVOLUTION AND IMPACT OF JOURNALISM EDUCATION ON PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES WORLDWIDE

Dr. Syed Shahid Raza, Assistant Professor
Department of General Management, Centre for Management Studies, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.syed_shahidraza@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

This study delves into the intricate landscape of journalism education, examining its evolution, diverse approaches, and the critical role it plays in shaping journalistic practice. The premise is rooted in the belief that elevating the caliber of journalists through education can significantly impact the quality and development of journalism. The study begins by exploring the foundational aspects of journalism education, emphasizing its role in underpinning key democratic principles vital for societal development. The chapter further scrutinizes the global landscape of journalism education, drawing insights from the United States, China, Germany, and other nations. A historical overview traces the roots of journalism education, primarily in the United States, examining pivotal moments and influential figures. The dichotomy between journalism as a trade and as a profession becomes a central theme, with debates on the balance between theoretical and practical courses. The study encompasses a critical analysis of existing literature on journalism education, highlighting its generic or overly specific nature. Various works, including "Making the Newsmakers," "Journalism Education in Europe and North America," and "Journalists for the 21st Century," contribute diverse perspectives on the challenges, expectations, and motivations of journalism students globally. The contentious issue of whether journalism is best viewed as a trade or a profession remains a focal point, with the implications for education and the conflicting perspectives of scholars and practitioners explored. The study concludes by acknowledging the ongoing debates in postsecondary journalism education, emphasizing the need for a nuanced understanding of the ideological underpinnings shaping journalism education's future.

KEYWORDS:

Education, Ideological, Journalism, Professional, Worldwide.

INTRODUCTION

It is believed that by raising the caliber of journalists, journalism education would raise the caliber of journalism. It is seen to be the "one-way society can intervene to influence journalism's development." Put another way, the kind of education that aspiring journalists get matters because, among other things, journalists are important. "Journalism, and the educational programmes that enable individuals to practise and upgrade their journalistic skills, are essential tools for the underpinning of key democratic principles that are fundamental to the development of every country," according to UNESCO in the foreword of Model Curricula for Journalism Education for Developing Countries & Emerging Democracies.

The main topics of journalism education will be covered in this chapter, with a focus on the notion of enhancing journalistic practice. It will then look at the development of journalism education in the United States over the course of a century. It will go over some of the most

important books from the last several years and address the professionalization debate, which is central to postsecondary journalism education. The issue of what should be taught in journalism education as well as the often ignored ideological presumptions that underpin journalism instruction will then be summarized in this chapter. The chapter will conclude by suggesting topics for further investigation [1], [2].

Establishing Bases

The idea that journalism education lays the groundwork for future journalists' attitudes and expertise is one of its most important components. Divergent opinions exist on the education that journalists need to get. There are just as many methods for teaching journalists. Thus, the enormous variety of journalism education is another essential component. All that is required to get the picture is knowledge about the range of educational backgrounds among journalists and the proportion of individuals who pursued journalism studies prior to entering the field. According to the findings, there is a clear tendency that journalists who have access to current data tend to be college or university educated. But few people have degrees in communication studies, media, or journalism before working as journalists.

If we define journalism as primarily news journalism, we also need to recognize that the majority of newspapers are produced in Asia, which reflects the region's growing prominence in terms of both population and geopolitics. Newspapers with the largest circulation are in Japan. According to Gaunt, only graduates from top colleges with degrees in political science, economics, or the humanities are accepted by the most prominent news outlets, the Asahi, the Yomiuri, and the Mainichi. The bulk of aspiring journalists undergo on-the-job training in the form of a strict apprenticeship system, and very few colleges offer media studies programs.

In the first decade of the twenty-first century, journalism and communication are quickly gaining popularity as fields of study in China. This demonstrates how quickly Chinese culture and the media landscape are changing. Currently, courses are seen as falling behind market needs as they integrate practical training with studies in Chinese Communist thought. However, as shown by Germany and the United States, higher education programs offered in media, communication, or journalism studies do not result in journalists choosing to pursue them as a career route. This has shaped journalism education in the United States into a more general mass or public communication field, as Weaver, Beam, Brownlee, Voakes, and Wilhoit found in the United States: "from 1982 to 2002, the proportion of journalism and mass commu- nication bachelor’s-degree graduates who went into mass communication jobs declined sharply from over one-half to about one-fourth." Conversely, about ninety percent of journalists are degree holders.

Comparably, 80.5 percent of journalists in Germany have a college degree or have attended college, but just 13 percent have a journalism major or minor and another 17 percent have studied communication or media studies. Significantly, about 70% completed an internship (nearly 90% in the under-35 age group), and 60% completed the two-year, one-year in-house training program for graduates.Even while fundamental journalistic "working practices appear universal," the aforementioned career paths show distinct country preferences. These numbers demonstrate that pursuing a journalism degree at the graduate level is not the only path to becoming a journalist. This throws academic literature on journalism education which is almost exclusively limited to journalism education at the university level out of step with the reality of mostly in-house training.

Journalism education, as discussed here, has the clear intent of modifying practice, enriching the quality of information produced, and, with the help of this quality journalism, achieving

improvement in the workings of civil society. Gaunt begins his book, Making the Newsmakers, with the words, "Journalism training perpetuates or modifies professional practices and molds the perceptions journalists have of the role and function of the media [3], [4]."

Chronicles of Journalism Instruction

In the second part of the nineteenth century, the concept that providing journalists with a college or university degree would improve their journalism was developed in the United States. The United States served as the primary location for tertiary journalism education throughout the most of the twentieth century. Journalism was not widely recognized as a topic until the 1980s and 1990s, when it was often taught at newly established colleges. The United States pioneered journalism education and news journalism, which was one of the reasons it broke new ground. Chalaby contends that modern journalism is an Anglo-American creation. In continental Europe, journalism was strongly associated with the literary arts, which required a distinct skill set and writing ability from that of a daily rounds reporter.

The US Civil War's losing commander, Robert E. Lee, is credited with putting the concept that aspiring journalists should get a college degree into practice. In his capacity as president of Washington College, which is now known as Washington & Lee University in Lexington, Virginia, he began offering scholarships for liberal arts degrees that included journalism courses as early as 1869.

There were already questions then about journalism as a legitimate academic field. At the time of Lee's initiative, newspapers were little businesses, and the editor and printer were sometimes the same person. Thus, rather than emphasizing reporting, the early courses included writing, editing, and technical printing abilities. Regardless of this previous attempt, James Carey said that journalism education didn't start in earnest until Joseph Pulitzer forced funding into Columbia University's hesitant hands in order to establish a School of Journalism. In 1912, the Columbia School of Journalism started as a graduate school instead of the undergraduate institution that Pulitzer had originally intended. The goal of Pulitzer was to elevate the standards of journalism at a period when the majority of reporters were from working-class backgrounds. He intended to do this by giving them the education in liberal arts that they were lacking.

A distinct approach was used by other pioneers in journalism studies. In the latter part of the 1920s, Willard Bleyer integrated the new research into the political science and sociology PhD programs at Wisconsin University. He believed that doing journalistic research was a crucial component of journalism education. There were long-term effects from the choice to situate journalism inside the social sciences.

The Wisconsin program produced the "found- ers of many major journalism schools elsewhere, and they carried its empirical social sciences assumptions with them." The Association of Journalism Education Administrators and the organization that accredits journalism programs are two other foundations of the American journalism education system that Bleyer was instrumental in establishing.

Before long, university journalism programs offered three different models. These functioned as stand-alone graduate or undergraduate journalism schools, similar to the University of Missouri program founded by Walter Williams, or as distinct departments inside liberal arts colleges or social science faculties.

DISCUSSION

Wilbur Schramm added an extra model. After the Second World War, Schramm headed the journalism department at the University of Iowa. He went on to build the departments of communication studies and research at Stanford University and the University of Illinois. Although Schramm first intended to integrate his new program in communication with the journalism department, communication as a field study quickly displaced journalism education, which was unable to let go of its reputation as a vocational training school. Professors Bleyer, Williams, and Schramm, in contrast to Pulitzer, were only concerned in journalism and not in journalists. This left journalism education in the awkward place between practical and academic studies, where it still finds itself, as Rogers wrote, "a communication research institute could serve as a source of prestige for a school of journalism that may have been looked down upon by academics in other fields because of the perceived trade school nature of journalism training." The debate over the professionalization of journalism and the journalism education curriculum emphasizes how unresolved this issue is.

While there are other nations that have a history of journalism education, none has had the same influence on the field as the United States. The EcoleSuperieure de Journalisme, France's first journalism school, was established in 1899 and joined the Ecole de Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales the following year. The darker side of journalism education was shown in Spain, when General Franco established the national school of journalism in 1941 and the Falangist Party took control of it. The most significant training facility in Spain was the national school of journalism, which was governed by the government until the early 1970s. This journalism school was a requirement for the journalists working for the main Spanish government-controlled newspapers. Extant instances of journalism education under government control may be seen throughout the former Eastern Bloc, confirming the basic notion that journalism education plays a significant role, if not functions as a tool, in molding journalists and journalism.

It should come as no surprise that there aren't any official essential books on the subject given the variety of journalism education. Deuze made a valid observation when he said that the literature on journalism education is either extremely generic, with senior scholars frequently providing more or less historical accounts of their lifetime experiences "doing" journalism education, or extremely specific, with case studies of what works and what doesn't in a given curriculum, course, or classroom. Books that have a broader perspective usually have a survey format, outlining the many activities involved in teaching journalism. The most comprehensive survey, however out of date now, was conducted in 1992 by Philip Gaunt. In his UNESCO-sponsored book Making the Newsmakers, Gaunt first evaluates the variations in training systems, training demands, and structures before going country by country and continent by continent to describe the different countries' or regions' efforts in journalism education.

According to Gaunt, the difficulties and opportunities facing journalism education may be divided into two predictable groups: those affecting industrialized and developing nations, respectively. He identifies technological transformation as the major threat to the industrialized world and political control and resource scarcity as the two primary obstacles confronting the developing world. As he outlines his worries, Gaunt also highlights how the prestige and compensation that journalists get directly affect the kind of instructors and students that are attracted to the field of media studies:

The profession is unlikely to draw the smartest and brightest students or the most skilled professors in nations where journalists are seen as government workers, or "flacks." Courses on professional standards, ethics, investigative reporting, press history, and many facets of communication theory are not appropriate for inclusion in the curriculum of such systems [5], [6].

A decade and a half later, much has changed in the globe in terms of politics and development, even if this remark still holds true in some countries. At the time Gaunt wrote, the world was mostly unaware of the enormous changes occurring in China, and the changes in Central and Eastern Europe had just started to take hold. These days, those countries' media systems as well as that of South Africa—are referred to be "transitional." These changes have an impact not just on the countries' media systems but also on journalism education. In addition, even nations that are considered to be "not free" in terms of media freedom like Qatar, the country where Al Jazeera is based—are now recognized for producing high-caliber journalism that is supported by journalism education. The antiquated dichotomous view of the world as being divided into nations where journalism and journalism education are either completely government-controlled or free is giving way to the realization that nations may use "calibrated coercion" or long leashes in place of repression and that media freedom in democracies can have ideological and commercial implications.

Making Journalists, a compilation by Hugo de Burgh, is influenced by this understanding. Although this volume's title is similar to Gaunt's book, its organization is distinct. Rather than offering a methodical evaluation of what is done there, Making Journalists is a compilation of issue-focused chapters. "There is no satisfactory way to write a "global" account of journalism education," the book's editor declares unequivocally. "Exor- cisinghomogenisation by demonstrating that the old fallacy that all journalisms were at different stages on route to an ideal model, probably Anglophone, is passé," is how he describes the strategy he has chosen. The specifics of training programs are not covered in De Burgh's book; instead, it takes a broader look at "journalism and journalists," "journalism and the future," and "journalism and location" throughout the majority of continents, including the Indian subcontinent. The editor of the book, de Burgh, said that cultural distinctions rather than variations in political and legal systems account for the disparities in journalism education, which are very purposefully welcomed and highlighted in the work. Because he believes that "journalism operates in a society is the product of culture," De Burgh seeks to develop a new paradigm that is based on culture. It's a risky move on his part to quote Carey in saying that "communication is most revealingly examined as ritual rather than as transmission." By focusing on cultural frameworks for journalism instead of political, legal, or economic ones, de Burgh avoids discussing the ideological impacts on the standards and values that are taught in journalism programs.

There is a hint of Gaunt's survey nature in Fröhlich and Holtz-Bacha's previous work, Journalism Education in Europe and North America: An International Comparison, which is composed of 14 pieces. According to their preferences for journalism education, the European Union, the United States, and Canada are divided in this book into three groups: those with a long history of academic journalism education, those that choose non-tertiary journalism institutions, and those with a mix of forms. It also examines the potential for a new European journalism. Even so, Fröhlich and Holtz-Bacha note in their conclusion that there are many different approaches to journalism education, even though their volume was restricted to Western democracies and comparable political systems. "The chapters revealed an unexpected diversity of educational philosophies," they write. In contrast to de Burgh,

Fröhlich and Holtz-Bacha believe that political and historical differences are primarily to blame for these differences.

Journalists for the 21st Century by Splichal and Sparks is a novel sort of research that looks at the expectations, motives, and professionalization trends of first-year journalism students in 22 different nations across all five continents, from Tanzania to Austria. There are methodological issues with the book. It is very dubious to consider first-year journalism students, who have never worked in a newsroom, to be "socialized" and to believe that they can provide definitive explanations for how the political and national contexts have influenced their standards and beliefs [7], [8].

One may argue that what was really assessed was the proportional impact of professional education in its formative years. The findings of Splichal and Sparks are quite positive for journalism education in this regard. The young people's "stress a desire for the independence and autonomy of journalism" was the most obvious commonality that was found. At "the precise point in their development when one would expect to find the "idealistic" conception of journalism as a genuine profession most strongly marked," Splichal and Sparks observe that first-year journalism students are. However, they also acknowledge that "exposure to more realities of the occupational situation would lead to a moderation of these idealistic views."

The book by Splichal and Sparks raises an important issue about journalism education: the desire for independence and autonomy among journalism students did not decrease even if a third of these students' home countries are categorized as somewhat free with regard to press freedom. This raises the possibility that norms and values taught in authoritarian or semi-democratic countries are comparable to those in democratic ones. As such, journalism education may be seen as a force for change all things considered.

Trade or profession in journalism

Whether or whether journalism should be seen as a trade or a profession remains the central topic in journalism education. The implied status granted to journalists and the educational background required of them are the primary differences between the two. An occupation's customary practice is called a trade. If journalism were a trade, then on-the-job training without previous study would be sufficient, and only vocational schooling would be required "to perpetuate practice."

At the very least, journalism would need a well-defined educational route to support its claim to be a profession. But as was already said, journalists have a wide range of educational backgrounds, and the majority of them are trained internally by the media outlet they work for. Because of this, the discussion around journalism education has been "framed as scholars versus practitioners," and there is a hostility between academia and business that doesn't seem to be going away. This conflict between theory and practice "adds a level of complexity to our understanding of journalism," as Deuze accurately notes, adding that "journalism education [...] must negotiate rather essentialist self-perceptions of both industry and academy."

This contradiction is also seen to be one of the main issues in postsecondary journalism education, with debate focusing on how much emphasis should be placed on academic versus practical courses. However, this argument obscures a more serious problem. The deeply ingrained ideological stances of media education are made clear when examining the theoretical topics covered in journalism studies. For the majority of people in the West, journalism and journalism education are closely associated with democracy as a political

system. One of the most important but seldom discussed issues in journalism education to date is the significance of this connection. Journalism researchers and educators will need to confront the long-held belief that journalism education is only relevant in democracies due to changes in media systems and geopolitical shifts.

Advanced Study

Since the idea of a profession originated in the English-speaking world, here is where the professionalization argument is most fiercely contested. Marx, Weber, and Durkheim—the three founding fathers of sociology remain "relatively vague about the role of professions," according to Tumber and Prentoulis. This is because the German language contains the phrase "akademischeBerufe," which refers to positions requiring university education, but does not have a clear understanding of what these professions entail. To put it another way, there are varying perspectives on what professionalization in journalism entails, and this variety is reflected in the literature.

It should come as no surprise that the dean of British media sociology, Jeremy Tunstall, defined journalism as an indiscriminate employment and that the term "journalist" is a "label which people engaged in a very diverse range of activities apply to themselves." In contrast to the United States, university-based journalism programs were not established in the United Kingdom until the late 1900s. In the past, journalism in the United Kingdom was seen as a profession that could be learned on the job. It should come as no surprise that the United States, which has the largest university-based journalism schools, led the primary drive for professionalization.Hallin and Mancini, drawing in part on Hallin's previous chapter "Commercialization and Professionalism in the American News Media," provide one of the most comprehensive efforts to define what professionalization may entail for journalism in their book Comparing Media Systems.A strong influence on Hallin's perspective is the belief that journalism is "very different from the classical professions law, medicine, architecture, and engineering in that its practice is not based on any systematic body of knowledge," as well as his awareness of journalism's lack of detachment from commercial and political factors. Nevertheless, Hallin believes that professionalization has promise despite these disadvantages. formal, college-level education to serve as a buffer between business interests and political influence.

These concepts are expanded upon in Hallin and Mancini's Comparing Media Systems, where they assess journalistic professionalism based on three parameters: autonomy, unique professional standards, and public service focus. When compared to physicians and attorneys, journalists have never attained the same level of autonomy, according to Hallin and Mancini's measurements. They are used by large companies where a wide range of factors impact the production process. Nonetheless, "achieving relative autonomy within those organizations has often been a success for journalists." Hallin and Mancini see significant differences in the manner and extent to which journalistic standards have changed with respect to professional norms. Additionally, they contend that norms can only be formed in fields with a high degree of autonomy and raise the possibility that journalism practices may be seen as being too often governed by external parties. Hallin and Mancini do not wish to discount the assertion that journalists work for the public interest as “mere ideology,” even if they advise against accepting such assertions at face value.

Compared to other professions that claim professional status, journalism lacks esoteric knowledge, so journalists' claim to autonomy and authority is heavily reliant on their claim to serve the public interest. This makes the ethic of public service potentially more significant in the case of journalism. The American professional standard of objectivity is very different

from public service, which is so important to Hallin and Mancini. Though they acknowledge that such norms prove elusive in a world with diverse and often conflicting ideologies, Glasser and Marken contend that "being a professional means abiding by certain norms and accepting the uniformity of practice that this implies" and that America's "disdain for any model of journalism that violates the precepts of private ownership and individual autonomy" forestalls a broader agreement [6], [9].

The Internet has also cast doubt on traditional ideas of professionalism. On the one hand, a greater degree of citizen "communication autonomy" has positioned journalism as a "intervention" as opposed to a useful information source. Conversely, the professional standards of impartiality and indifference have been seen as a hindrance to controversial journalism. This has given rise to worries that, rather than being inclusive, professionalization may make journalism elite and exclusive. Though the professionalization argument has not been as heated as it once was in the early 21st century, discussions over journalism school curriculum have never stopped.

CONCLUSION

This comprehensive exploration of journalism education underscores its pivotal role in shaping the future of journalism. From historical perspectives to contemporary global trends, the study reveals the complex interplay of factors influencing journalistic practice and education. The ongoing debate between journalism as a trade or a profession reflects the dynamic nature of the field, necessitating a delicate balance between theory and practice in educational curricula. As journalism adapts to technological advancements and changing geopolitical landscapes, education emerges as a key driver of innovation and quality journalism. The study calls for a nuanced approach to understanding the diverse educational backgrounds of journalists and challenges the conventional pathways to a journalism career. In conclusion, the study emphasizes the need for ongoing dialogue and critical examination of journalism education, acknowledging its potential to perpetuate or modify professional practices. The evolving nature of journalism education warrants continuous exploration, ensuring its alignment with the evolving needs of a dynamic media landscape and the principles of a democratic society.

REFERENCES:

[1] H. Bhaskaran, H. Mishra, and P. Nair, “Journalism Education in Post-Truth Era: Pedagogical Approaches Based on Indian Journalism Students’ Perception of Fake News,” *Journal. Mass Commun. Educ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1077695819830034.

[2] B. R. Heravi, “3Ws of Data Journalism Education: What, where and who?,” *Journal. Pract.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/17512786.2018.1463167.

[3] S. Jiang and A. Rafeeq, “Connecting the Classroom with the Newsroom in the Digital Age: An Investigation of Journalism Education in the UAE, UK and USA,” *Asia Pacific Media Educ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1326365X19837769.

[4] T. Vukić, “Sustainable journalism education-the only possible way towards the future,” *Croat. J. Educ.*, 2019, doi: 10.15516/cje.v21i0.3449.

[5] K. Meier and J. Schützeneder, “Bridging the Gaps: Transfer Between Scholarly Research and Newsrooms in Journalism Education—Toward an Evidence-Based Practice in an Age of Post-Truth and State of Flux,” *Journal. Mass Commun. Educ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1077695819830021.

[6] M. Siitonen, P. Uotila, T. Uskali, J. Varsaluoma, and T. Välisalo, "A Pilot Study on Developing Newsgames in Collaboration between Journalism and Computer Science Students," *Nord. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.2478/nor-2019-0038.

[7] A. Ilyas, "Closing the Gap: A Comparison of Journalism Education between Pakistan and the United States of America," *Glob. Reg. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.31703/grr.2019(iv-ii).04.

[8] L. Steiner, "Addressing sexual harassment in journalism education," *Journalism*. 2019. doi: 10.1177/1464884918809272.

[9] M. Jaakkola, "The heterogeneity of the nordic journalism education models: The 'academic' and the 'professional' in the bachelor's curricula," *J. Appl. Journal. Media Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.1386/ajms.8.1.3_1.

