

Reviewing the Nexus of Participatory Journalism and Mediatized Engagement

Oscar Westlund

Oslo Metropolitan University | oscarw@oslomet.no

Paul Clemens Murschetz

Berlin University of Digital Sciences | murschetz@berlin-university.digital



Oscar Westlund, Ph.D., is a Professor of Journalism and Media Studies at the Oslo Metropolitan University. He holds secondary appointments at Volda University College and at the University of Gothenburg. He specializes in media production, digital journalism and media use. He is the Editor-in-Chief of Digital Journalism and has published widely in this field.



Paul Clemens Murschetz, Ph.D., is an associated researcher at the Berlin University of Digital Sciences, and the Austrian Academy of Sciences, Institute for Comparative Media and Communication Studies (CMC), Vienna. He lectures on media management studies at Macromedia, Munich. His specialism is on studies of media management and media economics.

Keywords

Audience engagement; Critical discussion; Digital journalism; Literature Review; Mediatization; News industry; Participatory journalism

Abstract

This study reviews the scholarly literature on participatory journalism and mediatized audience engagement as two emergent perspectives of digital journalism studies. We discuss four propositions drawn from an interdisciplinary literature. We find that a review and critical discussion of the nexus of relations and impacts of these perspectives provides valuable insights to the transformation of journalism and the news media industry. Furthermore, we believe that thinking about participatory journalism and mediatized audience engagement can be fruitfully applied to various novel approaches regarding research on the fundamental transformation of journalism in the digital age.

Introduction

The news media industry is currently facing a plethora of radical challenges due to hugely disruptive effects of digitization and convergence on the entire ecosystem of the industry.

Now that the media industry is not only challenged by technological change, but also by tech giants to develop media formats and reach audiences outside of the established media industry channels, “legacy” news media – defined as the “traditional” mass media, including print newspapers and broadcast news organizations which are still guided by traditional news values and practices (Westlund, 2013), seem to be challenged particularly the most (Franklin, 2014; Murschetz & Friedrichsen, 2014; Newman, Fletcher, Kalogeropoulos, & Nielsen, 2019; Picard, 2014). Today, these traditional “standard” media are forced to figure out how to harness social, mobile and online media for their marketing, sales, customer services and other business objectives, without alienating their core target audiences too much (Westlund, 2013). Indeed, by offering interactive applications and services and thereby actively engaging the citizens as active participants or “producers” (Bruns, 2012) in the communication process, news media organizations may build more solid and sustainable relationships that help them achieve competitive positional advantages in the digital marketplace. This may imply relinquishing some of the professional control that a media company has traditionally had (Lewis, 2012). Doing so can open a space of fruitful interaction with audiences in news production processes and does not necessarily limit to proprietary news sites and applications.

As a corollary, legacy news media and their journalists are called for becoming more “entrepreneurial” in order to engage audi-

ences more valuably and profoundly (Achtenhagen, 2017; Heft, & Dogruel, 2019; Vos & Singer, 2016; Will, Brüntje, & Gossel, 2016). This is critical because, assumingly, traditional business models of media organizations are being increasingly disrupted by the tech giants acting as digital intermediaries (e.g. Küng, 2013, and 2017). Also, there is a greater need for collaboration of media firms with their possible competitors (e.g. Westlund, 2012). And, moreover, there are new modes of media work and content production facilitated through digitization (Olleros & Zhegu, 2016). All of the above largely challenge the media firms’ operations (e.g. Pallas & Fredriksson, 2013; Sylvie & Gade, 2009; van den Bulck & Tambuyzer, 2013; Virta & Malmelin, 2017). Indeed, solving the issue of how to effectively refund news media is vital as the legacy revenue model through “paid” (i.e. all forms of advertising for which a media purchase is necessary) and “owned” (i.e. all content assets a brand either owns or wholly controls) so far seems to fail (Murschetz & Friedrichsen, 2014). Paid advertising has found many outlets, dispersed into thousands of blogs, Facebook pages, specialized news media outlets, as well as “fake news” publishing sites (Braun & Eklund, 2019), so that it becomes difficult to trace the return on investment due to increased audience fragmentation.

Today, we can witness a peak of initiatives across the globe to foster the acceleration of digital entrepreneurial activity in the news media in many areas, ranging from the origination of ideas and creative opportunities, the identification and sourcing of capital and other resources, the institutional policy frameworks, to risks and uncertainties related with the creation and development of “digital start-ups”, and not-for-profit blogs and other digital native publications. Notably, if legacy news media continue to be innovation-adverse and ignorant to adapting their media channels to the requirements of an engaged and increasingly interactive

audiences, these disruptions will eventually force them to exit the industry (Duffy, Ling, & Westlund, 2017; Horst, Murschetz, Brennan, & Friedrichsen, 2018).