CHAPTER 7

EVOLUTION OF NEWS PRODUCTION: ROUTINES, BEATS, AND THE IMPACT OF THE DIGITAL AGE

Dr. Pradeep Kumar R, Assistant Professor
Department of General Management, Centre for Management Studies, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.pradeepkumar_r@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

This study explores the evolving landscape of news production and dissemination in the context of changing relationships between journalists, media organizations, and technology. Traditionally, news creation was closely tied to media organizations, but the advent of the Internet has empowered journalists to operate independently. The literature on news organizations often stems from historical periods when organizations held more influence than individual journalists. However, with shifts in the dynamics between news workers and organizations, there is a need to reassess the conceptualization of news routines—the regular tasks journalists perform. The study identifies certain aspects of news routines that change over time, across settings, media companies, and among journalists. The examination incorporates historical perspectives and proposes a method to understand the fundamental mandates of news work and their impact on routines. The paper also discusses the implications of these findings for future research on news construction, particularly in settings where news work may not be confined to traditional news organizations.

KEYWORDS:

Journalists, Media, News, Organization, Production.

INTRODUCTION

News is produced by journalists and the companies they work for. Put differently, news may be considered a product of both organizations and individuals. Until recently, the dissemination of messages by journalists who were not hired by a media organization, known as freelancers, was dependent upon media organizations. Few people controlled the resources needed for the sophisticated technology employed to disseminate media messages. Much has changed in terms of how news is created and disseminated thanks to the Internet. These days, journalists can operate independently and disseminate their ideas independently. Although the majority of journalists now work for news organizations that disseminate news, it is unclear how long that will remain the case.

The majority of the literature on news organizations and news construction is based on historical periods in which news organizations were strong and journalists were weak. But when the relationship between news workers and news organizations changes, so does the literature. An overview of the conceptualization and study of news organizations is given at the beginning of this chapter. The topic of news routines—the regular tasks journalists do while at work—is then covered. The discovery that media outlets and journalists adhere to recognizable processes when generating news has had a profound effect on the study of news reporting. The discovery of these patterns has aided in the development of a significant theoretical debate in the literature, which holds that news should not be seen as a reflection of actual occurrences but rather as a manufactured social reality [1], [2].

However, a thorough examination of the early studies on news routines and later studies in this field points to a major flaw in the idea of news routines. It has been difficult for researchers to pinpoint the aspects of the routines that change over time, within settings, within media companies, and amongst journalists. We have noted certain procedures that do differ in this chapter and offered a conceptual framework for comprehending them. We have proposed a method to examine and comprehend the fundamental mandates of new work and to see how those mandates impact routines, drawing on the historical work on routines as well as our own, more recent study. We think the review shows that routines do differ in certain ways across media firms and employees over time and in different settings. The last section of the chapter discusses the issues this literature raises for further research on news building, especially in a setting where news work and routines won't always take place in news organizations.

Press Entities

According to Schudson, there have been three approaches to news construction research. The political economics viewpoint connects the way the state and economy are structured with how news is produced. For instance, Herman and Chomsky contended that news produced by the media promotes governmental interests above those of the individual. An alternative methodology, mostly grounded in sociology, endeavors to comprehend news creation via the lens of occupational and organizational theory. One example is Epstein's seminal research on how television network structure affected news. This perspective has accounted for the majority of the effort done on new construction. A third method focuses on the general cultural limitations placed on news reporting. One example is Chalaby's examination of the evolution of American and French journalism, which highlights the impact of the French literary heritage on its journalism. The three viewpoints are not entirely separate, as Schudson points out, and several of the major works in the organizational tradition also make significant cultural and political allusions.

Tunstall distinguished between media organizations, which are larger entities that comprise more than one news organization along with other forms of communication units, such as magazines and publishing houses, and news organizations, which are defined as editorial departments that employ primarily journalists. According to Tunstall, the objectives and bureaucracy of these two types of organizations are different. News organizations will follow fewer rituals, while media companies will be more commercially oriented.Sigal said that bureaucracies are typified by the traits of large news organizations. They divide up the work based on both functional and geographical categories. There are differences among journalists depending on whether they work as editors or reporters. There are two types of reporters: general assignment reporters and topic-area reporters. Geographical organization is another feature of news organizations.

In an examination of the three main television networks, Epstein concentrated on how they organized their news gathering and discovered that the methods utilized by those establishments to create their national newscasts differed very little. Epstein maintained that the mirror metaphor did not adequately describe the operation of television news shows. The rituals involved in selecting and producing news on television would be meaningless if it were like looking into a mirror. It was implied by the metaphor that television news would cover every important occurrence. Epstein said that Network News was a constrained and extremely selective news organization. For example, Epstein discovered that throughout the observation time, 10 crews in five large cities generated ninety percent of the NBC national news since that was where their news teams were stationed.

In a previous investigation into television news, Warner saw parallels between the organizational structure of the network and that of a newspaper. He concluded that, for instance, the responsibilities of an executive producer were comparable to those of a newspaper editor and that, like an editor, the executive producers used space, significance, and political balance as their primary selection and distribution criteria. In their analysis of how national newspapers and British television stations covered the anti-Vietnam War rally, Halloran, Elliot, and Murdock discovered a significant media resemblance. The issue of violence was the main emphasis of the media. The authors contended that it was more the outcome of what those news companies deemed noteworthy than a conscious effort to misrepresent the incident. In the end, it did not matter how different the media were from one another in terms of technology, political stance, and news-collecting practices.

Shoemaker and Reese described media organizations as social, formal, and often economic entities that employ media workers to generate media content in their survey of the study on the characteristics of news organizations. These organizations' primary objective is often to earn a profit, particularly when it comes to focusing on audiences who appeal to advertising. Journalists' judgments are influenced by economic forces. The writers claim that ownership, participation in a network or media group, and the size of the media organization are additional variables that influence the content and the processes used to produce it [3], [4].

The News Routine Concept

"Those patterned, routinized, repeated practices and forms that media workers use to do their jobs" is how Shoemaker and Reese characterized news routines. Shoemaker and Reese argued that these routines are the result of the news organization's limited resources despite the abundance of content that may be turned into news. More precisely, technology, time constraints, physical location, and social conventions all influence the routines. According to Shoemaker and Reese, "the job of these routines is to deliver the most acceptable product to the consumer in the most efficient manner, within time and space limitations."

Tuchman seems to have been the first to explore routines in the context of journalism, based on works in the sociology of labor. Tuchman expanded on this theme by arguing that organizations routinely perform tasks because it “facilitates the control of work.” Workers always have too much work to do, she wrote, so they “try to control the flow of work and the amount of work to be done.” She argued that a crucial aspect of news creation is a reliance on routine procedures for “processing information called news, a depletable product made every day,”.

According to Tuchman, since they are "called upon to give accounts of a wide variety of disasters—unexpected events— on a routine basis," journalists are workers who need to be in charge of their profession. "Thrives upon processing unexpected events, events that burst to the surface in some disruptive, exceptional manner," the argument went for news work.

Tuchman contrasted a system she developed based on the sociology of labor with the categorization of news based on a scheme often employed by news employees. News personnel categorize stories as "hard," "soft," "spot," "developing," and "continuing." Tuchman said that news needs to be categorized according to the organization's needs and how it occurs. This prompted her to categorize news according to its status as "scheduled" or "unscheduled," the urgency of its dissemination, how news work was impacted by technology, and whether or not journalists could decide in advance how to cover an event in the future.

Tuchman said that her categorization of news provided a more comprehensive explanation of how news organizations function in practice than the journalistic category system. She claimed that her plan specifically explained how journalists and journalism organizations manage their work so they can react to unforeseen situations. She contended that the journalistic categorization structure fell short of that objective.

Tuchman's first regular talk was significant for at least two reasons. Initially, it proposed that news reporting might be comprehended via the lens of the sociology of labor as a whole. Secondly, it proposed that "it might be more valuable to think of news as reconstituting the everyday world, rather than as distorting." She maintained that journalists create and reassemble social reality. Instead of concentrating on whether the final result was prejudiced in any way, researchers who want to understand news should examine how it was produced.

Tuchman's first interest in news reporting sprang from his disapproval of sociologists' use of newspaper articles as a gauge for community characteristics. She made a clear case in her 1972 paper published in the American Journal of Sociology that news reporting creates its reality rather than seeing these tales as reflections of reality. Tuchman challenged Danzger in a discussion that was published in the American Sociological Review. Danzger indexes community conflict using articles from newspapers. She maintained that news practices, such as depending on centralized sources, consistently benefit those in positions of political and financial authority. The capacity to create news is, in fact, often a component of power.

Three essays written by Molotch and Lester during this same era center on the idea that news is the result of news organizations and journalists rather than a reflection of some "reality." In the first of these articles, the team claimed that the media is "not an objective reporter of events but an active player in the constitution of events." The media chooses which events to report on in the news based on its agendas. They said that news should be seen as "purposive behavior," or the result of the actions taken by journalists and their employers to serve their respective interests. The journalists "transform a perceived set of promoted occurrences into public events through publication or broadcast" using mostly the raw materials that event marketers provide them with.

DISCUSSION

This viewpoint is distinguished by Molotch and Lester from what they perceive to be the prevalent viewpoint held by sociologists and other news-focused individuals at that period. As per their argument, the majority of observers presume that there is an objectively meaningful set of occurring that are known, deemed relevant, and hence covered by skilled, unfettered news professionals. They contended that when news reports depart from this "objective" account of events, it's often because reporters were dishonest, management meddled, or outsiders tainted the process with bribes. Molotch and Lester said they did not assume there is an "objective reality," but rather that news is a byproduct of the procedures that are employed to make it. This leads to "bias."

According to Molotch and Lester, comprehending the "routines" involved in turning events into news is crucial. It is important to recognize that the media are formal establishments that follow "routines for getting work done in newsrooms." Some of those practices were noted by Molotch and Lester in their analysis of the 1969 oil disaster in Santa Barbara, California. They state that these practices "may become so ingrained that they become reified as 'professional norms' of 'good journalism.'" These include the customs of focusing news workers in major cities, covering events closer to home than those further away, and covering events near to when they happen and then gradually paying less attention over time.

There were at least three reasons why Tuchman, Molotch, and Lester's foundational work was significant. It began by outlining how journalists generate news by engaging in everyday actions. It also addressed the role that power plays in shaping news. Thirdly, it made a distinction between what news professionals refer to as "reality" and the created reality of the news. These basic aspects of labor were not considered to be mutable across media companies, media workers, or historical periods by these early authors' routines. Instead, it was believed that these "routines" were what made news reporting unique.

In contrast, Eliasoph discovered that routines did not differ in her investigation of what she called an "oppositional radio station," challenging the notion that routines were universal. The reporters at the media outlets that others have investigated have similar patterns to those of the radio station she watched, Berkeley, California's KPFA-FM. The journalists at the rival radio station did not create the same kind of news as the reporters at the other media, despite their dependence on the same methods. The news product's features were shaped by the station's relationship to its audience, the journalists' social and political positions, and the people in charge of the newsroom, but the routines were employed for the same purpose as at other media: to make the journalists' work more manageable.

Researchers Hansen, Ward, Conners, and Neuzil studied how newspaper news cycles were affected by the development of electronic news libraries for the archiving and retrieval of previously published items. They concluded that procedures had remained mostly unchanged. In a similar vein, Hansen, Neuzil, and Ward found in follow-up research that the formation of news topic-focused teams in newspaper newsrooms had not significantly changed the daily operations of news production.

It seems that more recent studies that have used the idea of news routines have mostly assumed that the notion is unchanging. Cook contends that news routines generate news that is consistent over time and across news channels in his examination of the function of the news media in politics. In a study similar to Danzger's, Oliver and Maney examined the differences between police reports and media accounts of community protests. They discovered differences between the police data and the coverage, which they attributed to newspaper routines—that is, a predilection for stories about local leaders and conflicts that lead to the appearance of counterdemonstrators. According to Wolfsfeld, Avraham, and Aburaiya's research, news coverage in Israel is mostly controlled by established routines that show its Arab inhabitants negatively due to cultural and political presumptions in Israeli culture [5], [6].

Bennett and Ryfe contended in line with the Wolfsfeld et al. research that the media adheres to routines that are the product of professional and organizational norms. The term "rules" is used, and this is crucial since it denotes a constant. Bennett believes that these guidelines account for the news's continuity over space and time. In a similar spirit, Sparrow acknowledged in her writing that media routines and practices need to adapt to the unpredictability of the media landscape. But it's unclear what the mutation is specifically like.

The idea of limited utility in news construction research is rendered meaningless by the absence of diversity in news routines. The researcher has to be able to spot variability in the routines themselves to comprehend the routines' causes and effects. To put it another way, the researcher must identify circumstances in which the routines are broken or modified in some other manner to determine the reasons for the deviations from the routines and the effects they have.

All things considered, the significance of this early work on routines mostly lies in its contribution to the understanding of news as a creation of reality rather than a reflection of it.

In his assessments of the research on news routines and news production, Schudson has acknowledged this contribution and voiced some reservations about it. According to him, academics seem to have "overstated" the idea that actual events have little bearing on what constitutes news. In his opinion, the incident that sparks the development of news has a greater influence than many of the early authors on news-building thought. "If the powerful continue to trample on the world "out there," their methods of creating reality will fail," Schudson stated. Schudson cited Livingston and Bennett's results as one example. These researchers found that the industry's shift toward technology between 1994 and 2001 resulted in a sharp rise in the quantity of news centered on impromptu events on at least one cable news channel, CNN.

The Idea Of Beats

News beats are a notion that is included in the discussion of news routines. Typically, news organizations set up shop to enable them to watch events and collect the information needed to create news. It is unknown where the word "beat," which refers to the news-gathering process's organizational framework, came from. One explanation for the term's possible origin is that it comes from the police when officers are given beats or geographical regions to regularly patrol. The meaning of "beat" according to a dictionary is really "a habitual path or round of duty: as a policeman's beat."

Beats have received a great deal of attention in the literature that studies how news and news routines are constructed. According to Tuchman, news organizations gather the information that is eventually turned into news by using a "news net." She contends that the net's initial purpose was to "catch appropriate stories available at centralized locations." It is assumed that news audiences are engaged in events occurring in these areas, that they are worried about the actions of these organizations, and that they are curious about particular subjects.

Tuchman contends that the news network is "flung through space, focuses upon specific organizations, and highlights topics" because of these factors. Geographic territoriality is the most significant of these three techniques for distributing reporters. According to Tuchman, a beat is a way of assigning reporters to news-generating organizations and maintaining a consolidated database. When Fishman conducted his now-classic observational study of news gathering in the late 1970s, he found that the beat system of news coverage was so commonplace that not employing beats was a defining characteristic of being an underground, experimental, or alternative newspaper. According to Fishman, the beat is a notion created by journalists and is based on their real-world experiences as reporters. Within the journalistic organization, beats have a history that predates the lifetimes of the beat reporters. Reporters are assigned beats by their superiors; while they are in charge of and have authority over the beat, they are not the owners of that beat. According to Fishman, the beat is an area of activities that take place outside of the newsroom and go beyond haphazard groupings of events. Ultimately, the beat is a social environment that the reporter is a part of, according to Fishman. The beat is the network of social ties that the reporter joins. Beats, according to Fishman, have a topical and territorial quality.

Journalists refer to their beats as a set of issues that they are accountable for covering, as well as locations to visit and people to see. Gans views story proposal as the most important step in the news-generating process. Reporters have to come up with story ideas. They are judged in part on their capacity to recommend appropriate stories, thus they must "keep up with what is going on in the beats they patrol or in the areas of the country assigned to their bureaus." Story suggestions are also required of other staff members, such as senior editors and producers, and nonjournalists are urged to contribute as well, according to Gans.

Gans' conception is enlightening as it relates beats to the idea generation that drives the tale. It concentrates on the idea-generating process. According to this perspective, raw material can only become news if someone working in the new construction industry recognizes its potential. This process of coming up with narrative ideas was dubbed "story ideation" by Bantz, McCorkle, and Baade; this term is covered in more depth below [7], [8].

TV and Beats

The majority of beat writing presupposed beats existed in journalistic companies. However, there were indications of diversity in beats and beat structure in early investigations of news production. In particular, those early studies demonstrated that beat structure was either less commonly used by television newsrooms than by newspapers, or that the beats that were employed were typically less developed than those employed by newspapers. In his research, Drew examined decision-making processes in three local television newsrooms in a mid-sized Midwest market. He discovered that some beats particularly those covering city hall have occasionally been used in television. Epstein, however, discovered that fixed beats aside from those in Washington, namely at the White House didn't “satisfy the network's basic problem of creating 'national news'” based on an examination of newsgathering and production practices at three significant US television national networks. As a consequence, when the assignment editor determined that the particular event was worthy of being covered, reporters were switched around based on availability and logistical factors.

In his seminal investigation of a local television newsroom, Altheide failed to discover any indication of a beat organization. The reporters' and editors' main worry was having enough content for the newscasts, and they got their story ideas from wire services, newspapers, press releases, and phone calls. According to Fishman, this means that most significant occurrences are determined indirectly for television journalists by newspapers and wire agency reporters, who mostly cover beats.

In an analysis of three television news organizations, McManus discovered that the majority of the reporters at each station were tasked with covering certain "areas to search for news," or news beats. Finding noteworthy incidents took no more than a few minutes each day due to the news managers' expectations for producing daily reports. Reporters at one station were meant to have one day a week to catch up on their beats, but the assignment editor would often take that day away for an urgent story. In the process of obtaining information, the station's size matters. There will be more highly active discoveries on a bigger station. However, McManus contended that stories that are found relatively passively get much more airtime on television than do tales that are found actively [8], [9].

Idea for a Story

The notion of narrative ideation appears to hold some of the keys to understanding why beats are produced. Story idea is the most important step in the news generation process, according to Gans. narrative idea creation is referred to as "story ideation" by Bantz, McCorkle, and Baade. They saw that a process that started with the story concept resulted in something becoming news in the television newsroom they investigated. To identify potential stories, news staff members evaluated the material arriving at the newsroom from a variety of sources, including phone calls, emails, newspapers, magazines, press releases, and police, fire, and FBI radios. Following discussion of these story ideas, judgments were taken over which of the raw materials would be turned into news at the daily story "budget" meeting.

It seems that television networks have discovered other methods for coming up with narrative ideas. Unlike newspapers, television news organizations have limited personnel and

expensive production expenses, so they cannot afford to generate more stories than they will utilize. Because of this, assignment editors divide their staff to increase the likelihood of producing a story.

While beat structures differ in that reporters are required to come up with ideas on a given issue, certain television news tactics are similar in that they replace conventional beats. All these methods have in common, however, is that they generate concepts that meet the requirements of the media company. Beats are seen as a means of organizing news collecting in the majority of the literature on news production, but they are a means of coming up with narrative ideas.

CONCLUSION

This study contributes to the ongoing discourse on news production by addressing the changing dynamics in the relationship between journalists and media organizations. It highlights the need for a nuanced understanding of news routines, recognizing variations across media firms, employees, and historical periods. The examination of news beats and the idea of story ideation provides insights into how news is generated and shaped within news organizations. The study underscores the importance of recognizing variability in news routines to comprehend their causes and effects effectively. While acknowledging the foundational contributions of early works on news routines, the study suggests that the concept is not static and must be explored in diverse contexts. As news continues to evolve in the digital age, future research should consider the impact of technology, ownership, and organizational norms on news construction, ensuring a comprehensive understanding of the dynamic nature of the news production process.

REFERENCES:

[1] A. Mare, H. M. Mabweazara, and D. Moyo, "'Fake News' and Cyber-Propaganda in Sub-Saharan Africa: Recentering the Research Agenda," *African Journalism Studies*. 2019. doi: 10.1080/23743670.2020.1788295.

[2] I. Bergillos, "Rethinking Vox-Pops in Television News Evolution of Person-on-the-Street Interviews in Spanish News Programs," *Journal. Pract.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/17512786.2019.1635042.

[3] F. REBILLARD and N. SMYRNAIOS, "Quelle « plateformisation » de l'information ? Collusion socioéconomique et dilution éditoriale entre les entreprises médiatiques et les infomédiaires de l'Internet," *Tic société*, 2019, doi: 10.4000/ticetsociete.4080.

[4] A. Cañedo, "Austerity versus diversity: The production of news content in televisión del principado de Asturias," *Commun. Soc.*, 2019, doi: 10.15581/003.32.4.77-92.

[5] M. Martinez-Nicolas, E. Saperas, and Á. Carrasco-Campos, "Communication research in Spain over the past 25 years (1990-2014). Objects of study and research methods in the papers published by Spanish peer-reviewed communication journals," *Empiria*. 2019.

[6] M. H. Ansari, A. van Steensel, and Y. V. Nazarov, "Entropy production in quantum is different," *Entropy*. 2019. doi: 10.3390/e21090854.

[7] D. Rohlin, "ETHOS IN CLIMATE CHANGE COMMUNICATION: ANALYZING DIGITAL AND BROADCAST NEWS COVERAGE OF THE FOURTH NATIONAL CLIMATE ASSESSMENT," 2019.

[8] A. Bouchard *et al.*, "Promising Future for the Berry Industry," *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, 2019, doi: 10.1021/jf061538c.

[9] C.-Y. Chen and S.-L. Chang, "Factors associated with belief or disbelief in false news: From the perspective of elaboration likelihood and moderating effect model," *BMC Public Health*, 2019.

CHAPTER 8

EXPLORING THE NEXUS: NEWS PHILOSOPHY, NARRATIVE IDEATION, AND THE ROLE OF BEATS IN MEDIA ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. Harshith K M, Assistant Professor
Department of General Management, Centre for Management Studies, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- harshith_km@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

This study delves into the intricate relationship between news philosophy, narrative ideation, and the utilization of story ideation techniques in media organizations. Investigating the concept of beats and their varied purposes, the research explores how media companies formulate distinct news philosophies that influence their story ideation strategies. Drawing on observations of two television stations and one newspaper in a medium-sized metro area, the study reveals how news philosophies shape the organizational structures and practices, subsequently impacting the final news output. The findings indicate that television newsrooms, unlike their newspaper counterparts, exhibit less complex beat structures due to differing organizational needs and resource availability. The study highlights the significance of story ideation processes and suggests a need for further exploration into the multifaceted nature of news creation.

KEYWORDS:

Knowledge, Media, Organization, Philosophy.

INTRODUCTION

Understanding why a specific media organization would choose to use one technique for story ideation over another is necessary if story ideation is a defining feature of news, which implies that all news organizations need story ideas. Additionally, if there are multiple ways for media organizations to generate story ideas, then knowledge of these reasons is necessary. According to Hage's definition, an action premise is required, which indicates which mechanisms for narrative ideation will be employed and when. At least one recommendation is provided by recent study on the ways in which media companies react to market demands. In commercial systems, media companies give their products a personality, or what marketers refer to as a brand. The news product's attributes are specified by the identity, often known as the brand. This compels media managers to formulate what they refer to as a news philosophy, which is a perspective about the kind of news offering the company will provide. That news mindset is anticipated to influence the media organization's story ideation strategies.

Only lately has media academics focused on branding in the media sectors, especially in TV stations. Atwater discovered that in order to outperform their rivals in a cutthroat industry, television news organizations do differentiate their offerings. Stations specifically used somewhat soft news items to set themselves apart from other outlets. A common method for achieving this kind of product difference is branding, which is the creation and upkeep of a set of customer-pleasing qualities and traits for a product. "News philosophy" is something that media companies often brand, either overtly or covertly. This is how the company generally handles its news product. Organizations choose which features of their

communities to highlight or minimize, which news to present in a serious or lighthearted manner, and whether to emphasize or minimize news regarding crime and violence. Since these choices are meant to set competing news offerings apart, they are motivated by the market. Organizations choose distinct "news philosophies" for radio and television, where there is intense rivalry, at least in the US, and then market those distinctions by branding their products appropriately [1], [2].

Extra Purposes for Beats

The action premise required to explain why beats are used in certain media companies but not in others is provided by this examination of the ideas of news philosophy and narrative ideation. Media companies should be increasingly distinctive in their news philosophies and, as a result, more distinctive in the ways they use story ideation approaches as market rivalry grows. Although much of the study on news architecture focuses on how beats might be used to collect news, there are other purposes that beats can have for newsrooms. In fact, Becker, Lowrey, Claussen, and Anderson have contended that beats may be interpreted in at least three distinct ways. Beats are used by news organizations as effective, if not necessary, instruments for news collecting, according to one perspective the one presented in the studied literature on news creation. Beats are a kind of work distinction, according to Becker and colleagues' analysis of the sociology of organizations literature. In other words, they are a means of allocating individuals to roles where they can contribute most effectively to the success of the company as a whole. According to this theory, newsrooms should have developed beats as they became larger since, at its core, job segmentation makes an organization run more smoothly. Lastly, beats may be seen as a component of the management incentive system. Beats may be used to reward good performance and penalize or discipline poor performance by ranking them hierarchically.

There is no contradiction between these three meanings of a beat. Beats may be used to generate ideas for stories as well as to collect news. They may serve as a reward system and represent differences in jobs. In their examination of newspaper newsrooms, Becker and colleagues found no indication that beats are employed for this third purpose. Beat structure did, however, vary depending on the size of the organization, but it remained mostly constant as it became more complicated, supporting the idea that beats are instruments used in the creation of news.

Beats may obviously have unintended effects in addition to those that their designers intended. Some have discussed the effects of the connections that form in beats, for instance. Beats are important to Breed because they offer reporters power. He deduced that beat reporters were given the role of "editor." According to Eliasoph, depending on the power dynamics between the reporter and the source, beat reporting need not always be objective. Beat reporters and their sources are entangled in a "symbiotic relationship" of reciprocal obligations, according to Soloski. This makes their task easier and harder at the same time. According to Donohue, Olien, and Tichenor, authors who cover a beat on a regular basis have a shared meaning system that allows for the efficient production of tales with mostly consistent outcomes.

Our research offers preliminary evidence in favor of the hypothesised connection between news philosophy, narrative ideation, and the use of story ideation techniques. In a medium-sized metro area in the Southeast of the country, researchers spent two days monitoring the newsrooms of two television stations and one newspaper. The television stations were selected due to their similar newsroom sizes, weekly newscast production counts, and network-related resources. However, variations in methods for producing the final news

product were to be expected. The newspaper served as the metropolitan area's only daily newspaper. Informal interviews were also carried out by the researchers with journalists and newsroom management. During the observation period, the newspapers and newscasts produced were read, watched, and examined.

This research offers some straightforward responses to the queries raised about the significance of beats. Initially, while lacking the conspicuous specialty structure seen in newspaper newsrooms, television newsrooms were staffed by experts. For instance, experts covered consumer news, sports, health, and the weather. In their specialized fields, these experts were in charge of coming up with tales, ideas, and other material. The findings show that, for the simple reason that television newsrooms did not need such a complex organization, they did not have the intricate beat structure of newspaper newsrooms. Compared to newspapers, television newsrooms require fewer stories, and they could come up with story ideas and stories from scanners, their general assignment reporters' casual observations, websites, press releases, and easily accessible listings of local events.

According to the research, news organizations established a mechanism to produce specialist content when they determined they required it on a regular basis. This was accomplished by assigning a specific person to handle the creation of this kind of material. In one of the TV stations under investigation, these experts were referred to as "franchise" reporters. Their duties included coming up with story ideas, reporting, and producing pieces on things like health and consumer news. Even though they weren't referred to as "franchise" reporters, sports reporters and weather reporters operated similarly. The station determined that it required a consistent programming schedule that included sports and the weather, and that hiring a specialist whose job it was to develop that schedule was the best way to acquire it [3], [4].

The editors of the publication under study had determined they need a consistent flow of material from a region that is outside of the city, therefore they made a beat just for it. A very particular requirement for the newspaper under study was met by the establishment of a geographic beat at the publication. The newspaper sought copies from that area in order to broaden its readership there. Furthermore, the journal aimed to fulfill its own ambition to have a regional emphasis. It was required of the reporter assigned to the beat to consistently submit articles and provide story ideas. The methods used by the two television networks under investigation to come up with story ideas varied. The bigger of the two stations depended more on the abilities, knowledge, and organizational prowess of the key assignment person, while the smaller station depended more on its reporters and producers. The variations seem to be a reflection of the two stations' divergent approaches to reporting. The news philosophies of the newspapers and television stations obviously differed significantly from one another.

Discussions inside the newspaper workplace demonstrated a concern for the breadth, depth, and comprehensiveness of the news coverage. The emphasis was much more focused in the television newsrooms. The news directors understood the boundaries of what they could do during a broadcast in both situations. Essentially, they were more concerned with producing an entertaining broadcast for the viewers than with reflecting even the most salient aspects of the community's activities. When it comes to separating story conception and development at television stations from daily newspapers, the numbers are rather obvious. Regarding the distinctions between the television channels, they are less explicit. Even though those disparities were little, they seemed to be important as they looked to represent different perspectives on news.

The conclusions drawn from the news building literature in this chapter align with the fundamental ideas presented in these case studies. The concepts that would be utilized to create news stories were the raw ingredients that each of the news organizations under observation needed to start each news day. The organizations developed routines or processes to ensure the availability of these products since they had limited resources available for their procurement. There were beats engaged for the newspaper. Though not as complex, they nevertheless required specialty for the television stations. The television stations gave people particular tasks including developing, putting together, and organizing story ideas, and they also assigned people to make "packages" on a regular basis. The qualities of the news product were shaped in part by anticipated customer demand. Every media outlet seemed to have a news philosophy, or a sense of purpose, influenced by what was popular in the industry. They made an effort to "brand" their goods appropriately.

DISCUSSION

In the foreword to a news-focused special edition of the journal Political Communication, Ryfe makes the case that the study of news media has yielded a single, generally consistent conclusion: news is very homogenous. The answer provided by the study also explains this homogeneity: news is the result of a set of organizational procedures that are constant over space, time, and organizations. The majority of routines research is focused on the analysis of American media, Ryfe acknowledges, and it remains unclear if routines vary in other regions of the globe or whether they have changed throughout time and should be anticipated to alter going forward. According to Bourdieu, French media also exhibits a certain level of content homogeneity. Shoemaker and Cohen examined a composite week of news stories from newspapers, radio shows, and television shows in ten different nations across the globe and discovered more similarities than differences in the subjects covered.

On the other hand, Donsbach discovered that American journalists exhibit a greater degree of division of labor compared to their counterparts in four European nations. Compared to journalists in other nations, American journalists are also more inclined to modify their reports for accuracy's sake. Esser discovered stark contrasts in the function differentiation of newsrooms in German and British newspapers after a thorough examination of their structures. German newsrooms had almost no role differentiation, while British newsrooms had a lot of it. In a research including journalists from twelve different states, Weaver discovered significant variations in the roles that the journalists believed they ought to perform in society. Because previous study has concentrated on the glaring parallels in content, Esser came to the conclusion that the body of current scholarship is naïve in its failure to acknowledge variations in routines and structure.

In a critical analysis of the organizational approach to the study of news, Cook said that although this viewpoint demonstrated the importance of routines, it provided no details on those routines. Cook maintained that there is more to the American news industry than just a collection of companies. He argues that since news content and the mechanism that creates it are comparable, the news media should be examined as a single entity. There is now more attention in news routines as a result of Cook and Sparrow's virtually simultaneous emphasis on an institutional approach to news. This is confirmed by essays and reports written by Benson, Cook, Entman, Kaplan, Lawrence, Lowrey, Ryfe, and Sparrow, the majority of which were printed in the Political Communication special issue.

Lowrey contends that the "new institutional" approach is a response to conventional organizational behavior research and theory by relying on the sociological literature. That study did not consider the context of human behavior; instead, it saw people and their

organizations as merely goal-oriented and calculative. Institutionalists have concentrated on the environment of organizations as well as the influence of customs, conventions, and unquestioning typifications on decision-making. The institutions' policies and procedures become accepted without question. Businesses adhere to them without questioning their efficacy. It's unclear yet how much of a difference this new method will make to news production studies. Based on modern institutionalism, Sparrow contends that news organizations create standard operating procedures in reaction to three types of uncertainty: those related to raw resources, earnings, and legitimacy. The first and third of these are major points of contention in the literature on media economics, which makes the case that media organizations are essentially economic in character. Entman contends that news institutionalism by itself is insufficient to explain how the media covers foreign policy and recommends combining it with insights from the literature on foreign policy and the media.

As previously said, we think the organization viewpoint is still useful. Since story ideas are the foundation of news, we believe that one of the distinguishing traits of news organizations is their need for them. This need gives rise to the organizational structures and practices, which in turn influence the final news output. Story ideation has received less attention in historical literature than might seem optimal. As a consequence, nobody is aware of the many ways that tales might be created. Undoubtedly, beats which have historically been a source of worry in the literature on news construction are essential to the creation of narrative concepts. There are other methods as well [3], [4].

Because routines were not seen as flexible, the literature on news routines seemed to have stagnated. This renewed attention to differences in narrative idea creation approaches provides a new direction for investigation. In a similar vein, it is worthwhile to investigate the causes of variance in tale ideation processes. One such precursor is mentioned here: news philosophy. It's conceivable that others will show up as well. Variability in narrative ideation approaches might point to discrepancies in media representation, especially locally, that have been overlooked by most previous studies.

As expected by Ryfe, procedures will change over time. We also believe that the process of producing news will be significantly impacted by the separation of journalism from media corporations. The news agenda of use-driven websites differs significantly from that of the mainstream press, according to preliminary study. Citizen journalists, or journalists operating outside the conventional media's bounds and without specialized training in journalism, are probably going to come up with different story ideas than journalists employed by the media. Since such concepts will have little to no bearing on how journalism is now practiced, the processes for coming up with them are also probably going to change. The most important procedure in news creation will most likely continue to be story ideation. It is thus the area where it makes the most financial sense to focus future study [5], [6].

Analysis: Units vs. Levels

When developing a gatekeeping research, deciding on the unit and degree of analysis are the most crucial choices. The features of the unit of analysis make up the variables in a research. It is the object under measurement. Each instance in a data file, such as Web sites, magazine articles, TV news programs, newspaper front pages, reporters, editors, or producers, and corporate codes of ethics, constitutes one unit of analysis. A study's analysis is more theoretical in nature: What is the hypothesis based on? About what is speculation made? To what extent are certain phenomena aggregated? From micro to macro, different levels of analysis separate the universe into sections for theoretical purposes.

More misunderstanding arises from these components of the research than any other, in part because the phrases are frequently used interchangeably. This is because survey and experimental techniques are used in the majority of quantitative communication research; individual subjects are often the unit of analysis as well as the level of analysis. To test ideas about specific individuals, we collect data about them. On the other hand, content analysis technique is often used in gatekeeping research, and the level and unit of analysis are frequently different. Shoemaker and Reese suggest that the individual, media routines, organizational, extramedia, and ideological levels of analysis are the five that are relevant for the examination of communication content. For any level of analysis, several units of analysis may be examined. Explanation is often provided at one level by the use of information acquired at a different level. When, for instance, judgments are made about news professionals based only on the organization they work for, this might give rise to the "ecological fallacy."

Micro units are examined in research conducted at the person level, although they are not restricted to specific individuals. Additional individual-level units of analysis may include news articles, blogs, images, television news programs, reporters, producers, or even viewers. Making the choice of the unit of analysis the newspaper or the day is crucial. We are operating at the organizational level of analysis if the newspaper serves as the analytical unit. When analyzing at the individual level, variables are traits of specific individuals.

The routines used to complete tasks are the units of study in studies that examine the standard procedures of communication work. For instance, a researcher interested in examining how ethics affect gatekeeping choices can examine the codes of ethics of specific people or television companies. The unit of analysis is the code of ethics, which varies throughout news companies. Journalists could be bound by more than one code of ethics, for example, from the government or a professional association. In this instance, not each newspaper, but rather each code of ethics would be its own case in the data file. Each code of ethics has variables, which include the themes addressed, the date of revision, and the level of detail.

A lot of research on gatekeeping use the organizational level of analysis, whereby blogs, television networks, newspapers, newspapers, or chains become the unit of study and all variables are attributes of them.

A few examples of variables might include hits per day, replies received, blog post subjects, and so on. The features of each radio station, such as profitability, signal coverage, or the proportion of Asian ethnic origins in the coverage region, would be the variables if radio stations were the units of analysis.

Governments, interest groups, and religious institutions are examples of units of analysis that fall within the social institution level of analysis. These are also organizations, but examining non-media social institutions enables us to evaluate their unique influence on the gatekeeping process, in contrast to the organizational level of study.

Variables are attributes of these units, including the number of employees in public relations, the amount allocated to outside PR firms, or the total amount spent on PR campaigns in the previous year.

Lastly, we examine variables that are traits of social systems at the macro level. Every subsequent level is built upon the foundation of the social structure. Units of study for social systems include cities, nations, continents, and political coalitions. Factors include the number of ethnic groups, the size of the population, the quantity of imports and exports, and the political system characterize the units under study [7], [8].

Getting Over Levels of Analysis

The intricacy of the gatekeeping process, which spans many levels of research, may have led communication experts to choose case studies over other approaches. Through the use of case studies, researchers may gather a variety of evidence for inductive analysis, which is then utilized to develop theories. Even though Mr. and Ms. Gates' studies focused on individual decisions, it was immediately apparent that these editors followed the standards of news ethics as interpreted by their employers and the profession as a whole, rather than choosing news items solely based on their own whims.

As a result, the gatekeeper's personal preferences are variables at the individual level of analysis. This raises the issue of what personal traits may account for preferences. The level of analysis addressing the regular behaviors of communication professionals includes deadlines and a preference against repeating information about the same issue. Routine practices include news values that are shared by news organizations, but it's also conceivable that the organizations or management push their own preferences to include or avoid articles about subjects that interest them. Analysis is also done at the organizational level when such preferences are codified into written or unwritten corporate policy.The social system and its institutions have an impact on items as well. Even though media organizations are social institutions in and of themselves, examining them independently of other institutions enables us to examine the differences across media organizations as well as the connections between media corporations and other social institutions. Among the organizations that communicate with the mainstream media are the government, interest groups, sponsors, and religious organizations.

It is obvious that misunderstanding will arise and inaccurate conclusions will likely be drawn when gatekeeping studies speculate about units on several levels of examination. Although it is possible, scholars often refrain from thinking about one level of analysis and gathering evidence regarding units of analysis from another level. Shoemaker, Eichholz, Kim, and Wrigley, for instance, looked at the relative effects of factors on the content of newspaper reports regarding 50 Congressional bills at the individual and regular practice levels of analysis. The researchers performed a content analysis in addition to two questionnaires. Two surveys were distributed: one to editors and the other to newspaper reporters who covered the 50 legislation. Only personal questions about gender and political philosophy were posed to reporters. Editors were simply required to rank the newsworthiness of each of the fifty legislation.

Data from the two polls and information about the newspaper articles had to be combined in order to create the final data file since the data were gathered from three distinct units of analysis. Such intricacy is typical of gatekeeping research. Each article on a bill in the final data file was given a story number based on the average of the editors' judgments of each bill's newsworthiness and the reporter's attributes. According to statistical research, regular "news values" were a more reliable indicator of how widely the legislation were covered than the traits of the authors.

Scholars may now access quantitative data from several levels of analysis thanks to newer statistical techniques like hierarchical linear modeling. The main benefit of this is the increased accuracy obtained by utilizing the data at lower levels at the time of collection, as opposed to averaging or otherwise merging them to create an aggregate at a higher level of analysis. The corpus of information about the gatekeeping process has to be up to date since media environments are always evolving. According to Bourdieu, the journalism profession is "continually being modified." Ideology, as Gans tells us, "changes somewhat over time."

Other new study avenues must be investigated in addition to the dynamics of gatekeeping in the context of new media, which has been the subject of a promising new line of inquiry[9], [10]. The study of gatekeeping has been employed to examine the variations and commonalities across social systems. Understanding journalism in the framework of the social system "should not be the closing line of a sermon but the beginning of an investigation into how various political cultures and institutions shape and structure various news cultures and institutions," claims Schudson. Benson and Neveu agree when they say that cross-national research is the only way to reveal certain sorts of variation, particularly at the broad system level. In addition, we must investigate commonalities amongst systems in addition to their differences. Shoemaker and Cohen have looked at parallels in the definitions of news in 10 different nations—differences partially accounted for by human evolutionary biology.

CONCLUSION

This study contributes valuable insights into the dynamic interplay between news philosophy, narrative ideation, and story ideation techniques within media organizations. By examining the roles of beats and their implications for news collection, organizational structure, and management practices, the research sheds light on the nuanced decision-making processes in newsrooms.

The observed variations in story ideation approaches among media entities underscore the impact of market demands, resource considerations, and organizational size on news production. As the media landscape evolves, understanding these factors becomes crucial for adapting news creation processes.

This research sets the stage for future investigations into the evolving dynamics of news ideation and the potential influences of emerging media formats on journalistic practices.

REFERENCES:

[1] J. Sutduean, A. Harakan, and K. Jermsittiparsert, “Exploring the nexus between supply chain integration, export marketing strategies practices and export performance: A case of Indonesian firms,” *Humanit. Soc. Sci. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.18510/hssr.2019.73102.

[2] C. Thongrawd, W. Bootpo, S. Thipha, and K. Jermsittiparsert, “Exploring the nexus of green information technology capital, environmental corporate social responsibility, environmental performance and the business competitiveness of Thai sports industry firms,” *J. Hum. Sport Exerc.*, 2019, doi: 10.14198/jhse.2019.14.Proc5.33.

[3] D. Todorovski and J. Potel, “Exploring the nexus between displacement and land administration: The case of Rwanda,” *Land*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/land8040055.

[4] C. Le Roux and M. Pretorius, “Exploring the nexus between integrated reporting and sustainability embeddedness,” *Sustain. Accounting, Manag. Policy J.*, 2019, doi: 10.1108/SAMPJ-02-2018-0049.

[5] M. Valbjørn and R. Hinnebusch, “Exploring the Nexus between Sectarianism and Regime Formation in a New Middle East: Theoretical Points of Departure,” *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism*. 2019. doi: 10.1111/sena.12293.

[6] M. Dhanabhakyam and G. Sowmya, “Exploring the nexus between talent incongruence and psychological contract in it industry,” *Int. J. Adv. Sci. Technol.*, 2019.

[7] S. J. McGrane *et al.*, “Scaling the nexus: Towards integrated frameworks for analysing water, energy and food,” *Geogr. J.*, 2019, doi: 10.1111/geoj.12256.

[8] F. M. Dzanku, “Food security in rural sub-Saharan Africa: Exploring the nexus between gender, geography and off-farm employment,” *World Dev.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.08.017.

[9] N. H. Chiroma, “Exploring the nexus between children and youth ministry,” *Verbum Eccles.*, 2019, doi: 10.4102/ve.v40i1.2024.

[10] T. Nawaz, “Exploring the Nexus Between Human Capital, Corporate Governance and Performance: Evidence from Islamic Banks,” *J. Bus. Ethics*, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s10551-017-3694-0.