The future of digital journalism is as much an economic issue as it is a societal one. (...) the individualization of civic cultures has emerged in tandem with the growth of mediatized communication processes whereby individuals use new technologies, with a tendency toward personalization in the public domain

But while “new” interactive media enable an improved dialogue via digital communication platforms, traditional media may have to hand over some of their professional control not only to active audiences (Lewis, 2012; Westlund, 2012a), but also to “media” outside of the traditional news media realm, such as Facebook and Google which likewise veer for audiences’ and advertisers’ attention (Ekström & Westlund, 2019; Küng, 2013 and 2017).

However, while research into “participatory journalism” has attracted significant scholarly attention in journalism studies (Borger, van Hoof, Costera Meijer, & Sanders, 2013; Deuze, Bruns, & Neuberger, 2007; Karlsson, Bergström, Clerwall, & Fast, 2015; Rosen, 2008), our review of this discourse concludes that novel participatory epistemologies (Anderson & Revers, 2018), which extend research perspectives beyond proprietary platforms of legacy news media to include platforms that are non-proprietary to the news media domain (Westlund & Ekström, 2018; Robinson & Wang, 2018), are largely unaddressed. This void also refers to issues of “mediatization”, a concept which – in our view – is intrinsic in ways in which (digital and other) media are embedded in processes of civic engagement and various

forms of participation. Mediatization dominantly shapes the processes and conversation around journalistic communication among the media, publishers, journalists, and audiences as citizens at large.

However, the future of digital journalism is as much an economic issue as it is a societal one. In fact, the individualization of civic cultures has emerged in tandem with the growth of mediatized communication processes whereby individuals use new technologies, with a tendency toward personalization in the public domain (Alvarez & Dahlgren, 2016; Bennett and Segerberg, 2013). As it looks, social media, podcasts, blogs, open-source software sites, and wikis, have paved the way for an “increasingly individualized civic environment” (Gerodimos, 2012, p. 188), with engagement in the public domain being “subjectively experienced more as a personal rather than a collective question” (Dahlgren, 2013, p. 52). Here, mediatization research comes as another reminder that political communication and, in its entourage, civic engagement are currently changing. When seen as a “meta-process” (Krotz, 2011), mediatization, alongside various other “mega-trends” of change in political communication such as digitization of communication technologies, hybridization of communication forms, globalization of communication spaces, or individualization of communication repertoires, comes as another important driver of change to affect individuals in their motivation to engage politically (Vowe & Henn, 2016). In theory, mediatization investigates the interrelation between change in media repertoires and usage as drivers for communicative and socio-cultural change, understood as a long-term process of change.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to clarify the nexus of research issues of “participatory journalism” and “mediatized engagement”

as two emergent perspectives on digital journalism studies.

We believe that both perspectives should play a more prominent role in digital journalism research as they support the notion that news value is co-created and enhanced through the producers' interaction with their active customers who an active role in the process of collecting, reporting, analyzing, and disseminating news and information on the other side. Hence, this study shall undertake a comprehensive and necessarily interdisciplinary literature review on these concepts and critically discuss them with a view to their leveraging impact on digital journalism studies.

Eldridge, Hess, Tandoc, & Westlund (2019) define Digital Journalism Studies as a field which "should strive to critically explore, document, and explain the interplay of digital and journalism, continuity and change, and further focus, conceptualize, and theorize tensions, configurations, power imbalances, and the debates these continue to raise for digital journalism and its futures" (see, Abstract; also Steensen, Larsen, Håggvar & Fonn, 2019).

Necessarily, the present study shall draw from disparate academic fields such as journalism studies and media management and entrepreneurship research, and thereby systematize, link, and extend familiar definitions, characteristics, types and dimensions of these perspectives on digital journalism from extant literature in these fields. By delineating the central properties of these perspectives, it seeks to build a conceptual bridge between "participatory journalism" and "mediatized engagement" and its potentials for creating value for legacy news media and journalism in the digital era. Methodologically, this study will discuss some key propositions developed through reviewing the literature and, hence, generate the scientific claim for analyzing some key research paths regarding the digital journalism studies that may result from

analyses into participatory journalism and mediatized engagement in the digital era.

“Participatory Journalism” and “Mediatized Engagement”

One might expect a rich literature and ample empirical insights into the plethora of issues involved in "participatory journalism" in supporting the notion that news value is co-created and enhanced through producers' interaction with their presumably active participants, the latter potentially playing an active role in the process of collecting, reporting, analyzing, and disseminating news and information.

In fact, research into participatory journalism has grown significantly (Borger, van Hoof, Costera Meijer, & Sanders, 2013; Deuze, Bruns, & Neuberger, 2007; Karlsson, Bergström, Clerwall, & Fast, 2015; Rosen, 2008). When considering "participatory epistemologies" more particularly (Anderson & Revers, 2018), scholarly research looks beyond issues of proprietary platforms to also include platforms that are non-proprietary to the news media. Evidently, these extensions are essential for the study of participatory journalism as well (Westlund & Ekström, 2018; Robinson & Wang, 2018).