CHAPTER 9

GATEKEEPING IN THE MEDIA LANDSCAPE: UNDERSTANDING PROCESSES, INFLUENCES, AND EVOLVING PARADIGMS

Dr. Uma C Swadimath, Assistant Professor
Department of General Management, Centre for Management Studies, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.uma_swadimath@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

This study delves into the enduring significance of gatekeeping theory in the field of journalism, tracing its roots to Kurt Lewin's social psychology and exploring its evolution over time. Gatekeeping, a multifaceted process involving the selection, crafting, and dissemination of news, has been a focal point in communication research since the 1950s. The study examines key components of gatekeeping theory, ranging from individual gatekeepers to organizational and societal influences. The historical progression is dissected, highlighting seminal studies such as David Manning White's examination of news editors and Warren Breed's insights into social control in the newsroom. The research also addresses shifts in gatekeeping dynamics, considering the impact of technological advancements and changes in news consumption patterns, particularly in the digital age. Theoretical frameworks, including Pierre Bourdieu's field theory, are explored to gain a comprehensive understanding of gatekeeping across different levels of analysis. The study concludes by identifying essential issues that persist in gatekeeping research, emphasizing the need for clarity on the nature of the forces influencing news selection and the application of diverse methodological approaches. The gatekeeping theory remains a vital framework for examining the intricate dynamics of news selection and dissemination. As media landscapes continue to evolve, future research should strive for a nuanced understanding of the forces at play, utilizing diverse methodologies to enhance the depth and breadth of gatekeeping scholarship.

KEYWORDS:

Information, Internet, Newspapers, Planning.

INTRODUCTION

Information from the Internet, newspapers, news magazines, radio, television, and their sources is thrown at journalists nonstop. Without gatekeeping, they would be unable to choose and mold the little quantity of information that makes it into news. It is the process of choosing, crafting, revising, placing, planning, repeating, and manipulating information so that it becomes news. Scholars must comprehend the gatekeeping process and how it affects the reality that is given to the public because gatekeepers paint an image of the world for the rest of us. Throughout the 1950s, communication researchers have consistently used gatekeeping, one of the first social science ideas, to analyze news1. The key components of gatekeeping theory are defined in this chapter, along with the major gatekeeping theorists and texts, the state of gatekeeping research at the moment, important issues in gatekeeping theory theorizing, methodological questions and concerns, and, lastly, suggestions for future gatekeeping scholarship.

All gatekeeping research centers on items, or those pieces of information that are molded, scheduled, rejected, or chosen. Kurt Lewin's social psychology idea of how people's eating habits may be altered is where the practice of tracking the flow of things originated. The objects in his hypothesis were food items. A plethora of objects might make their way into the gatekeeping process. Not everything is chosen. Some find their way into channels, which

are sometimes separated into areas that are exclusively accessible utilizing gates. Forces may act on one or both sides of the gate, changing in strength and valence direction, to either assist or restrict the movement of objects through the barrier. Certain goods are prevented from moving through the channels by weak or negative forces, and it's vital to remember that forces exist both before and after gates. For instance, the cost of microwave remote equipment hinders a television station's ability to cover live events until it is purchased and passes the gate. However, once the equipment is acquired, the purchase has a positive force that encourages the news producer to use it frequently to justify the cost. The last component the conclusion of the gatekeeping procedure. This includes the outcome of the item's selection as well as the effects of various influences throughout its passage through channels, sections, and gates [1], [2].

Information flows via the channel only if the gatekeeper is in charge of what happens to it afterward. Gatekeepers may take many different forms, such as individuals, corporate rules, professional standards of behavior, and computer algorithms. Although they all exercise some degree of autonomy, gatekeepers all make choices. The concept of autonomy may refer to anything from a person's peculiar whims to a system of unbreakable laws that are understood by computer programs. The information management corporation Google selects news articles for users of the news website news.google.com using algorithms, which are collections of formulas that convert the organization's gatekeeping rules into computer instructions. It may seem that human censors have little control since Google presents its choices as current news to its large readership, but algorithms are the result of several judgments made by everyone from code writers to managers. The result of this process is Google News, which presents an ostensibly impartial view of the day. However, this objectivity is a quality of people and their perception of the world, not of computer systems.

Early research on gatekeeping about news events saw the gate as a point of entry and exit, with little to no consideration for other facets of the gatekeeper's duties. But Donahue, Tichenor, and Olien stress that gatekeeping is a more involved process that involves choices about how much time and space are given to news events, wherein a magazine or news program the story is placed, whether graphics are used, how many stories are published about the event in a single day or over several days, and whether the story cyclically repeats itself. Or, to put it another way, reporters may present the narrative.

Early Impacts

Even while audience and effect-related concerns have dominated communication studies, gatekeeping has consistently served as a reminder of the significance of institutional, organizational, and professional aspects in comprehending the media environment. One of the first ideas in the area, gatekeeping, is linked to Kurt Lewin, one of the major "forerunners" suggested by Rogers and one of the "four founders" of the subject as determined by Berelson. Like any paradigm, the gatekeeping tradition has had an impact by compellingly drawing attention to certain occurrences. As a consequence, this key idea has inspired many research topics across a broad spectrum of communication activity, going much beyond the original meaning of the term developed by Lewin, a social psychologist with training in physics. By establishing channels and gates that controlled what flowed through them, he attempted to apply the concepts of physical science to human behavior.

This simple but effective model helped to make sense of the limitless effects and people who work in a communication situation. It is adaptable to other areas. Lewin's thinking was similar to that of other early thinkers like Claude Shannon and Norbert Wiener, who created unifying "engineering" models that could be applied to mass and interpersonal

communication regardless of "channel," and who believed that psychological "forces" could be studied mathematically.Lewin had a significant impact on a former journalist named David Manning White, who was Wilbur Schramm's student and Lewin's assistant at the University of Iowa. According to White's memory: "I came upon a paper written by Kurt Lewin wherein he introduced the phrase "gate-keeper." I pursued it because I believed that the intricate set of "gates" that a newspaper report had to pass through from the real-life event to the completed narrative in a newspaper would make an intriguing study.

White's 1949 study of a news editor contributed to the history of research on media "gatekeepers" by bringing Lewin's ideas into the context of journalism. His research addressed the intuitively clear issue of how news companies handle the conundrum of having too much information and not enough room. "The 'Gatekeeper': A case study in the selection of news," the title reads. The 1950 Journalism Quarterly included an essay by White that was extensively republished and quoted, dubbed "one of the first studies of its kind," that looked at the rationale behind a news editor's decision to accept or reject a list of possible stories. Despite focusing on a single person's choices, the approach had a significant impact.

“How highly subjective, how reliant upon value judgments based on the 'gatekeeper's' own set of experiences, attitudes, and expectations the communication of 'news' really is,” White noted after reading the justifications provided for choosing ten percent of the wire reports to run in the Peoria Star. His interpretation of Lewin was firmly individualistic, emphasizing the gatekeeper above the channel. This approach was adopted by later research, which identified journalist selection as the primary cause of news "bias." White reflected on his past professional activity with a similar realization: "I tried to edit Westbrook Pegler's vitriolic prose with objectivity, but I quickly became quite aware of my antipathy to the incoming columns." Nonetheless, the managing editor of the daily summoned me to his office one day and informed me that Pegler's articles had become noticeably shorter over the last several weeks...Unconsciously or visibly aware, I had been deleting whole lines or paragraphs of old Pegler content.

The model strongly implies that the necessity to condense a vast array of events that occur in the world into a small number that ultimately make the news is the primary cause of media distortion. That suggests that news selection would be less difficult if that were not the case and editors were more adept at making the right decisions. In addition, the gatekeeping model allows for several decision-makers throughout the selection process; yet, many studies, including White's, have a propensity to concentrate on a single phase of that process. The fact that "Mr. Gates" did not have complete control over the events of the day suggests that he may have received too much credit for his ability to exert influence. Additionally, his primary responsibility was to choose from a limited pool of options since the articles in the major wire services were essentially similar.

Warren Breed's study on social control in the newsroom is often cited alongside White's, although not being a "gatekeeping" study per se. Additionally, a former newspaper reporter, Breed conducted interviews with a sample of newsmen at medium-sized newspapers for his book "Social Control in the Newsroom: A Functional Analysis" to learn how they choose which stories to choose. In a way, Breed recognized newspaper publishers as the unofficial gatekeepers who use oblique tactics to make sure that only news that complies with corporate guidelines is distributed. Breed found that "policy news may be slanted or buried so that some important information is denied the citizenry" to be a pertinent gatekeeping concern [3], [4].

Breed's contribution was to demonstrate how the most significant gatekeeper could not always be the person directly participating in the selection process, but rather someone who works at a higher, more influential level of the company. The subjectivity of the gatekeeper would appear to seriously problematize the news process if news is just what journalists think it is, yet the field was sluggish to act upon this crucial realization. The assumption that the gatekeeper, working in the best interests of the community, "sees to it that the community shall hear as a fact only those events which the newsman, as the representative of his culture, believes to be true," according to Reese and Ballinger, explains why. Similar to White, Breed suggested that if the excessive power of publishers was limited, the gatekeeping system might satisfy the community via journalistic norms and other guidelines. These viewpoints thus held that society did not need to dread the choices made by gatekeepers as long as they continued to be devoted cultural ambassadors.

DISCUSSION

For many years, this benevolent perception of gatekeepers served to deflect attention from this crucial procedure, until journalistic judgments were once again scrutinized by those who were not in the area of communication. While Breed's perspective attributed gatekeeping authority to the publisher and White to the editor's subjective assessment, subsequent research in media sociology, conducted a decade or more later, put the responsibility at the organizational level. Herbert Gans, a sociologist, explored sources of power inside organizations and the incentives journalists have to follow practical concerns and social norms in his extremely important work. This strategy, which is a beneficial corrective, integrates gatekeeping into the regular and operational operations of businesses. Gans locates the process by which all organizational components, procedures, and arrangements are used to create news rather than the journalist, publisher, or gatekeeping editor. This helps shift the responsibility for misrepresentation away from certain journalists.

According to Gans, the news process entails resolving the issues associated with transforming the daily stream of events into a commodity that can be sold to consumers. Journalists employ "considerations" to help them make decisions on the answer, which must be applicable with little thought. They have to ensure the greatest outcomes with the least amount of work, help prevent excessive ambiguity, be adaptable, justify or explain things to others simply, and be efficient. Power and efficiency are the foundation of the news equation and are intimately related.

The competitive aspects provide the best example of how these elements are not always taken into account. The news media wouldn't need to check with one another for confirmation if considerations were made automatically. In the murky realm of journalism, journalists always want to know what other people are up to. Journalists evaluate their work using the competition. The way journalists rely on the New York Times is among Gans's most perceptive insights. An arbiter who is expected to transcend media concerns and determine trends is needed by the networks and news magazines. It would need to be created if it didn't already exist.

Gans observes that "the news is not simply a compliant supporter of elites or the Establishment or the ruling class; rather, it views nation and society through its own set of values and with its conception of the good social order," which is consistent with the influence gatekeeping ascribes to journalists. Using this method, gatekeeping judgments are based on practical issues rather than personal preferences. However, do these choices work to consistently provide a stable selection of news products? Gans correctly points out that the finished result is the highlight of the highlights, particularly in television due to its space

constraints. Naturally, this begs the issue of what criteria are used to emphasize certain aspects of reality, and which aspects of truth are most exaggerated [5], [6].

The Keepers of the Gates

The gatekeeping tradition has, by its very nature, directed scholarly attention on the people in charge of the gates, even while it allows for channels and outside influences: "Mr. Gates. A significant area of study has been dedicated to characterizing these people's traits to predict their propensity for making judgments. The question of "who is a journalist" has been the subject of recent thinking, but gatekeeping subtly places the professionals who work for news organizations at the center of that definition: persons who prepare or distribute news items or other material with editorial responsibility, such as editors, writers, correspondents, columnists, and full-time reporters.

The most extensive tracking of this track has been done by Weaver and colleagues, who have identified the professional attitudes that guide gatekeepers for journalists, expanding the original work of Johnstone, Slawski, and Bowman's two categories of "neutral" and "participant" to include "disseminator," "adversarial," "interpretive," and, in a nod to the public journalism movement, "populist mobilizer." Weaver et al.'s most recent national survey builds on two earlier studies that compared these journalists to the broader population to characterize the professional and personal characteristics of these journalists. Therefore, these findings are predicated on the significance of the approximately 120,000 persons who comprise this professional group, in addition to the many and less objective polls of journalists that claim to demonstrate individual prejudice. The authors contend that because of their ability to influence our worldviews, their composition is more significant.

State of The Art

According to a survey of books and journals on communication, empirical investigations on gatekeeping research resumed in the previous ten years, after slowing down in the 1980s. The sociological movement in journalism studies, which Gans and others had foreshadowed, was followed by a paucity of gatekeeping research in the 1980s. The subject of research on gatekeepers in their organizational context has been directed by the sociology of newswork. White's theory of gatekeeping, which focused on the autonomy of individual gatekeepers in choosing what to report, has become less popular.

Since the 1980s, gatekeeping research has also advanced by reexamining earlier findings to take into consideration the evolving nature of journalism. As previously mentioned, Weaver and his associates have monitored several shifts in the composition and methods of journalism. They're not alone. Bleske examined how gatekeeping changed or did not change when the gatekeeper was a woman rather than a male, in line with the increasing number of women in journalism. Liebler and Smith discovered that there was little variation in the news content based on the gatekeeper's gender. The subject of race and its influence on news selection and composition has been examined by others. Weaver et al. have investigated how the 1990s civic or public journalism movement broadened notions of journalistic duty and affected gatekeepers' perceptions of their job.

The new generation of gatekeeping study, however, has been sparked by the entrance of technology and concomitant institutional changes. For instance, Berkowitz investigated the gatekeeping procedure in local television news, while earlier research focused on gatekeeping in newspapers. Abbott and Brassfield discovered some similarities in the decision-making processes of gatekeepers in print and electronic media. More lately, the focus has turned to the internet space where news is created. This research's overarching hypothesis is that as

technology advances, news organizations' operations and activities will also evolve. "The Web is not a finite, concrete media form; instead, its form is simultaneously fluid and global and supremely individualistic," as Singer states.

The early research on Internet news came to a variety of results; while some hailed the demise of organizational impacts on gatekeeping in the context of new media, others found few distinctions in the gatekeeping roles of older and newer media. Singer looks at how conventional print news organizations have changed to operate in the internet news environment and makes the argument that print routines are still effective there. However, some news. Websites have embraced the Internet's interactivity to provide a venue for reader involvement. Singer comes to the conclusion that, despite changes in the internet news landscape, the gatekeeping role "seems unlikely to lose all relevance any time soon."

An empirical study has arisen to explain how changes in the demographics of gatekeepers, news job routines, and news work settings have influenced the news we see and hear daily. Generally speaking, these investigations have depended upon past theories on gatekeeping systems. For instance, new types of subsidies, such as the introduction of video news releases targeted at electronic news organizations, have been studied using the notion of the news subsidy, as put out by Gandy and others. Part of the vitality of gatekeeping stems from an array of scholarly works that have evolved in tandem with the evolution of journalism [7], [8].

In the meanwhile, the widespread adoption of the gatekeeping notion as it has been more widely defined may have contributed to the relative lack of gatekeeping studies in the 1980s. As previously said, gatekeeping is no longer seen as only a question of selection or the work of a single, strong agent. The field of media sociology has been able to include gatekeeping study and restore its theoretical significance due to a more comprehensive understanding of gatekeeping.

This shift in direction toward sociology was more of a daring regression than a daring advance. The reason for gatekeeping's ongoing significance is a return to its origins. The role of the gatekeeper within a "field" was highlighted by Lewin, the father of gatekeeping research, whose "field theory" held that gatekeeping resulted from interactions between various elements within a social field. What Lewin referred to as "psychological ecology" served as the foundation for his field theory and was later linked to the theories of ecological systems and human ecology. Four systems were to be considered when understanding an individual: a micro-, meso---, exo-, and macrosystem. These systems generally lined up with the five levels of analysis that Shoemaker and Reese defined. The individual journalist level, the journalism routines or practices level, the organizational level, the extra-media level, and the social system level are these five layers, which are further explained below. More attention and room for theory on the creation and curation of news has resulted from this analytical approach. To get a better understanding of the elements influencing news about federal legislation, Shoemaker, Eichholz, Kim, and Wrigley, for instance, analyzed components at different levels of analysis.

Reexamining field theory may also benefit theoretical discussions on gatekeeping. Although Lewin's notion of the "field" served as the foundation for early gatekeeping research, more recent studies have looked at Pierre Bourdieu's field theory. A large amount of the work that has been done on the numerous ways that Bourdieu's field theory relates to journalistic gatekeeping has been done by Benson and Neveu, and delving into the nuances of his theorizing is beyond the purview of this chapter. Here, a few noteworthy contributions will be mentioned. First, the link between the various levels of analysis is addressed by Bourdieu's

field theory. "Field theory highlights the dynamic nature of power and is concerned with the relationship between macrostructures and organizational routines and journalistic practices." These organizational procedures, journalistic standards, and macrostructures all restrict people's agency. It should be noted that this paradigm is not strictly hierarchical, with routines and practices being dictated by macrostructures such as economic structures. Despite the significant impact of economic reasons on the majority of Western media, journalism retains a certain level of independence due to its foundation in "the specific capital unique to that field." Put another way, gatekeepers are somewhat shielded from the impact of outside forces by the institutional traits and practices of the news industry.

Second, researching individual components might be challenging since the subject is a network of linked factors. "The 'field' opens up a new unit of analysis for media research: the entire universe of journalists and media organizations acting and reacting about one another," writes Benson and Neveu in their conclusion. Few of the theories Benson offers for empirical investigation appear to focus on the field as an analytical unit. He suggests, for instance, that "a greater reliance on advertising is likely to contribute to more pro-consumerist depoliticization and ideological narrowing of news, as well as more positive coverage of business and labor unions." Nevertheless, thinking about the link between levels of analysis in a gatekeeping paradigm is given fresh momentum by Bourdieu's field theory.

Essential Issue

In the field of journalism, gatekeeping research has a long history, yet some important problems still exist. How we hypothesize about the many levels of analysis for the journalistic profession is one of those crucial questions that has already been discussed. If, as Herman and Chomsky have suggested, ideological considerations ultimately govern gatekeeping, then we must be clear about the reasons why it is valuable to investigate other levels of analysis. We'll also take into account another important factor in this discussion: the so-called "forces" involved in gatekeeping.

Lewin maintained, as previously said, that forces at the gate decide what becomes news and what doesn't. These factors restrict the independence of individual gatekeepers and consistently slant the news. Despite the use of metaphors like channels and gates in Lewin's gatekeeping theory, "force" seems to have some ontological significance. At the very least, gatekeepers are required to choose whether information to pick or not select. However, what are such forces? Research and theory on gatekeeping have mostly avoided addressing that issue. Nonetheless, it is a worthwhile question and response for several reasons. First, we should give practitioners the authority to change institutional practices or alignments if society is dissatisfied with the news that journalistic gatekeepers provide. Understanding the initial dynamics that formed or enabled such behaviors and alignments will be necessary to achieve that. Second, Lewin's usage of "force" might mask the kind and extent of coercive "power" that is used in the gatekeeping procedure. Those with less authority may not fully understand how hegemonic elites control the news industry. Thirdly, a coherent collection of propositions is necessary for theorizing. However, if we fail to clarify the essence of the force at the gate, we could maintain incongruous beliefs, such as about the essence of human reason. Alternatively, we can depend on functionalist presumptions that are not supported by actual evidence. Gans, for instance, referred to even his findings as "speculative" and accepted the empirical limits of functional analysis.

The nature of the "forces" at the gate seems to differ depending on the degree of analysis, even though little systematic research has been done on the subject. Research has shown, for instance, that not all individual decision-making is motivated by conscious thinking, but

rather might be the consequence of unconscious forces like the availability or representativeness heuristic. Meanwhile, social institutions provide "constraints and opportunities to which media organizations and actors respond" at the level of social systems. These potential and limitations result from the concurrent growth of political, media, and economic institutions. Because participants in a social system react rationally to the same opportunities and limitations, news content in social systems is comparable. We may anticipate variance even among rational individuals to the degree that the institutional context can provide several reasonable paths [9], [10].

Methodical Problems

As of right now, gatekeeping is seen to be a complicated idea that can be put to the test using a range of methodological and statistical techniques. Gatekeeping studies have made use of a wide range of research techniques, including participant observation, case studies, content analysis, questionnaires, and experiments. Several methods are used in certain investigations. Every technique addresses a distinct facet of gatekeeping.

CONCLUSION

Gatekeeping theory, rooted in Kurt Lewin's early work, continues to be a fundamental framework for understanding the intricate process of news selection and dissemination. Over the years, scholars have expanded the scope of gatekeeping research, considering individual, organizational, and societal factors that shape the media landscape. The study's historical overview underscores the contributions of foundational works, such as those by David Manning White and Warren Breed, in shaping the discourse around gatekeeping. The evolution of gatekeeping theory in response to technological advancements, especially in the realm of online news, reflects the dynamic nature of media environments. The exploration of theoretical frameworks, including Pierre Bourdieu's field theory, offers insights into the interconnectedness of different levels of analysis in gatekeeping. The study recognizes the persistence of essential issues, particularly the need to elucidate the nature of forces influencing gatekeepers and the consequent news selection. Clarity on these forces is crucial for understanding and potentially reshaping institutional practices in response to societal expectations. Methodologically, gatekeeping research has embraced a diverse array of techniques, from participant observation to content analysis, reflecting the complexity of the phenomenon. The study acknowledges the multifaceted nature of gatekeeping and underscores the importance of employing varied methodological approaches to capture its nuances comprehensively.

REFERENCES:

[1] M. Grafström and H. S. Rehnberg, “Public Organisations as News Producers: An odd species in the local media landscape,” *Nord. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.2478/nor-2019-0028.

[2] C. Swart and J. Hanekom, “Corporate brand communication: Beyond-modern realities in a social media landscape,” *Communitas*, 2019, doi: 10.18820/24150525/Comm.v24.4.

[3] J. Rappaz, D. Bourgeois, and K. Aberer, “A dynamic embedding model of the media landscape,” in *The Web Conference 2019 - Proceedings of the World Wide Web Conference, WWW 2019*, 2019. doi: 10.1145/3308558.3313526.

[4] R. Figueiras, “Public interest in the neo-liberal order: The role of the EU austerity model in the morphing of the Portuguese media landscape,” *Glob. Media Commun.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1742766518818860.

[5] A. Haller, K. Holt, and R. de La Brosse, "The 'other' alternatives: Political right-wing alternative media," *Journal of Alternative and Community Media*. 2019. doi: 10.1386/joacm_00039_2.

[6] V. Sukmayadi, "The Dynamics of Media Landscape and Media Policy in Indonesia," *Asia Pacific Media Educator*. 2019. doi: 10.1177/1326365X19844853.

[7] A. van der Hoeven, "Historic urban landscapes on social media: The contributions of online narrative practices to urban heritage conservation," *City, Cult. Soc.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ccs.2018.12.001.

[8] D. Voci, M. Karmasin, P. Nölleke-Przybylski, K. D. Altmeppen, J. Möller, and M. Bjørn von Rimscha, "What is a media company today? Rethinking theoretical and empirical definitions," *Stud. Commun. Media*, 2019, doi: 10.5771/2192-4007-2019-1-29.

[9] R. A. S. Alsaif and D. Starks, "Medium and domains in the linguistic landscapes of the Grand Mosque in Mecca," *J. Multiling. Multicult. Dev.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/01434632.2018.1461874.

[10] F. M. Wartmann, K. F. Tieskens, B. T. van Zanten, and P. H. Verburg, "Exploring tranquillity experienced in landscapes based on social media," *Appl. Geogr.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.apgeog.2019.102112.

CHAPTER 10

NAVIGATING BOUNDARIES: UNDERSTANDING JOURNALISTIC AUTHORITY, PROFESSIONALISM, AND OBJECTIVITY IN THE GLOBAL NEWS LANDSCAPE

Dr. Uma C Swadimath, Assistant Professor
Department of General Management, Centre for Management Studies, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.uma_swadimath@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

This study delves into the evolving landscape of gatekeeping in the context of globalized news reporting. It explores the emergence of a "global newsroom" where coordination transcends national borders, especially among collaborative broadcast firms. The research analyzes decision-making processes within these international networks, highlighting the coordination of news supply and demand. The study also emphasizes the importance of understanding journalism as a historical institution, going beyond economic considerations. Drawing on new institutionalism, it scrutinizes how institutional behavior in journalism may arise unexpectedly, influenced by past struggles and societal expectations. The paper extensively discusses the role of authority, jurisdiction, expertise, and networks in the professionalization of journalism. It draws on sociologist Andrew Abbott's work, emphasizing the battle for jurisdiction and the relationship between knowledge and labor. The concept of journalistic objectivity is explored as a key factor in establishing professional authority. The study investigates how journalists engage in "cultural work" to maintain their exclusive claim to competence, focusing on the interplay between work and abstract knowledge. Additionally, the research reviews the idea of journalism as a field, as proposed by Pierre Bourdieu. It scrutinizes the challenges of incorporating alternative media into this conceptual framework and highlights the blurred boundaries between traditional journalism and newer forms like blogging. The study concludes by emphasizing the importance of understanding the complex and contradictory nature of claims to professional authority and expertise in journalism.

KEYWORDS:

Authority, Firm, Jurisdiction, Network, Organization,

INTRODUCTION

Globalization factors may also be the source of similarities. Research on gatekeeping has to increasingly take into account the reality of news reporting that is coordinated across organizational boundaries and is internationally networked. The concept of a "global newsroom" serves to illustrate how coordination takes place beyond national borders, especially amongst collaborating broadcast firms. In the biggest of these exchanges, like the Geneva-based Eurovision, decision-making is shared among "distributed" gatekeepers in a manner that results in agreement on a shared, national television story agenda rather than being centralized due to common ownership. Requests and offers from participating news organizations were used by Cohen, Levy, Roeh, and Gurevitch to study how the supply and demand for news are coordinated. Diverse tales were paired with a consensus on the top stories in story lineups that were mostly event-driven. The writers discovered a vibrant culture in this "newsroom" that aimed to reach a consensus on relevant news while

challenging the particularistic reporting conclusions of many major news organizations. Because they needed to be approved by a collective decision, national news professionals suggested and sought stories that they had been trained to believe were of universal interest.

Future studies must have a deeper understanding of journalism as a historical institution rather than only an organization based on economics and reason. Even when it criticizes these initiatives, a lot of study focuses on how news organizations adapt to commercial demands. For instance, Turow emphasizes the news media's utility-maximizing practices in his analysis of them. As a logical way to accomplish preset objectives, the media create coping mechanisms including market research, engaging news story formats, and talent with a proven track record. As an example, "news executives pursue a strategy of linking news and entertainment organizations for the parent firm's profit while acting to cultivate audience belief in the journalistic integrity of their products." There is no denying that media companies want to enhance revenue and efficiency. But if we think that this explains every organizational procedure and every journalistic routine, we have to exercise caution [1], [2].According to the ideas of new institutionalism, institutional behavior may arise as an unanticipated outcome rather than as a result of historical circumstances that optimize value. According to Bourdieu, "the possibilities bequeathed by previous struggles, a space which tends to give direction to the search for solutions and, consequently, influences the present and future of production" limit the gatekeepers within a given institution.

New institutionalism is valuable for its ability to assist in theorizing about the interconnection of the journalistic profession, even if it may also suggest new topics for empirical research. One example may be the way that the idea of the disseminator's function in journalism, which still forms the foundation of American media practice despite some advocates for alternatives, supports the interests of both organizations and wealthy elites. Strong elites are not the beginning of the explanation; they do not only control news coverage. Audiences have historically grown to anticipate the disseminator function, and this expectation is a strong path-dependent factor that restricts the scope of work that journalism organizations may do. The journalistic field is a combination of components that occur in certain temporal situations; no single factor can explain the result. Future studies might focus on a variety of other topics, including methodological, empirical, and theoretical structuration theory for thinking about gatekeeper roles. Despite having one of the oldest histories in mass communication study, gatekeeping theory still has a lot of room to grow into a significant research project.

Authority, Jurisdiction, Expertise, and Networks

So, following the professionalization theories' example, what social indicators may professions struggle with as they progress their "professional project"? According to Sarfatti Lar- son, for a group to achieve professional status, they must band together and struggle for dominance over the market for their services. As human service marketers, they have to "produce their producers" through education and training; they also have to get governmental approval for their occupational monopoly and confirm it with "the license, the qualifying examination, and the diploma."

Although it is a significant improvement, sociologist Andrew Abbott's work in The System of the Professions has many similarities to that of Sarfatti Larson. Abbott's most significant contribution to the work of the 1970s is his argument that professional work, rather than the occupational group and the structural markers of professionalism as a distinct object of analysis, should be the focus of the study of the professions. He also criticizes Larson for her overemphasis on economic power as the ultimate basis of journalistic authority. Abbott posits

that the crux of professional conflict lies in the battle for jurisdiction or the relationship between knowledge and labor. Abbott sees the professional world as a battlefield, but in this case, the battle is over jurisdiction rather than the institutional markers of professionalism. A profession requests that society acknowledge its cognitive structure via exclusive privileges as it asserts its sovereignty. Abbott contends that in addition to culture, jurisdiction also has a social structure that results from its acknowledgment by society. For example, attorneys and doctors assert not just their authority over certain fields of practice but also acquire legally binding and political rights via government action. Through preferential access to political leaders and shield legislation, for example, even journalists who lack many of the structural advantages enjoyed by other professional organizations have attained some degree of judicial legitimacy.

The way a profession both concretizes and displays its foundation of "abstract knowledge" daily, according to Abbott, is what distinguishes professional knowledge from merely occupational knowledge in general. It is "a knowledge system governed by abstractions, a knowledge system that can redefine its problems and tasks, defend them from interlopers, and seize new problems." Abbott believes that establishing professional jurisdiction requires more than just labor. Additionally, this understanding has to be shown by labor. In Abbott's theoretical scheme, the relationship between work and knowledge is explained as follows by Fournier: Abbott suggests that professions engage in cultural work to establish their exclusive claim of competence over a particular "chunk of the world," emphasizing the active work that professionals have to put in to maintain the boundaries defining their jurisdiction. 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 [3], [4].

Abbott helps us to think of new ways in which occupational groups struggle over social and cultural status and expands our discussion of knowledge-based occupations beyond the "traditional" professions by turning his focus from "the structure of professionalization" to an analysis of jurisdictional disputes concerning the relationship between abstract knowledge and work.Abbott kindly allows a significant amount of room for a debate on journalists. According to Abbott, journalism has asserted authority over the gathering and dissemination of current, qualitative information on broad events, at least in the United States. There is an internal differential in journalism generally, and US journalism specifically, wherein journalists covering politics or other issues impacting democratic democracy have the highest professional status and a particularly strong cultural authority. Journalism's closest connection to official acknowledgment stems from its tight ties to democratic politics, although a contradictory one as the First Amendment forbids rather than requires governmental control. Because US journalism purports to possess a certain level of skill or intellectual discipline, it can claim objectivity that is, the specific technique by which this material is gathered, processed, and presented which gives it its distinct jurisdictional emphasis. A claim to a unique kind of authority is the establishment of jurisdiction over the capacity to objectively interpret reality.

In conclusion, journalistic objectivity functions as a standard within the field as well as a point of contention in the greater conflict over professional authority. Utilizing occupational conflict, "expert" professional's journalists in this case seek to monopolize a certain type of journalistic expertise. This expertise is itself discursively created from a variety of journalistic practices and narratives, including the assertion of professional neutrality.

However, the sociological examination of the professions finds journalism to be an exceptionally intriguing instance due to the fundamental concept of journalistic competence.

There are two issues with the concept of journalistic skill itself. "Somewhat exclusive groups of individuals applying somewhat abstract knowledge to particular cases" is how Abbott defines professions. However, neither the majority of journalism professions nor journalistic expertise are exclusive. It seems that journalism makes both very humble and lofty claims about its expertise at the same time. Abbott's paradigm, which emphasizes jurisdiction and knowledge, makes it clear why journalism is a sociologically unusual profession right away.

DISCUSSION

There are several common responses to the literature in journalism studies and sociology that highlight the process of defining boundaries and creating insiders and outsiders. Thomas Gieryn developed the idea of "boundary work," or the act of defining, challenging, and reinforcing boundaries across domains of knowledge, in a significant article published in 1983. Gieryn specifically addressed the 19th-century English division between religion and science, contending that the lines separating "science" from "non-science" were partly constructed and originated from the self-serving rhetorical strategies of scientists. By defining science in terms of both its qualities and flaws, the process of addressing the question "What is science" has contributed to the development of contemporary ideas about the discipline. Gieryn saw the debate over what constitutes a scientist as a rhetorical conflict about limits.

Zelizer repeated Gieryn's idea of boundary-work ten years later when she spoke about journalism. Zelizer distinguished journalists as an "interpretive community" whose authority originates from discursive sources functioning both within and outside the professional domain, explicitly rejecting the professionalization paradigm in the process. Zelizer describes how one newly formed group, TV journalists, imposed itself on the industry via their coverage of Kennedy's death and perhaps more importantly the tales they subsequently told one another about the killing in her case study of media coverage of the John F. Kennedy assassination. According to Zelizer, journals utilize stories to preserve internal group coherence and to solidify their status as an "authoritative interpretive community." They also use narrative to reinforce their "truth-telling" stance about other interpretive communities. Zelizer highlights that rhetorical devices like synecdoche, omission, and personalizing are key components of the process of journalistic legitimization.

The purposeful and planned deployment of narrative by journalists was a prerequisite for their ability to portray themselves as credible spokespersons for the assassination tale. Although formalized bodies of knowledge constitute the basis of all professional groups, journalists' claims to legitimacy were no less rhetorically based than their narrative reconstructions of the events that preceded the news. However, a significant portion of journalists' interpretive authority is derived from how they present their knowledge rather than from what they know.

It would not be controversial to argue that the representation of knowledge is just as important in establishing journalistic professionalism as knowledge itself. Discussions regarding the constructed nature of professional expertise date back to Elliot Freidson and are present in sociological scholarship before the post-structuralist critique. The focus on the rhetorical component in forming journalists' cultural authority is noteworthy and novel. The one area in which Zelizer's Covering the Body falters is its almost exclusive concentration on the rhetorical element. Zelizer may benefit from Eyal's recent criticism of Gieryn as well:

The first and most evident issue with Gieryn's concept of border work is that it only applies to rhetoric. Social mechanisms are far more powerful than rhetoric; they restrict the number of authoritative speakers, give their statements different values, exclude some topics and devices from non-expert inspection, classify something as "calculable" or "not calculable," etc.

Politics, the economy, science, and other relationship realities could never have been produced by rhetoric alone [5], [6].

Journalists probably use rhetoric to describe themselves more than people in other professions since they use language that is both about and about their job. Additionally, journalists lack the same level of autonomy in their profession as physicians and attorneys, who, with government support, have significant influence over the entrance barriers to their respective areas and, therefore, market power. Almost typically, they are hired hands rather than independent contractors.

Therefore, "rhetorical" conflict is one aspect of the struggle for journalistic authority, but it cannot be the only one. Here's another important quote from Abbott: "Jurisdiction has a social structure in addition to a culture." Zelizer's almost wholly cultural definition of journalistic legitimacy is significant but unfinished. In what other manner may the conflict over journalistic excellence be structured to better integrate the social structure of the profession and the "external" factors that influence it?

An idea that has gained popularity recently is reconsidering journalism as a journalistic "field," in the words of Pierre Bourdieu. According to Bourdieu, contemporary society is extremely divided, consisting of many sectors or "fields," each of which is mostly independent and somewhat governed by its logic. The artistic, political, academic, and most significantly for our purposes—journalistic realms are among these disciplines. When it comes to integrating Bourdieu's field notions into journalism studies, Rodney Benson and Eric Neveu have set the standard among communications researchers. The efforts of alternative youth media to "channel into the journalistic field" are discussed by Klinenberg in the same book, and some other academics have examined the interaction between professional and non-professional media systems using field notions.

However, as Chris Atton points out, it is tricky to include alternative media within Bourdieu's conceptual framework since they almost by definition assert their journalistic credentials by questioning the standards and procedures of mainstream journalism. Although the field notion is useful for theorizing highly organized and relatively static social-cultural constellations, it is less flexible when it comes to describing the boundaries, competition, and gaps between fields. In his writings regarding journalism as a discipline, Bourdieu himself voiced concern that it would become subservient to the political or commercial spheres. However, complete independence from these other domains is improbable, if not unfavorable; politics and economy are interwoven with journalism. If this were not the case, journalists could find it impossible to resist their tendency toward solipsism as opposed to interaction with a sizable democratic audience. It doesn't seem that the idea of "field" provides any useful tools for examining boundaries, areas, or rivalry [7], [8].

Think about how difficult it is to conceptualize blogging in connection to journalism. The distinctions between "insider and outsider," "professional and non-professional," and "journalist and blogger" are becoming hazier in today's world. We would be better to envision a thick, ill-defined "border zone" composed of spreading hybrids, evolving social and professional roles, and networks of knowledge rather than a clearly defined border. Bloggers, who were first considered outsiders with no journalistic authority, are now granted press credentials. Dan Rubin, a longtime writer for the Philadelphia Inquirer, transitions from a full-time blogger to a journalist once again. A subway commuter, for example, provided crucial images of the 2005 London subway bombings that news organizations worldwide printed. Amateur photographers with camera phones are widely dispersed throughout the world, far outnumbering professional news photographers. As a result, they have access to

many events of the moment that the professionals do not. When an international organization of professional photojournalists based in the Netherlands, World Press Photo selected its best photos of the year in 2005, it eliminated photos taken at Abu Ghraib or after the tsunami from competition because, despite appearing in mainstream news publications, they were taken by amateurs. This illustrates the boundary-maintaining problem this creates for journalism. In the age of smartphones, cameras, and blogs, jurisdictional issues will arise often. Meanwhile, the character of how journalistic claims to authority are expressed changes due to other advancements in portable and effective information transmission. According to Montgomery, there is a growing informality to on-air discourse in television due to the increasing use of live "two-way" interactions between a studio-based news presenter and a field-based reporter. This informality allows the field reporters to be less committed to the veracity of their statements. According to Montgomery's analysis of the BBC, there is a rise in the use of phrases like "probably" and "perhaps," "certainly" and "actually," and "I think" or "my instinct is" by reporters, which gives the discourse of news a more human voice than an institutional one. To some extent,

This kind of writing keeps journalism credible by taking it down from its perch. This is not to say that social actors don't still think repairing their boundaries has rhetorical significance. It is helpful for journalists, bloggers, citizen journalists, and activist reporters to categorize themselves and other people as insiders or outsiders, members of "our" group or "the other." This is where the Bourdieuean concept of the field is useful if not as a description of the social reality that truly exists, then at least as a phrase that highlights the limits that are culturally constructed and in which traditional journalists and their rivals have strong emotional attachments. Since the categories are fluid and subject to questioning, and the language that defines insiders and outsiders is always changing, the way that rhetoric is used is crucial to understanding the identities of the many social actors at play.

Final Verdict

Building on past research, we have maintained that objectivity serves as a standard that both strengthens and distinguishes a group's claim to hold a certain kind of professional knowledge that is expressed via labor. In the context of journalism, this knowledge claim is peculiar since journalists do not assert that they have esoteric or particularly complicated expertise, in contrast to most claims made by scientists or lawyers to have the professional capacity to determine the "objective truth" about reality. Journalism, on the other hand, simultaneously makes modest and extravagant claims.

It is more difficult to determine and more complex to understand how objectivity functions within a broader social, political, and economic framework. Professional claims undoubtedly help to define boundaries between those who are "inside" and "outside" of their field. However, several scientific studies conducted over many decades have cautioned us against thinking that the rhetorical claims made about boundaries claims that are often advanced by occupational organizations themselves reflect the reality of how professional power, expertise, and authority function. To put it simply, assertions of expertise and authority are often inconsistent and illogical. We have not attempted to develop a great theoretical argument about how professional authority, power, and competence function [9], [10]. For the time being, it's important to remember these straightforward assertions: any empirical study on the state of journalism should be cognizant of the significance of journalistic expertise as well as the contradictory nature of that claim; at the same time, any analysis of journalism should be mindful of the intricate and contradictory nature of claims to be both "inside" and "outside" of an occupational system of power.

CONCLUSION

This study contributes to the ongoing discourse on gatekeeping theory and the professionalization of journalism. By examining the globalized nature of news reporting and the dynamics of coordination in a "global newsroom," the research sheds light on the intricacies of decision-making across international boundaries.

The emphasis on journalism as a historical institution, influenced by both economic factors and societal expectations, underscores the need for a nuanced understanding of the profession. The exploration of authority, jurisdiction, and expertise, drawing on Andrew Abbott's work, provides valuable insights into the complexities of professionalization within journalism. The study underscores the significance of journalistic objectivity as both a standard within the field and a point of contention in the broader conflict over professional authority.

Furthermore, the discussion on journalism as a field, following Bourdieu's conceptualization, offers a framework for understanding the evolving nature of the profession. The challenges posed by alternative media, blogging, and the shifting boundaries within the journalistic landscape highlight the need for a more flexible and dynamic approach to conceptualizing journalism as a field. In essence, this study calls for continued research into gatekeeping theory and the professionalization of journalism, recognizing the fluid and evolving nature of the field. Understanding the intricate relationships between authority, expertise, and societal expectations is crucial for comprehending the ever-changing dynamics of journalism in a globalized and digital age.

REFERENCES:

[1] H. Spyksma, “Unintentional Journalists: The role of advocacy group 350 in filling a news gap for reporting from the Pacific region,” *Journal. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/1461670X.2017.1351885.

[2] S. A. Eldridge, “Where do we draw the line? Interlopers, (ant)agonists, and an unbounded journalistic field,” *Media Commun.*, 2019, doi: 10.17645/mac.v7i4.2295.

[3] S. P. Campbell, “On the Record: Time and The Self as Data in Contemporary Autofiction,” *M/C J.*, 2019, doi: 10.5204/mcj.1604.

[4] H. Chen, J. M. B. Nunes, G. Ragsdell, and G. Cao, “Understanding effective knowledge sharing by IT professionals in Chinese social networks,” in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Knowledge Management, ECKM*, 2019. doi: 10.34190/KM.19.180.

[5] A. Wagemans, T. Witschge, and F. Harbers, “Impact as driving force of journalistic and social change,” *Journalism*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1464884918770538.

[6] F. J. Caro-González, M. Pérez-Suárez, and I. Sánchez-Torné, “Characteristics of the Social Journalistic Enterprises,” *CIRIEC-Espana Rev. Econ. Publica, Soc. y Coop.*, 2019, doi: 10.7203/CIRIEC-E.96.12723.

[7] T. P. Vos, M. Eichholz, and T. Karaliova, “Audiences and Journalistic Capital: Roles of journalism,” *Journal. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/1461670X.2018.1477551.

[8] J. Mayoral, S. Parratt, and M. Morata, “Misinformation, manipulation and journalistic credibility: A historical perspective,” *Historia y Comunicacion Social*. 2019. doi: 10.5209/hics.66267.

[9] S. Wu, E. C. Tandoc, and C. T. Salmon, "When Journalism and Automation Intersect: Assessing the Influence of the Technological Field on Contemporary Newsrooms," *Journal. Pract.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/17512786.2019.1585198.

[10] D. Blanco-Herrero and C. Arcila-Calderón, "Deontology and fake news: A study of the perceptions of Spanish journalists," *Prof. la Inf.*, 2019, doi: 10.3145/epi.2019.may.08.

CHAPTER 11

REFRAMING JOURNALISM PROFESSIONALIZATION: A SOCIOLOGICAL INQUIRY INTO OBJECTIVITY, PROFESSIONALISM, AND TRUTH-SEEKING

Dr. Uma C Swadimath, Assistant Professor
Department of General Management, Centre for Management Studies, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.uma_swadimath@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

This study delves into the intersection of media studies and the sociology of professions, particularly focusing on journalistic professionalism. Departing from traditional analyses that often neglect sociological perspectives, this research adopts a Weberian framework, building on Abbott's concept of "professional jurisdiction." Examining two main research streams within journalism studies, it proposes a nuanced approach that combines insights from journalism and media studies. Emphasizing the link between a profession and its work, the study advocates for a shift in focus from debating journalism's professional status to understanding the social process through which journalists assert their professional identity. Drawing from MagaliSarfatti Larson's concept of the "professional project," the study explores the collective endeavors of journalists to translate specialized knowledge into social and economic rewards. By employing a modified Abbott framework, the research aims to contribute to ongoing debates on journalistic professionalism and provide a roadmap for further investigations.

KEYWORDS:

Journalistic, Media, Organization, Sociological.

INTRODUCTION

For many years, there has been a mutually indifferent coexistence between the area of media studies and the subject of sociology known as the sociology of the professions, which investigates professionalization and professional systems. The majority of studies of journalistic professionalism, on the other hand, avoid engaging with the majority of the sociological literature on professional occupations and systems. Few classic professional studies in the sociology of professions even venture a guess as to journalism's professional status, preferring to focus on the traditional professions of medicine and law. It appears that there is much to be gained from revisiting questions of journalism and professionalization from an explicitly sociological angle, especially in light of the fact that many of the most significant scholarly questions about the profession now center on issues of power, authority, and professional status. These questions help to articulate a deeper understanding of journalism's troubled professional project, the relationship between the objectivity norm and that project, and the ways in which journalists attempt to forge a journalistic jurisdiction out of the link between their everyday work and their highly qualified claim to possess a form of professionalized knowledge.

This chapter begins with an overview of Weberian studies of the professions conducted in the late 1970s and early 1980s, including a discussion of Abbott's seminal analysis of "professional jurisdiction," in order to bring these sociological and journalistic perspectives on professionalization into dialogue. Next, we look at the two main lines of research that

have developed in journalism studies. The first strand, which stems from journalism itself, tends to be unconcerned with whether journalism generates authoritative knowledge or exhibits professional characteristics; for scholars in this field, the significance of journalism is obvious and unrelated to its place in an occupational hierarchy. In this field of study, the focus is on assessing the extent to which journalism has attained professional status, sometimes by means of surveys related to education or career. A second line of research, rooted in media studies and the sociology of news organizations, examines the nature of journalistic knowledge and claims to expertise, and therefore, the status of journalism as a "cultural authority," as defined by Paul Starr. The second strand conflates journalistic objectivity with journalism professionalism in general, whereas the first strand suffers from adopting the "trait perspective" on the professions. Recent research by Hallin and Mancini shows that, while professionalism does exist in many non-American media systems, impartiality is not the exclusive professional standard [1], [2].

We conclude by arguing that, while using a modified form of Abbott's framework, a fruitful mode of study of journalistic objectivity, professionalism, and truth-seeking would continue to build on the finest work of the two strands mentioned above. "The central phenomenon of professional life is thus the link between a profession and its work," which Abbott refers to as "jurisdiction," according to Abbott, who believes that studying professional work is the first step in studying the professions. In the specific example of journal-ism, knowledge that is real and expert but by no means abstract is what is meant to be understood as the daily method in which a profession both concretizes and shows its basis of "abstract knowledge." This is referred to as jurisdiction. Our goal is to apply Abbott's analysis to the ongoing debates about journalistic professionalism, link it with the two study streams already indicated, and provide a roadmap for further investigation.

The "trait approach" of occupational analysis, which 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, was widely abandoned, marking the beginning of the most fruitful era within the subfield of sociology devoted to professionalization research. The endeavor to identify certain professional traits and then assess the extent to which different occupational groups satisfied them was fundamental to the trait approach. The following characteristics are typically included in lists, though no single overview is particularly authoritative: work based on systematic or scientific knowledge; formal education; self-governing associations; codes of ethics; a relationship of trust between professional and client; licensing or other entry-level barriers; and widely acknowledged social status or social esteem. Sociologists gave up on the trait approach in the 1960s and 1970s, moving "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'" (Everett C. Hughes, Max Weber, and his work on status and authority as inspiration). The more Weberian study of professionalization and the "professional project" has largely supplanted the study of the profession as an idealized structural-functionalist category in sociology in the forty years after Hughes' challenge.

In her examination of the "professional project," MagaliSarfatti Larson, one of the earliest theorists of Weberian professionalization, argues that "ideal typical constructions do not tell us what a profession is, only what it pretends to be." What professionals really do in daily life to negotiate or retain their unique status is a better question, she said. According to MacDonald's definition, the term "profession" refers to a lay or folk term, and "the folk" are those who determine whether an employment qualifies as a profession, a semi-profession, or

less professional than other types of jobs. Sociology is not the scientific discipline to solve their problems. Finally, as Freidson puts it, if "profession" is a folk term, then phenomenological research methodology is the most suitable approach. Instead than trying to define a profession in a strict sense, one should focus on how society defines professionals and non-professionals, and how individuals "make" or achieve professions by their actions [3], [4].

For the last several decades, the notion of the professional project which was first put forward by Sarfatti Larson—has remained at the core of the majority of the most significant research in the sociology of the professions. The idea combines the ground-breaking early research on medicine by Freidson with Weber's famous study of occupational groups' efforts to establish a social class correlation. Professionals, in Sarfatti Larson's view, are collective social actors who “attempt to translate one order of scarce resources special knowledge and skills into another social and economic rewards.” Rather than being inherently existing occupational categories or the bearers of socially functional “traits." Even if the "goals and strategies pursued by a given group are not entirely clear or deliberate for all the members," Sarfatti Larson refers to this endeavor as "the professional project" and characterizes it as a collective intention with coherence and consistency.

DISCUSSION

When framed in this way, several elements of the professional project came to play important roles in the popular Weberian understanding of professional conflict throughout the late 1970s. A profession's attempt to establish an organizational monopoly on a body of abstract knowledge that is socially useful; the necessity of a market for the exchange of technical knowledge utilization; the relationship between a profession's monopolization of knowledge and the social status of its members; the interdependence of the profession's drive for social mobility and market control; attempts to convert economic power to social status; the necessity for a profession to "produce its producers" through education, credentialism, codes of ethics, etc. To be sure, sociological studies of education and higher education as a mechanism for the systematic reproduction of a class system and the justification of class inequality informed and influenced a great deal of sociological literature on professions. Neo-Marxist research highlighted the role of education in acquiring cultural capital to support one's elevated status in the social hierarchy rather than in preparing people for technical knowledge or skills appropriate for the contemporary economy. The notion of objectivity in US media was first criticized by those who either referenced this book or had the same philosophical attitude, which was suspicious of the authority of professions and tended to see assertions of impartiality, detachment, or dispassion as a front for power.

Because of this disciplinary reorientation, any research on professionalism, objectivity, and truth-seeking in journalism in particular should shift from debating whether or not journalism is a profession to examining the more intriguing set of circumstances surrounding journalists' attempts to become professionals. We may examine the social process through which journalists fight to assert their professional identity instead of listing the qualities that best define professionals and then evaluating the extent to which journalists achieve them. This research strategy may provide fresh light on many of the traditional institutional histories of journalism, particularly those that downplay or disregard a sociological perspective. It situates the study of journalism within the sociological study of the professions.

Media and Professional Research

What role has the disciplinary shift in journalism studies had in the move from "traits" to "struggle"? To claim that advances in sociology as a whole have had no impact on research

on journalistic professionalism would be an exaggeration. But it may be argued that the link has been indirect. Despite the auspicious beginnings of sociological inquiry into journalism, much contemporary work on journalism no longer comes from sociology per se, as Zelizer notes on the side of journalism studies. Alternatively, as Klinenberg argues from the perspective of a sociologist, much of this can likely be attributed to the general decoupling, over the past 25 years, of sociology and media research tout court.

The empirical study of journalistic organizations and news institutions has been largely abandoned by contemporary sociology, which is paradoxical given the increasing visibility of the media in political, economic, and cultural spheres and the emergence of other academic fields that are emphasizing the study of media and society. The shift of sociologists to the growing departments of communications and media at least partly explains the anomaly. Rather than being employed by sociology departments, sociologists like Silvio Waisbord, Todd Gitlin, Michael Schudson, and Rodney Benson have main or exclusive positions in communication. More so than in sociology, communication and media studies have taken an interest in the work of these academics. Even in the subfields of sociolinguistics and conversational analysis, there are certainly sociologists speaking exclusively to an audience inside sociology; among them is Steven Clayman and his colleagues [5], [6].

Given the paucity of literature that directly connects journalism to the sociology of the professions, two lines of inquiry have developed within journalism studies. The first, which includes what is often referred to as "institutional research," typically looks for quantitative information on the employment, educational attainment, adherence to ethical standards, etc. of journalists. Most often, scholars with strong links to professional journalism or the news business itself have started this kind of study. Statistics on recent journalism school graduates' career prospects are updated on a regular basis in the United States by the Annual Survey of Journalism and Mass Communication Graduates. More surveys and employment assessments have been carried out in other nations as well as in the US to "measure" the extent of professionalization in journalism, at least in terms of higher school certification. The information paints a rather contradictory picture. The proportion of American bachelor's degree holders in mass communication and journalism who entered degree-related employment fell from half to one-quarter over the 20 years between 1982 and 2002. In 1995, a significant percentage of American newspaper editors claimed that an entry-level hire's degree was unimportant, despite their vocal endorsement for the value of a journalism or communications degree. More than 90% of journalists have a degree, thus although the worth of a "journalism degree" may be debatable, the significance of higher education is not. Similar circumstances exist in other nations with developed media systems: a stronger focus on general education throughout the employment process is put above the presence of specialized "communication" degrees.

It is easy to transform the discussion of journalism into one that is "quasi," "pseudo," or "failed," and to repeat Weaver and Wilhoit's argument that "journalism is of a profession but not in one." In fact, a lot of the studies on journalistic professionalism have come to an end at this point. The earlier corpus of "trait theory" is echoed by basic institutional research, which halts the examination before it really gets started. In summary, this first field of journalism studies mostly stays away from the more profound inquiries about the unstable nature of journalism as a profession. Instead of situating journalism somewhere along the professional spectrum between neurosurgeons and plumbers, it would be far more fruitful to investigate the reasons behind the professional status attained by reporting and news editing, as well as any attempts journalism may be making to surpass it. By doing this, we take a step back from the relatively dry study of employment statistics and are forced to think about the philosophy,

practice, and history of journalism. Writers in the second stream of journalism studies what we could call cultural histories of professional objectivity have addressed these issues most clearly.

Objectivity and Professionalism in Cultural Theorems

Walter Lippmann is "the wisest and strong champion for the notion of objectivity," according to Schudson in Discovering the News. Lippmann advises journalists to "develop a sense of evidence and forthrightly admit the limitations of accessible information. To put it simply, Lippmann pushed reporters to "dissect slogans and abstractions, and refuse to withhold the news or put moral uplift or any cause ahead of veracity." The relationship between objectivity, professionalism, and the pursuit of truth would eventually be acknowledged not only by journalism scholars and media researchers as a related set of issues amenable to historical and sociological analysis, but also by journalists themselves as an occupational ideology. In summary, the key to comprehending the evolution of professionalism would be found in understanding the emergence of objectivity.

One of the most current summaries of the social history of the American press has been offered by Kaplan. We may discuss at least five orientations to this history here, building on his suggestion. First, journalism has been portrayed as inexorably heading toward social divergence, occupational autonomy, and professional independence by progressive history, which closely followed the formation of journalism's own occupational ideology. According to this interpretation, objectivity functions as a normative endpoint made possible by modernity and the increasing social separation that exists between politics, business, and media. It is seen as a goal and a "best practice" that has been made feasible by historical development rather than as a tool or a claim. Although it is not covered by Kaplan, a further perspective on the connection between objectivity and professionalism is the "technological" explanation for the rise of objective journalism. This interpretation, which is rejected by the majority of contemporary historical research, views objectivity as a literary style supported by technical advancements. A third body of research identifies the economic advancements that give rise to commercialism. The Commercialization of News in the 19th Century by Baldasty is singled out by Ka-plan as an unusually compelling, well researched, and ultimately misguided thesis about the link between commercialism and professionalization. According to Baldasty's idea, "journalistic visions" and news content were derived from the [capitalistic] financing system, resulting in a journalism that saw the people as customers as opposed to citizens.

Schudson'sDiscovering the News, along with his later work, moved away from viewing the emergence of objectivity as a "inevitable outcome" of broad social processes and changes, whether they be social, economic, or technological. Instead, they linked the emergence of journalistic professionalism to issues of social conflict, professional power, group cohesion, and the cultural resonance of claims to occupational authority. This constitutes the first of four research strands on the rise of journalistic objectivity in the United States. Rather of looking for the roots of professional objectivity in technology advancements or in the "natural" evolutionary process, Schudson's first approach in Discovering the News was to look for the intersection of events that created a "democratic market society." The more contemporary, early 20th century view of objectivity, which regards standards of objective reporting as a collection of defensive tactics rooted in the "disappointment of the modern gaze" the knowledge that true objectivity is unattainable differs from the journalistic beliefs of the 1890s, such as naïve empiricism or a faith in "the facts," according to Schudson. Numerous writers, mostly journalism historians, have continued Schudson's discussion of the establishment of a professional class of reporters within the framework of the growth of

professional objectivity. For these writers, among numerous others, objectivity remains the essential component of journalistic professionalization. If you can elucidate the factors that led to the development of objectivity as a profession and pinpoint its inception, you will have made significant progress in deciphering the "secret" of professional journalism [7], [8].

However, the strong connection between objectivity and professionalism implied by this work has been questioned by recent studies. Objectivity is not, at the very least, the only occupational standard that arises from and supports the professional purpose; in some situations, it could not even be the most significant norm. A new concept known as "contextual objectivity" has emerged to explain the editorial policies of non-Western cable news channels like al-Jazeera. Ramaprasad's extensive surveys of non-Western journalism do not even include adherence to "objectivity" as a major characteristic of newswork in Egypt, Tanzania, or Nepal. Chalaby has called journalism as a "fact-based discursive practice" rather than a literary, philosophical, or political commentary on current affairs, calling it a "Anglo-American invention." According to Donsbach and Patterson, American and European newsrooms continue to be distinguished by their dedication to impartiality.

Their comprehensive study of American, British, German, Italian, Swedish, and print journalists reveals that almost all US journalists state that their political opinions are unrelated to those of their employers. Journalists from Italian and German national newspapers claim that their political opinions align with the editorial stance of their respective publications. In addition, Schudson now contends that the journalism he previously considered to be "modern" is really more accurately classified as "American," with some of its distinguishing characteristics stemming from American cultural presuppositions rather than a universal modernity. This is especially true of the American invention of the interview, which was seen at the time by many European observers as an especially impolite and conceited method of doing business. Interviews are now a common instrument in journalism.

However, Hallin and Mancini provide the most compelling argument for disconnecting the connection in the news industry between objectivity and professional status. They define professionalism more in terms of "greater control over [one's] own work process," the existence of distinct professional norms, and a public service orientation. They define professionalism less in terms of educational barriers to entry, a lack of state regulation, or the ideal of "objec-tivity." They contend that the degrees of professionalism in various media systems differ. The North Atlantic and North/Central European models of journalism are both highly professionalized, whilst the Mediterranean model of journalism retains a relatively low degree of professionalism. But in democratic corporatist nations, being a "professional" does not always imply being an impartial person or being unaffiliated with any political party. Journalists in democratic corporatist nations, on the other hand, believe that journalistic autonomy may coexist with deliberate and aggressive political engagement. German journalists are just as "professional" as American journalists are in this sense. However, there are differences in the social foundations of their expertise and the particular substance of their principles.

Schudson argues that the "objectivity norm" in American journalism eventually benefits the group articulating it, either by promoting social cohesion or social control, in a later argument that essentially elaborates and generalizes his thesis from Dis-covering the News. For ceremonial purposes, ethics and norms serve as a means of identifying a group in relation to other groups as well as aiding in the internal unity and cohesion of that group. On the other hand, Weberian theories for the formation of occupational norms suggest that they provide some hierarchical control over social groupings. In big companies, the requirement for

superiors to maintain control over their subordinates necessitates the implementation of a kind of "overt ethical reinforcement" that guides people in a predictable and logical way.

While acknowledging that "a variety of moral norms could achieve the ends of providing public support and insulation from criticism," Schudson's thesis concentrates on the social purposes of the objectivity norm in American journalism. Schudson points out that journalists in China or Germany may, and in fact, do, operate under standards other than objectivity. If professionalism, as Hallin and Mancini contend, denotes the presence of an autonomous profession supported by unique professional standards, then professional journalism may have separate foundations across cultural boundaries, historical periods, and even future times. Even if objectivity does eventually disappear, professional journalism may not follow.

Fifth and last, Kaplan argues that earlier theories of the rise of objectivity in American journalism are inadequate because they fail to acknowledge the role played by political contention in American history. Kaplan advocates for the contingency of the development of objectivity as the American professional norm and for viewing it as a product of the distinctive shape of the US "public sphere." These theories often make the mistaken assumption that the main force in press history has been a societal consensus around ideas of political liberalism and economic capitalism. Kaplan's own empirical contribution is to demonstrate to Detroit newspapers how politics during the Progressive Era, particularly the delegitimization of political parties through primary elections and other reforms, and the particular political ramifications of the 1896 election, helped publishers, editors, and reporters develop a concept of “public service” through unbiased and independent reporting.

It has been instructive to see how journalists "turn themselves into a profession and themselves into professional people" in these diverse cultural histories of journalistic neutrality in the United States. The best of these studies, which draw from comparative studies of journalism, acknowledge that different professional norms may offer public support and crucial shielding for professional journalism projects in other nations, while the most recent historical surveys have helpfully reexamined the connection between journalistic style, professional norms, and the authority granted by the public sphere. Researchers studying journalistic professionalism are, at least partially, rediscovering a fundamental idea first put forth by Weberian professionalization theorists and attributed to Hughes: that the authority, status, occupational norms, and claims to expertise of journalism can all be understood as components of a professional project, of a struggle between and within groups [9], [10].

What precisely is the nature of this fight is still a big issue. In particular, what is the target of this conflict? Furthermore, how does this fight develop in terms of conflict and cooperative dynamics? As we outline the responses to these queries, we first suggest that professional competence and the application of that competence to the workplace act as a lever for competing occupational groupings to establish and take occupational jurisdictions. Second, we argue that the dynamics of this struggle are characterized by a peculiar fusion of clearly defined boundary lines and overlapping networks, and that drawing distinctions between professional “insiders” and paraprofessional “outsiders” is a key strategy in the fight to define “who is a journalist.”

CONCLUSION

This study offers a sociological lens to understand the intricate dynamics of journalistic professionalism. Departing from earlier trait-based approaches, it advocates for a deeper exploration of the professional project, aligning with the Weberian perspective. By contextualizing journalism within the broader sociology of professions, the research

encourages scholars to move beyond the simplistic question of whether journalism is a profession and delve into the complexities of journalists' efforts to professionalize. The nuanced examination of journalistic objectivity, professionalism, and truth-seeking proposed in this study provides a foundation for future research directions, emphasizing the interplay between professional competence, occupational jurisdictions, and the ongoing struggle to define the identity of a journalist.

REFERENCES:

[1] S. Melo and M. Roxo, "Which crimes make the news? An analysis of discursive matrices permeating Brazilian investigative reporting," *Brazilian Journalism Research*. 2019. doi: 10.25200/BJR.v15n1.2019.1138.

[2] B. Creech and A. Roessner, "Declaring the Value of Truth: Progressive-era lessons for combatting fake news," *Journal. Pract.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/17512786.2018.1472526.

[3] J. Szostek, "Losing Pravda: ethics and the press in post-truth Russia," *Russ. J. Commun.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/19409419.2018.1564356.

[4] O. Aponte, "The making of a modern newspaper: El Tiempo in Colombia, 1911-1940," *Palabra Clave*. 2019. doi: 10.5294/pacla.2019.22.4.4.

[5] M. De Las Nieves Agesta, "Conflicts and harmonies of cultural modernization in a local space. The Professionalization of Journalism during the Early Decades of the 20th Century in Bahía Blanca (Argentina)," *Secuencia*, 2019, doi: 10.18234/secuencia.v0i104.1369.

[6] J. Wiik, "Professionalism, Professionalization, and Deprofessionalization in Journalism," in *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication*, 2019. doi: 10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.863.

[7] I. Chupin, "From the national professional training model to local adaptations. Rationales behind the differentiation in curriculum of two French journalism schools," *Rev. d'Anthropologie des Connaissances*, 2019, doi: 10.3917/rac.042.0147.

[8] L. M. Rodríguez, "Journalists, media and social system: Relationships that conduce to the de-professionalization of the Cuban press," *Estud. Sobre el Mensaje Periodis.*, 2019, doi: 10.5209/ESMP.63737.

[9] R. Petre and F. Nănescu, "The field of local journalism in constan□a: Profession as metaphor," *Analele Universitatii Ovidius Constanta, Seria Filologie*. 2019.

[10] H. Örnebring and M. Karlsson, "Journalistic Autonomy," in *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication*, 2019. doi: 10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.829.

CHAPTER 12

UNRAVELING POWER DYNAMICS: A GLOBAL EXPLORATION OF THE DYNAMIC RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REPORTERS AND SOURCES IN NEWS PRODUCTION

Dr. Salma Begum, Assistant Professor
Department of General Management, Centre for Management Studies, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- salma.begum@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

This study explores the intricate relationship between reporters and their news sources, delving into the power dynamics, influence, and cultural implications that shape their interactions. Initially rooted in a Western context, the research gradually expands its scope to include a global perspective, recognizing the diversity in press systems and journalistic practices. The study argues that beyond the immediate influence on public opinion, the interplay between reporters and sources holds a lasting impact on society by contributing to the shaping of enduring cultural meanings. It emphasizes the need to consider not only the power struggles but also the negotiation over long-term cultural interpretations and ideological dominance. In conclusion, this study underscores the multifaceted nature of the relationship between reporters and their sources, moving beyond the conventional focus on immediate news influence. The analysis reveals that the dynamics shift from a power-centric perspective to a broader cultural meaning-making focus. The negotiation and interaction between these two entities extend beyond short-term news agendas, influencing the cultural interpretations that endure over time. The study also highlights the need for a global context, acknowledging variations in press systems and journalistic cultures. As media technologies evolve, the communication between sources and journalists undergoes changes, impacting the way news stories are constructed. In essence, understanding the deeper layers of this relationship is crucial for comprehending the societal implications of news reporting.

KEYWORDS:

Journalistic Practices, News Production, News Sources, Reporters.

INTRODUCTION

The study of news sources and reporters is rooted in the issues of influence, power, and prejudice. Nestled in an environment of hostile circumstances, a fundamental query in the early research was whether sources or reporters had more influence over the news. This subject may also be expanded to explore how news organizations are used by journalists to promote a certain news agenda that either prioritizes or downplays certain concerns. A second extension inquires as to whether source power has the capacity to underwrite the time and labor necessary for reporting. It has long been assumed that the relationship between reporters and their sources is essentially a struggle for control over public opinion and consent. Journalists ultimately play the job of guarding society against corruption, while corporate and governmental leaders assume responsibility for upholding their own interests at any costs. However, these forms of power only signify transient abilities, namely the capacity to influence the course of certain matters and policies. The power struggle restarts once the outcome is decided.

This chapter makes the case that there is more at risk for journalists and their sources than just their ability to influence public opinion in the near term. Rather, the exchange between these two entities reflects a dynamic, long-lasting impact on society: the capacity to mold enduring cultural meanings. The Western foundation of much of this research is also questioned. What could seem to a Western viewpoint as co-optation, in particular, also likely represents the pragmatics of journalistic and, more generally, cultural realities since press systems, political systems, and the social position of journalists differ among regions and nations.

It is crucial to note that the word "source" simply refers to the individuals that reporters consult for information; these individuals are often officials and specialists with ties to the main institutions of society. The phrase is also used to refer to news agencies, which are businesses like the Associated Press that provide news material to websites, broadcasters, and newspapers. This second use of the word is beyond the purview of this topic. In order to provide a framework for comprehending the positions of their interaction, the chapter opens with a sociological viewpoint on the connection between reporters and their sources. After then, it moves from the first portrayal of an antagonistic relationship, based on efforts to sway public opinion, to a more neutral discussion between two parties with competing interests, and ultimately to a negotiation over long-term cultural meanings and ideological dominance. After putting these components in place, the chapter starts to contextualize what is fundamentally a Western research discourse in larger global contexts. Next, as a crucial mediating aspect, the issue of voice and empowerment—of both reporters and sources—is raised. The chapter concludes with a summary of the main points made and a short discussion of how changing media technologies are changing the way that sources and journalists communicate [1], [2].

Relationship Between Reporter and Source from a Sociological Angle

The fundamental principles of journalism's professional philosophy determine the nature of the connection between a reporter and a source. Therefore, in order to perceive what is within this ideology and comprehend the connection, it is necessary to remove it at least momentarily. It is necessary to address two aspects: the first is the ideology's fundamental requirements, and the second is the methods journalists use to carry out their tasks and create their output.

The ideology of the field stands for a paradigm, or a set of instructions for carrying out a work. Journalists should anticipate the intended outcome if they follow this model. The paradigm of journalism essentially adopts a science-like approach, with reporters gathering reliable information and presenting it without overtly taking a position in the debate. Reporters are forced to rely on experts and authorities as sources in order to get the information needed to produce news stories. Even while reporting on an event, reporters are not permitted to express their opinions on their own. As a result, interpretation is restricted to details like crowd size estimates, setting descriptions, people's appearances, and their remarks. Reporters become society's scientists by adhering to this source-driven methodology, and the news they provide becomes their "scientific report" their veracity.

This model seems to be successful on the surface, but it overlooks the reality that news providers often have a stake in the reports of journalists, connecting news stories to public opinion and eventually their own profitability. Maintaining public support for those in positions of power helps them to hold onto such positions longer. Since their capacity to hold office and carry out their intended policies is on the line, elected authority people have an even greater incentive to successfully shape public opinion. For company and organization

leaders, the media's portrayal of them supports the social license to go on with business as usual; losing the public's favor may necessitate a shift in strategy. Reporters and sources alike have a great deal on the line. With every story they write, journalists risk losing their trustworthiness and credibility. Similarly, sources often jeopardize their professional success. Combining the two sides of this equation implies that reporters and their sources engage in a carefully negotiated relationship where both sides want to further their own objectives and preserve their standing in society and organizations.

According to Sigal: After all, news is not about journalists' opinions; rather, it is about what their sources have to say. News organizations, journalistic norms, and traditions serve as a filter for many of the personal biases of individual journalists. This portrayal of news and the relationship between a reporter and their source draws attention to the second challenge that journalists encounter: news is a product with organizational expectations. As such, reporters need to create plans and processes to guarantee that their work will be completed on schedule and in a way that will be deemed acceptable by their colleagues. The way that news is constructed depends on the interactions between reporters and sources. Almost all careers and professions share this same challenge, at least conceptually: an organization needs to hire labor, employees must strategically apply their skills to meet production quotas given their available resources, and in the end, customers must be happy with the product they receive in terms of quality and timeliness.

Routines help reporters effectively handle the organizational constraints they face. They need to set limits for their reconnaissance process even if they must communicate with many sources in order to write tales. Because sources aren't always readily accessible, setting up interviews becomes a laborious operation that takes time to complete and reduces the amount of time that can be worked until the deadline. This process is made simpler by having a baseline collection of well-known sources, but sometimes new sources need to be located. Complicating matters further, some sources may not cooperate with certain stories or may not be accessible when required. Reporters must handle the opinions of sources who may want to enter the conflict at any time. Adding to the complexity, unwritten, socially-learned organizational "policy" might sometimes specify the paths reporters must follow as well as the sources and subjects that are off-limits.

After reporters have a face-to-face or virtual meeting with their sources, another round of negotiations begins. There, reporters try to extract as much information as possible from their sources, often leading their conversation in unexpected areas. In response, sources tend to be more inclined to continue the information-gathering process in accordance with the details they are prepared to provide, which are often neutral data that might support their own cause or, in rare circumstances, details that can harm an opponent's cause. However, sources often actively attempt to shape what is reported via press releases, press conferences, organized events, and leaks that may accelerate the reporting process, so reporters don't always take the lead. Sources may even try to further their cause by drawing attention to incidents that may have occurred organically, such other people's problems and calamities. A significant amount of news is the result of sources' work, and those who can provide reporters readily compiled material are more likely to have their views heard. Over time, astute sources who can consistently provide information and comprehend reporters' demands have become the primary source of news; yet, a large portion of the information these sources provide generally falls short of expectations and is eventually dropped from the news [3], [4].

All things considered, scheduling has become a daily part of a journalist's job: sources need to be scheduled. Scheduling might become more difficult for certain topics due to a tight deadline or unavailability of sources. Finding sources that can be easily booked and who will

provide them the information they need in a clear and manageable manner is a skill that reporters acquire. After arranging the sources and doing their interviews, reporters may transition to a different work mode where they will analyze the material they have obtained, giving certain sources' information more weight than others, and creating a news article that complies with the paradigm's guidelines.

Changing fromA Power Perspective to A Cultural Meaning-Making Focus

Reporters' efforts to get vital information from sources become vital if the media's watchdog function over big business and the government is a fundamental component of journalistic philosophy. This may be seen as a power struggle, with sources trying to thwart what can be interpreted as excessive journalistic investigation and reporters always searching for information. Reporters may find it difficult to get information if a source is really powerful. High power reporters, on the other hand, are able to get more information from more sources. Getting back to the initial query. The decision for reporters ultimately boils down to their personal qualities as well as those of their employer. Three things about the reporter are noteworthy. First, experience helps a reporter become more respected over time if they stay in the field for a long time. But strength is not the same as longevity alone. An experienced society reporter, for instance, would be powerless against national, state, or even local news organizations. A reporter's reputation for producing stories that have an impact—a reputation that the news sources they deal with on the job know—thus plays a second role in determining their influence. Intra-organizational power is a third aspect. A reporter might have less deadline pressure and more opportunities to create a story if they have more autonomy inside the company.

DISCUSSION

Power is also influenced by the reporter's organization, albeit this is not a strict designation. For instance, when it comes to news sources, news organizations having a wider reach nationally or internationally generally wield more influence. A prior track record of releasing or broadcasting noteworthy news articles strengthens and consolidates that authority. In the same range of sources and audiences, for instance, a quality broadsheet newspaper and a popular tabloid would have different degrees of power; in this case, their impact is strongly related to their power differential. That broad reach, however, may not matter if a news agency from a bigger sphere covers news in a smaller sphere. For instance, if the locals in that region were not among the media company's viewers, a national news agency that primarily covers news affecting a tiny geographic community could not have much influence. There, the local media outlet may prove to have a greater say in how a problem or incident turns out.

Assessing source power is a little easier. The most potent sources are usually those who are situated inside a power structure and who possess both the independence to talk about their knowledge and the authority to possess it. Temporary influence might come from sources that have the capacity to highlight an event in the media under certain conditions. An example of this would be pushing an environmentalist attitude in the media after an oil disaster. According to Reese, the perceived degrees of power that reporters and their sources bring to a given exchange have a significant influence on how the story turns out. The way that journalists and sources interact may also be influenced by this balance. For example, when power levels are about equal, relationships can become more symbiotic and cooperative, but when one party feels that they are in the stronger position, interactions can become more antagonistic.

The relationship between reporters and their sources seems to be a dynamic phenomenon, contingent upon the circumstances surrounding a particular incident and the relative strength of each involved, as this debate collectively implies. This balance of power also determines who may lead the negotiations for information that becomes news stories and how reporters and sources engage with one another. Which begs the second question: "What is the effect of this power?"

Traditionally, the response to this question has been expressed in terms of control over the news agenda and ability to sway public opinion. For public servants and corporate executives, sustaining favorable public perception is a daily challenge. As a result, a source's power is essentially the capacity to participate in a continuing discussion inside the news agenda. Being able to address a topic that makes the news agenda in addition to having the ability to control the topic that gets on the agenda and spark the first conversation about it gives sources a somewhat more powerful position. Even more potent is the capacity to choose whether a topic will make it into the news agenda and spark public conversation; keeping something out of the public spotlight equates to having the authority to make choices that have an effect on society without first obtaining approval from the general population.

For journalists, these levels are mirrored in terms of power. Obtaining primary data that expands public discourse reflects a fundamental type of power. Gaining the ability to highlight problems and initiate public discussion among news outlets makes one's perspective more influential. The third degree of authority, however, has no obvious comparable since reporters almost never want to keep a story under wraps. However, the ability of journalists and sources to shape a continuous news agenda is fleeting, contingent upon the shifting priorities of those in authority and the social milieu in which they operate. The news agenda's long-term viability is at risk when a new government takes office. Certain problems would persist, but others would go. For an official who is not in office, public opinion becomes entirely meaningless until it affects those who have moved in. In conclusion, while evaluating the connection between reporters and their sources, it is important to take into account more than just public opinion since this might have longer-lasting effects. Thus, it becomes crucial to change the topic of conversation to culture and its significance.

One method to think about how reporters and their sources affect meanings is to use the framing notion. This kind of thinking about the meanings of news implies that some topics may be addressed in certain ways, with particular limitations on which meanings are part of the debate and which are not. When journalists or their sources control a story in this manner, certain portrayals eventually come to dominate discourse. The approach's flaw is that it often fails to take the bigger picture of framing into account. Put another way, it means that a problem, an occasion, or a social group was "framed" in a manner that primarily capitalizes on certain norms. It is usually simple to identify instances in which news framing violates a standard and is therefore seen to be a "unfair" representation from the standpoint of journalism studies. However, the implications go much further than a debate about which party has more power in a relationship reporters or their sources and consider the long-term societal effects of this framing on the political clout of particular groups, administrations, or interests over others. Hence, a particular frame and point of view on the social order are produced and reproduced when reporters and their sources interact with one another. This means that one of the implications of the reporter-source relationship that affects ideology itself is the meaning of events and issues [5], [6].

The responsiveness of sources to their interpretative community offers another angle on meanings related to the interaction between the reporter and the source. A community that constructs, shares, and reconstructs meanings in the course of daily existence is known as an

interpretative community. A physical location, an organization, an online virtual meeting, and other social collectives may all create interpretive groups. Members of an interpretative community communicate with one another by internalizing implicitly held meanings and using them to inform their values and perspectives on various situations and events.

Both the professional interpretive community and the interpretative community of their sources have different connotations for reporters. The professional interpretative community of reporters consists of four primary aspects. First and foremost, reporters follow their professional philosophy, which takes into account values like impartiality, independence, justice, and the need to act as a watchdog. Second, while they go about their daily work, reporters consider the interpretative community inside their media company and the "policy" that they have socialized into it. This second interpretative community may contradict the first by subtly advising against choosing some sources and groups over others, or by being kind toward some while being harshly critical of others. Through Zelizer's concept of double time, the third and fourth interpretive communities become apparent. Reporters take into account both the localized meanings that events and issues have in the present as well as a more general historical reference point that allows for ongoing comparisons between what has happened in the past and what is happening in the present.

These four reporting aspects provide challenges to the interpretative community of sources. Sources aim to provide one primary interpretation among many options when something happens or when a problem is brought up. The ultimate goal for the corporate, governmental, and special interest sectors is to maintain and bolster their social standing and authority by interpreting the world in ways that make their preferred readings easier to accept. Adoption of these meanings does not always turn into a deliberate or purposefully planned move for reporters or their sources. Rather, they become implicit understandings, the meanings of which emerge gradually from group interactions. Additionally, these meanings are subtly dynamic even though they often exhibit short-term constancy.

In conclusion, these two contexts for creating meaning journalistic practice and source communities—illustrate how the traditional conception of socially independent journalists functioning as watchdogs and the transient conflicts between reporters and their sources do not alter news content. Journalists are accountable to four aspects of their interpretative community instead. Similarly, news sources react to the favored interpretations they have learnt while existing inside their own rival interpretative communities.

Including The Relationship Between Reporter and Source In A Global Context

A significant portion of the literature on reporters and their sources has been centered on Western press systems, particularly on the ways in which the connection manifests itself in the US. But there is a question that has to be answered: How far can we advance this understanding to comprehend different press systems? Two variations on the fundamental question lead to opposing poles. A second, more focused topic concerns the relative importance of variations within a particular press system against the wider question of how differences across press systems should be taken into account when formulating our understandings.

Answering these concerns is not simple, but it would also be challenging to claim that there is a global media that obfuscates many of the long-standing differences between countries and their press systems. There are several anecdotal instances that demonstrate how the norms of one system may become the deviations of another. It is not immediately clear what degree of analysis is necessary to comprehend these cases. Even while the extra-media or social levels seem to be the most probable, one must be careful not to overly reduce the homogeneity of a

single system. Ultimately, the fundamental question remains: To what extent does the rapport between the reporter and the source impact the news? Nevertheless, once we leave the convenience of a single home base for study, we are left searching for exact solutions [7], [8].

Instances of Transferable Relationships

Thus, it is possible to see the fundamental connection between reporters and their sources as "portable," meaning that it occurs in all press systems, from the most authoritarian to the most libertarian, although in slightly different ways. Even when looking at the same scenario from different journalistic professional perspectives, what is seen as a certain amount of freedom in one context may be considered as rather restricted in another. A core conviction of journalists is that they must always rely on information provided by those regarded to be in a position of authority rather than fabricating stories of their own.

For instance, in Japanese Kisha clubs, the dynamic between reporters and officials is strictly regulated, whereas in the Netherlands, foreign affairs reporters are relatively free from official sources due to the lack of pressure to report on breaking news. In the Netherlands, reporters are basically in command, with subjective production being the norm, but in Japan, news is mostly determined by what authorities say. In some systems, sources compensate reporters for their work, which is highly unethical for American reporters but is accepted by Mexican reporters as a necessary component of the "envelope journalism" system, which allows them to supplement their meager income in a manner akin to that of wait staff at restaurants [9], [10].

Other analogies draw attention to variations that result from society and professional cultures coming together. For instance, while both groups reported identical beliefs about maintaining source anonymity, American reporters were far less inclined to bargain with a source as compared to Israeli reporters based on how they responded to a series of hypothetical circumstances. Numerous studies have shown that relationships in Korea grow more intimate than those in the West, but sources do not try to entrap journalists in amicable exchanges; rather, strong friendships of this kind are an integral part of Korean society as a whole. A significant level of symbiosis between journalists employed by regional media outlets and political-economic elites was discovered in a research on Swedish/Danish media. This is comparable to the situation in Russia, where independent sources have just lately become prevalent. As a result, there is constant friction as sources compete to further their own interests while journalists try to make the most of their newly acquired influence. Although things seem friendlier in New Zealand, sources still have a tendency to take center stage and play a function more like to that of the para-journalist Schudson described that is, providing "favourable facts" as opposed to a more objective portrayal of the facts. According to a study of journalists in Britain and Spain, the presence of a crisis made the relationship between the journalist and the source unique, with sources trying to curry favor with journalists in order to advance their agendas and harm their opponents a tactic known as "ventriloquist journalism."

CONCLUSION

This study provides a nuanced understanding of the relationship between reporters and sources, emphasizing its transformative journey from a power struggle to a cultural meaning-making focus. The dynamic negotiation between these two entities not only influences immediate news agendas but also molds enduring cultural meanings. The study calls for a shift in perspective, moving beyond a Western-centric lens and considering the global context to comprehend the diverse manifestations of this relationship in different press systems. As media technologies evolve, the study suggests that the way reporters and sources

communicate is undergoing significant changes, necessitating ongoing examination of this crucial interplay in the realm of journalism.

REFERENCES:

[1] B. Swinburn, "Power dynamics in 21st-century food systems," *Nutrients*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/nu11102544.

[2] A. Lô and P. Fatien Diochon, "Unsilencing power dynamics within third spaces. The case of Renault's Fab Lab," *Scand. J. Manag.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.scaman.2018.11.003.

[3] N. Canning, "'Just 5 more minutes!' Power dynamics in outdoor play," *Int. J. Play*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/21594937.2019.1580332.

[4] W. Wang, "Centralized Agricultural Networks and Changing Agrarian Power Dynamics in the Platform Economy," *Int. J. Commun.*, 2019.

[5] M. Lokot, "The space between us: feminist values and humanitarian power dynamics in research with refugees," *Gend. Dev.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/13552074.2019.1664046.

[6] C. Bréthaut, L. Gallagher, J. Dalton, and J. Allouche, "Power dynamics and integration in the water-energy-food nexus: Learning lessons for transdisciplinary research in Cambodia," *Environ. Sci. Policy*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.envsci.2019.01.010.

[7] D. Conduit and S. Akbarzadeh, "Great power-middle power dynamics: The case of China and Iran," *J. Contemp. China*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/10670564.2018.1542225.

[8] P. Fatien Diochon and J. Nizet, "Re-embedding leadership development: Exploring power dynamics to understand the insensitivity of coaching programs to organizational contexts," *Leadership*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1742715018824442.

[9] A. Feldman and R. D. Gill, "Power Dynamics in Supreme Court Oral Arguments: The Relationship between Gender and Justice-to-Justice Interruptions," *Justice Syst. J.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/0098261X.2019.1637309.

[10] A. Sajadi, L. Strezoski, V. Strezoski, M. Prica, and K. A. Loparo, "Integration of renewable energy systems and challenges for dynamics, control, and automation of electrical power systems," *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Energy and Environment*. 2019. doi: 10.1002/wene.321.

CHAPTER 13

EVOLUTION OF GENDER DYNAMICS IN NEWSROOMS: A HISTORICAL ANALYSIS FROM THE 19TH CENTURY TO THE PRESENT DAY

Dr. Shalini, Associate Professor
Department of General Management, Centre for Management Studies, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.shalinir@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

This study delves into the historical evolution of gender dynamics within newsrooms, tracing the trajectory from the late 19th century to contemporary times. Focusing on the challenges faced by women journalists, the research explores how societal perceptions and expectations shaped their roles. The narrative unfolds through phases of gender-related discussions, including the Women's Liberation Movement's impact on newsrooms and the subsequent changes in content and editorial structures. Empirical evidence is presented to investigate the existence of gender-based differences in journalistic values and practices. The study concludes by examining the persistent underrepresentation of women in leadership positions and the continued emphasis on physical appearance in the field of network reporting. The study underscores the need for continued efforts to address gender imbalances in newsroom leadership and to challenge preconceived notions regarding the role of physical appearance in network reporting. As newsrooms evolve, acknowledging and confronting these issues will be essential for fostering an inclusive and diverse media landscape that truly represents the interests and perspectives of the broader population.

KEYWORDS:

Employment, Gender, Journalism, Media, Newsroom, Women.

INTRODUCTION

Discussions of "gender in the newsroom," without necessarily adopting the exact terminology of "gender," have their roots in the late nineteenth century, when a large number of women entered US and UK newsrooms to support their families. "Our girls will rush into journalism, teaching, or the stage, three professions that are already overstocked, and neglect really useful branches of employment, by which they might earn a steady if not luxurious livelihood," a concerned reader of a UK woman's magazine said. Men claimed that the network would defeminize and even desex women, infuriated by the invasion of women. These persistent claims, which only changed during world wars, had nothing to do with the notion that women are naturally incapable of reporting crimes. Rather, these assertions undermined the status of women readers and men's desire to maintain their exclusive access to high-status employment. Whatever the case, these diatribes show that women were able to participate in this traditionally male arena. Despite their frequent complaints that male editors, coworkers, and sources dismissed them as unimportant and confined them to the women's angle, women persisted in demanding roles in newsrooms.

Women were the subject of the "gender" discussion during the majority of the 20th century, according to both working journalists and academics. This illustrates the "Otherness" of women and the lingering maleness as the "unmarked" norm, in part. It also operates on the premise that femininity is the issue and that males and women are opposed. Research on gendered behaviors in journalism seldom questions generalized beliefs about gender or

sexual differences. Rather, gender and women are combined to form a unique, unchanging, and self-evident category that is then used to analyze the position of women. The topic of changing definitions of masculinity and the part men's magazines play in creating and perpetuating different versions of masculinity has just lately come to light. Seldom is the manufactured link between masculinity and femininity examined. Gender has mostly been used to raise the following dilemma: should women reporters attempt to behave like males, or would they be better served if women generated different forms? This question arises regardless of whether the newsroom is seen as a physical location, an institution, or a collection of cultural practices [1], [2].

Newsmen saved their best praises for a select few women whose work was "just like men's," at least until the 1950s. Stanley Walker, the editor of the New York Tribune, hailed crime reporter Ishbel Ross as the model newspaperwoman for perfectly reaching this criterion. The first book-length history of women reporters, Ross's Ladies of the Press, admitted that newsrooms had not been changed by successful front-page ladies. A small number of female authors of women's journalism textbooks adopted a pragmatic stance and urged other women to follow suit. "The fact of sex, the "woman's angle," is the woman writer's tool, but it must never be her weapon," asserted Ethel Brazelton, a Northwestern University journalism instructor. "But being a woman, she is possessed of a real advantage in the business of doing, recording, and interpreting women's interests, ways, and work." Otherwise, regardless of compensation, female reporters' autobiographies and other self-reports have emphasized more and more since the 1900s how they avoided becoming "sob sisters" or "agony aunts."

To put it plainly, a summary of the early history of gender in the newsroom entails following a change in perception from the early consensus among male and female journalists that women's job was to write about women for female readers, whose interests were perceived as being inherently distinct from men's; to a claim made by women that they could produce the same “unmarked” journalism as men, which the men then disputed to maintain their status, employment, and pay. Women's themes were first the entrance point for women. Pauline Frederick, for instance, began by covering women's topics on radio before being recruited by ABC to speak with the spouses of political candidates. But that wasn't the aim for women. Women realized that these women's forms—identified as female—represented professional ghettos rather than socialization or even innate tendencies.

Over the 20th century, the narrative became more convoluted and disputed. Men today claim, at least formally, that gender has no place in modern newsrooms because of the prominence of women as well as new economic limitations, audiences, technology, and professional standards. Ironically, recent grievances against the perceived feminization of newsrooms could be responses to emerging feminine forms. On the other hand, they could symbolize the overrepresentation of women in media or the fact that women are more recognized for their looks. Maybe it is a reaction against feminism. However, most women journalists agree with males that gender is a non-issue, albeit not all of them do. Women and other "minorities," who are classified according to their color, ethnicity, sexual orientation, class, or hyphenated versions of these characteristics, contest job discrimination based on qualifications and professional standing. Scholars have moved beyond normalized notions of women, depending on diverse logic, but they still see gender as fundamentally important and ever-present. Therefore, academics argue that inclusiveness is essential because varied perspectives matter; they assume that male and female journalists should and/or operate in different ways. They claim that since there aren't enough women in the media, either physically or figuratively, these groups won't be "well" covered in terms of quantity or quality.

The dispute started in 2005 when freelance opinion writer and law professor Susan Estrich criticized a male editor for not publishing more pieces written by women. Even the few women who do write columns, according to Estrich, "don't count as women because they don't write with 'women's voices.'" Regular Washington Post columnist Anne Applebaum called Estrich's complaint "bizarre" and "seriously bad" for women, saying that she didn't think other women saw themselves as female journalists with a special obligation to write about women's issues, nor did she think that Estrich saw so many excellent women around her at the newspaper, perhaps because so many of The Post's most well-known journalists are women [3], [4].

Women's Liberation Movement's Effect

Although sympathetic women reporters were able to insert some women's issues, like rape laws, into the women's pages of their sexist male editors in the 1960s by seeming objective to them, the structure of the US news media and the women's liberation movement's refusal to designate spokespeople worked against publicity for that movement. The National Organization for Women put a lot of effort into fostering relationships with female journalists and organizing the news industry. The movement was covered, whether it was because of the proactive information subsidies provided by women's groups or the agitprop efforts of radical feminists. Furthermore, newsrooms suffered greatly as a result of the women's movement. First, women journalists were encouraged and motivated by the movement to fight discriminatory hiring and promotion practices at many news companies via legal and regulatory avenues. With every triumph, women's opportunities increased.

It's unclear what will happen to content in the long run. A reporter for the Los Angeles Times asserts that the consequent rise in the number of female reporters had a significant, beneficial effect. Newsrooms gain from the variety that results from women reporters covering social problems and topics that appeal to women and using a greater number of women, feminist groups, and "ordinary people" as sources. Women did take action to destroy women's pages, first at The Washington Post and other prestigious publications and then at lesser ones. Women have been employed as editors of these sections by both mainstream and African-American newsrooms since Jane Cunningham Croly launched a women's page for the New York Daily World in the 1890s. Some women's page editors attempted, although their attempts were patchy and ineffective, to broaden the political, social, and racial reach of these sections in the 1950s and 60s. Once again, recently invigorated second-wave feminists denounced these passages for promoting “symbolic annihilation,” which was analogous to other discriminatory forms that denigrated or condemned women.

The elimination of women's pages resulted in the rapid elimination of the one editorial position designated for women, as highlighted in many oral histories supported by the Washington Press Club Foundation. A similar dynamic existed in Ireland, where women's pages were despised by "real reporters" until the Irish Times allowed women to redesign the pages and add "serious" reporting in the late 1960s. The section was quickly eliminated because, in the words of Maeve Binchy, its second editor and current best-selling author, women don't need a specific location. Ironically, numerous US newspapers brought back their women's sections in the 1980s to appease advertisers. These investigations show how marketing considerations shape the sex-binary packaging of news and the perception of women as being interested in domesticity and lifestyle problems rather than the unique values of women.

In addition to inspiring women to pursue their interests in women's history and join the academic world, the second wave of the women's movement also generated interest in and a

market for studies on women's labor and culture. Long-forgotten women were lifted "Up from the Footnote" by Marzolf's groundbreaking history; full-bore biographies of single people and Great Women of the Press followed, according to another title. In due course, academics shifted their focus to more specific areas, such as sob sisters, black women, and war reporters, in addition to conceptually complex histories of women's journalism worldwide.

Scholars have challenged the conventional wisdom that newsroom practices are a direct and unavoidable outcome of professional routines and socialization. Specifically, they have questioned the notion that management defines the abilities and talents they need based on what has historically increased circulation and prestige. Arguments for newsroom diversity and the research topic itself were informed by new perspectives on the significance of journalists' gendered identities. This caused women's responses to newsroom dynamics and structures including the definition of journalism and newsrooms themselves to be rethought.

DISCUSSION

The women-led news media was a major field of study for the second wave of researchers. It all started with young American textile workers' publications in the middle of the 1800s, which may have been the first sustained attempt by women to create their news and therefore redefine themselves. Periodicals of the women's movement are worth reading in the future because of their significance in defending, legitimizing, and elucidating women's emancipation as well as in discussing alternative ideals for femininity. In addition to voting rights, suffrage journals included other significant topics including politics, law, health, and labor. Their editors established their groups and participated actively in various reform movements and publications. The newsroom policies of their journals, such as how they handle family obligations, how dedicated they are to journalism training, and how they are changing journalism along feminist lines, may also be examined. The emergence of a gendered community of activists who persuaded women that they could “affect social change by creating a new gender-based political culture” by seizing public space was thus made possible by the 150 women-run UK political periodicals produced between 1856 and 1930.

Feminist magazines from the 20th century are also significant fora. For instance, Time and Tide was founded in response to dissatisfaction with both advocacy publications that exclusively focused on women and mainstream media in the UK that denigrated women. Compared to previous US and UK publications, feminist magazines that grew in popularity in the US throughout the 1970s had a more limited readership and catered primarily to a certain demographic, including ecofeminists, prostitutes, celibates, older women, Marxists, feminist witches, and a wide range of other hobbies and occupations. Additionally, they were more overtly critical of sexist stereotypes and rejected traditional notions of newsworthiness and journalistic procedures. Off Our Backs has been published since 1970 by an organization that still functions by agreement. The statement "We intend to be just, but we do not pretend to be impartial" defies accepted wisdom.

The majority of women who have produced second-wave women's movement organs have been activists, reformers, and crusaders who have little regard for financial gain. The exception that demonstrates the rule is Ms., the "mouthpiece" of popular feminism in the US since 1972. Despite her refusal to produce "complimentary copy" for marketers and her years-long abstinence from advertising, Ms. has been portrayed as a corrupt hybrid who is "always firmly enmeshed in a commercial mass media matrix." If not, the heads of feminist newsrooms did not consider themselves to be journalists first and had no background in commercial journalism. However, they offered industrial and professional possibilities,

especially those in journalism. For example, Amelia Bloomer, who started The Lily in 1849 as "a medium through which woman's thoughts and aspirations might be developed," was ready to put off finishing the book to educate her female printers. They kept membership costs affordable for women who were unpaid or earn little money, and they restricted advertising to what they thought suitable. Given their unprofessional writing, disregard for aesthetics, lack of long-term economic plans, inefficiency brought on by the communal or horizontal organization, and fixation with principles, critiques of alternative media therefore definitely apply to feminist political journals [5], [6].

These criticisms make it possible to investigate how new media, such as Internet zines, public access cable channels, and satellite radio, might cover topics that are difficult to address elsewhere on a worldwide basis. Women's voices were originally thought to annoy listeners and were thus only heard on programs that attempted to assist women with household chores on both commercial and mainstream radio. These days, a lot of women work as interviews, news program hosts, and reporters. More importantly, feminist radio stations and public affairs initiatives are led by women in several nations, but with differing degrees of feminist dedication. WINGS provides feminist news to radio stations, while Feminist International Radio Endeavor establishes an Internet-based worldwide news stream. Third-wave feminists also appear to follow whole new ideals in their work.

Empirical Proof of Differences Between Gender and Values

National surveys indicate that variations in professional practices are not significantly predicted by gender. Men and women exhibit comparable levels of work satisfaction and have similar conceptions of the function of news and the ethics of reporting techniques. However, feminist theory contends that social identity which is shaped by social history, socialization disparities, and intrinsically gendered experiences has a significant impact on how people think and know. According to Rogers and Thorson, "because men and women have different values and priorities," men and women socialize differently in the workplace. Given that men and women have different identities, it was anticipated that women reporters would have certain values, interests, and priorities that would influence how stories are gathered, investigated, structured, and produced, "like females in other professions." Interestingly, Rogers and Thorson's content examination of three newspapers revealed that while women at the major daily sourced and structured stories similarly to their male colleagues, they drew from a wider range of female and ethnic sources, particularly in positive stories. Van Zoonen concludes that generally speaking, women journalists have a particular "woman view" and are more engaged with their audience and surroundings. According to her, women question the objectivity of male journalists, thinking that males employ it as a defense against the empathy and sensitivity that journalism demands.

War reporting is still likely the most contentious beat for women due to the risks involved, including the possibility of catastrophic injuries as well as the chance for a career-making reputation. Viewers have long criticized women, particularly mothers, for placing their bodies in danger. The question of whether women and men report differently from one another has also sparked an exceptionally heated discussion among journalists, viewers, and academics about war reporting. The first conflict in which a significant number of women served was the Vietnam conflict. Some women discovered that just by being visible, they were acknowledged at press conferences and had their queries addressed first. However, women encountered discrimination and mistrust from the US military, the Vietnamese troops, and male reporters even when they were paid to write from and about the perspective of women. Because they were aware of the preconception that women were more sensitive to the "human side" of war and that these tales were more likely to be omitted, some women

detested writing war stories with a human aspect. That is to say, the proportion of women who objected to being assigned based on gender stereotypes or refused to write as women indicates that sexism, not gender differences, was the issue. Liz Trotta, the first female television reporter in Vietnam, surmised that her male colleagues were intimidated by the prospect of competing against women. Whatever the case, the kinds of tales written by men and women were quite similar [7], [8].

Results from smaller gender studies are inconsistent and non-committal. The majority of those who believe that gender "matters" or that it "should matter" more are women activists and academics. Women feel that female journalists provide a distinct, "more human perspective" to the news, according to informal polls conducted by the International Women's Media Foundation. However, several women also said that "news is news" and "ethics are ethics." In a similar vein, there was disagreement among the 22 female members of an advocacy organization who answered a questionnaire about how differently women describe women's concerns. Men still predominate in the professions, according to most women, who said that their reactions to tales vary from men's because they are more sympathetic to women and place more emphasis on personal and emotional aspects. However, 75% of them do not include feminism in their reporting, and many of them concur that female managers are even more manly than their male counterparts.

Many of the respondents, according to Ross, are unaware of gender problems because they have accepted and integrated concerns associated with men into their professions, normalizing them. Women's significant hesitation and lack of agreement, at the very least, call into question expectations that a "critical mass" of women would revolutionize journalism. Margaret Gallagher contends that gender has to be addressed as a professional problem to be innovative and creative, having produced important comparative studies on the worldwide exclusion of women. However, her Global Media Monitoring studies challenge the notion that the growing number of women entering the field of journalism in the majority of these nations would fundamentally alter content. There is no cohesive group of women. Many people have little regard for feminism as a movement and are unaware of the historical transformations that feminists have brought about.

In conclusion, women accept the sexist nature of many of their male coworkers, but they also choose to accept the structures and incentive system of journalism as part of their careers. Moreover, gender socialization theory is unable to explain why certain women can transcend their gender. Because it ignores the crucial perspective on gender not as a role, much less a static and dichotomous set of differences between women and men, but as a performance, a relational act it neither resolves the chicken/egg debate domestically nor on the battlefield. Both men and women act gender, sometimes in a creative way and sometimes not at all, and they also inspire others to do the same [5], [9].

One of the first female network news journalists, Marlene Sanders, was selected as the first network vice president on the news side in the 1970s. However, there wasn't much writing about or by the few women who achieved success until lately. This makes Katharine Graham noteworthy for her open account of her experience as the publisher of the Washington Post: even though her father had owned the publication, she had little involvement mainly social until her husband committed suicide in 1963. More importantly, businesses throughout the world including news organizations have been and still are hesitant to elevate women to leadership positions. It makes sense that the subtitle of Hemlinger and Linton's research on the gendered glass barrier in newsrooms read "Still Fighting an Uphill Battle." In the United States, women made up about 18% of big newspaper publishers in 2006. Women make up 35 percent of television news managers and 30 percent of senior positions at daily newspapers,

which are concentrated in a small number of chains. According to Annenberg's research "No Room at the Top," women make up just 12 percent of the boards of directors of news and entertainment organizations and 20 percent of the top executives of network news companies. However, it may be paradoxical to lament that 46% of female executives in the media and entertainment sector and 38% of female news executives work in PR, communications, or human resources, while also supporting, as the report does, the executive potential of women due to their unique communication abilities and understanding of the female market.

The idea that men and women "execute" leadership in different ways is consistent with other binary ideas: "Masculine management is more authoritarian, competitive, and defensive, while "feminine" management is more interpersonal, democratic, constructive, and collaborative. Statistically speaking, males write the majority of articles in both categories. If nothing else, the focus on management suggests that the debate about the value of female reporters is not quite right. For instance, women make up over 50% of reporters in New Zealand's newspapers but just 19% of editors. Judy McGregor, an Equal Employment Opportunities Commissioner and the first female editor of a major New Zealand newspaper says women in senior management are necessary to express women's unique perspectives and break the male dominance of the news. Notably, the Sarasota Herald-Tribune published the same material as other newspapers with the same proportion of female sources throughout the years when women held the positions of publisher, executive editor, managing editor, and two assistant managing editors. However, the all-female management team of that publication was seen to be providing the atmosphere of candor and open decision-making that was promised.

Network Reporting

Here, it is impossible to overlook the ongoing focus on women's physical attractiveness. Nancy Dickerson was not the last woman to be touted as an attractive lady, but she was the first to anchor a news broadcast with her five-minute afternoon report in 1963. Networks have pushed beautiful women who aren't ready for major roles, like Sally Quinn, a journalist for the Washington Post who was fired from CBS in 1973 after just a few months on the show. When market researchers discovered that Jessica Savitch "scored as high with men, who saw her as a sex object, as with women, who saw her as a role model," the novice journalist was given a promotion. Twenty years now, Kate Adie, a war correspondent for the BBC, laments that appearances still matter. She claims that TV management favors women with “cute faces and cute bottoms” above those with expertise in the field of journalism. And as Christine Craft showed, women's beauty has a finite shelf life. Eight months into her eight-month stint as co-anchor for an ABC station in 1981, Craft was demoted after being "made over" as a platinum blonde for CBS. The rationale was that she was "too old, too ugly, and wouldn't submit to men," according to focus group data [10], [11].

The US Federal Communications Commission started encouraging broadcasters to recruit more women in 1968, but it took some time for this to happen. A total of 60 women worked as on-air journalists for NBC in 1971; the other women had "dead-end" positions such as secretarial, research, or assistant duties, to which no males were assigned. Given that women already make up roughly 40% of US network news positions, network status—the gold standard of television status is the problem. Do women now have the gravitas, or whatever rating system measures it, needed to anchor high-profile programs, after being recruited and promoted based solely on their attractiveness? The first female anchor of a network primetime broadcast was Katie Couric in 2007. Couric's potential is mostly dependent on looks—in her case, an altered appearance. Males are indeed starting to place more value on beauty, mostly due to the "hard" statistics of focus groups. However, a surprising amount of

public criticism—albeit contradictory has been leveled at Couric's hair, attire, and cosmetics. Narrowly defined criteria for looks continue to be vital in deciding who is recruited, how they are employed, and how long they survive on television. The New York Times revealed its findings with a classic headline: "Now the News: Couric Still Isn't One of the Boys."

CONCLUSION

This comprehensive study illuminates the intricate journey of women in journalism, revealing shifting paradigms from early perceptions of women as relegated to specific topics for female readers to contemporary debates on gender neutrality within newsrooms.

The Women's Liberation Movement emerges as a pivotal force, fostering changes in news media structures and promoting women's participation in various roles.

While some progress has been made, challenges persist, evident in the underrepresentation of women in leadership positions.

The study underscores the need for continued efforts to dismantle gender barriers, recognizing the multifaceted dimensions that influence women's experiences in journalism. As the media landscape evolves, this research encourages ongoing exploration of gender dynamics to ensure a more inclusive and diverse future for newsrooms.

REFERENCES:

[1] J. C. Castro-Alonso, M. Wong, O. O. Adesope, P. Ayres, and F. Paas, “Gender Imbalance in Instructional Dynamic Versus Static Visualizations: a Meta-analysis,” *Educ. Psychol. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s10648-019-09469-1.

[2] M. G. Sendén, A. Klysing, A. Lindqvist, and E. A. Renström, “The (not so) changing man: Dynamic gender stereotypes in Sweden,” *Front. Psychol.*, 2019, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00037.

[3] P. P. Bassareo and A. Crisafulli, “Gender Differences in Hemodynamic Regulation and Cardiovascular Adaptations to Dynamic Exercise,” *Curr. Cardiol. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.2174/1573403x15666190321141856.

[4] E. K. Schmidt and M. Cacace, “Setting up a dynamic framework to activate gender equality structural transformation in research organizations,” *Sci. Public Policy*, 2019, doi: 10.1093/scipol/scy059.

[5] I. Zharkevich, “Gender, marriage, and the dynamic of (im)mobility in the mid-Western hills of Nepal,” *Mobilities*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/17450101.2019.1611026.

[6] E. Morris, R. Vooris, and T. Q. Mahoney, “You study like a girl: Experiences of female sport management students,” *Sport Manag. Educ. J.*, 2019, doi: 10.1123/smej.2018-0020.

[7] Y. S. Kwon, “The Dynamic Structure of Gender Stereotypes,” *J. Linguist. Sci.*, 2019, doi: 10.21296/jls.2019.9.90.1.

[8] E. G. S. Fèlix and D. S. T. David, “Performance of family-owned firms: the impact of gender at the management level,” *J. Fam. Bus. Manag.*, 2019, doi: 10.1108/JFBM-10-2018-0051.

[9] X. H. Ao, T. V. Vu, K. D. Le, S. Jirakiattikul, and K. Techato, “An analysis of the smallholder farmers’ cassava (Manihot esculenta Crantz) value chain through a gender

perspective: the case of Dak Lak province, Vietnam," *Cogent Econ. Financ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/23322039.2019.1645632.

[10] C. Querton, "Gender and the boundaries of international refugee law: Beyond the category of 'gender-related asylum claims,'" *Netherlands Q. Hum. Rights*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0924051919884764.

[11] K. McNamara and E. Wood, "Food taboos, health beliefs, and gender: understanding household food choice and nutrition in rural Tajikistan," *J. Health. Popul. Nutr.*, 2019, doi: 10.1186/s41043-019-0170-8.