Further, by studying "participatory journalism" within news on proprietary platforms, scholars should not overlook how journalists and citizens engage with the news via social media platforms (as reviewed in Lewis & Molyneux, 2018; Ferrer-Conill & Tandoc, 2018). This includes research on how journalists engage with citizens as active participants in news production processes via platforms such as WhatsApp (Kligler-Vilenchik & Tenenboim, 2019), and also the study of "private social media groups" where leisure-, work-, and location-based communities may arise (Swart, Peters, & Broersma, 2019).

Certainly, understanding issues of participatory journalism in the digital era is vitally important for the analysis of the media as a whole. Fundamentally, we observe that many spheres of life are saturated by the digital media technologies that enable communication and social interaction among and between human beings in various socio-technological settings.

Participatory journalism is a form of “engaged” journalism in a hyper-connected media era that advocates for active audiences and community engagement.

Today, digital media technologies are the artifacts of social interaction. They are hybrid and multi-dimensional which means that they are typically defined as a combination of technology, social interaction and practices, design, communication, and human agency. This process of “mediatization” whereby participatory journalism “mediatizes” engagement by shaping and framing the processes of interaction of political communication among audiences as citizens.

Hence, participatory journalism is a form of “engaged” journalism in a hyper-connected media era that advocates for active audiences and community engagement. It is driven by the seminal agenda of “shared power” between news media publishers, journalists, and communities that may decisively shape the future of social interaction in the modern digital society (European Journalism Centre, 2019).

Hence, this study shall critically discuss “participatory journalism” and “mediatized

engagement” as a nexus of two emergent perspectives in the field of digital journalism studies. It aims to reconcile limited and contradictory findings of existing research which result from:

- Inconsistent definitions as to the subject and scope of the concepts of “participatory journalism” and “mediatized engagement”; that is what is conceptualized/theorized as “participatory journalism” and what factors influence the “engagement” of audiences, particularly into the new modes of online news participation; what skills, competence and knowledge is required to be competent and effectively engaged, and is there any evidence that this would lead to wider and more sustainable engagement? (Almgren & Olsson, 2015; Wahl-Jorgensen, Williams, Sambrook, Harris, Garcia-Blanco, Dencik, Cushion, Carter, & Allan, 2016; Baines, & Kennedy, 2010; Bacigalupo, Kampylis, Punie & Van den Brande, 2016; Komarkova, Gagliardi, Conrads, & Collado, 2015);
- Different units and levels of analysis in identifying the factors predicting engagement (e.g, do they predominantly reside in the interests, motives and preferences of the individuals themselves, that is in “human agency” understood as the capability of individuals or groups to make free decisions or act, as against the “structure” defined as a patterned influence or limitation derived from rules and resources available to individuals or group actions (Giddens, 1984);
- A lack of appreciation of the role of “mediatization” and its role in transforming individual civic engagement into a collective action (Collins Watling & Zachary, 2014; Couldry, 2014, Dahlgren, 2009), given that the change of media communication has a fundamental impact on the socio-cultural sphere such as people’s

everyday communication practices and communicative construction of reality (Hepp, Hjarvard, & Lundby, 2015; Hjarvard, 2013; Couldry & Hepp, 2016);

- Lack in analysis on issues surrounding the extent to which there has been a shift from news journalism seeking to be detached from commercial influences and aspects to an explicitly business-oriented mind-set of “entrepreneurial journalism” driven by both non-economic and economic imperatives of value creation (e.g., the identified domains and mechanisms in entrepreneurship theory and discourse as a field of research in the creative industries context (Schulte-Holthaus, 2018) and its application to the journalism studies (Singer, 2016a, and b, 2018a; b, and c; Vos & Singer, 2016);
- A largely incoherent theoretical base for examining relations between the parameters mentioned above, particularly regarding relations between participatory journalism and mediated engagement as a novel research direction for digital journalism in the legacy news media domain. It also addresses the issue of links that work between different levels of engagement. That is the “macro-level” of the political and situational environments, the “meso-level” of news organizations facilitating participation, and the “micro-level” of journalists and individual citizens who wish to become more or less actively engaged, and their values, motives, attitudes, preferences and behaviors respectively (Quintelier & Hooghe, 2012; Schulte-Holthaus, 2018).

Based on this, this paper will discuss four key propositions on the two emergent perspectives of “participatory journalism” and “mediatized engagement” on digital

journalism, focusing on the relationships between news media organizations, journalists working for them, and processes of mediatization. By doing so, it intends to broaden existing knowledge of participatory journalism with a view to achieving knowledge transfers to “entrepreneurial journalism” (Ruotsalainen & Villi, 2018). In brief, the four propositions are as follows:

- Proposition 1: Legacy news media have adopted a conservative position to participation: Journalists and other social actors involved in the editorial process have largely sought to maintain their professional control, acting cautiously when it comes to enabling citizens to participate in news production processes via their proprietary platforms. Scholarly research should comprehend not only the journalistic but also the business and technological rationales for the organizations’ leaning towards participation.
- Proposition 2: Legacy news media control affordances of participation: Legacy news media are in charge of the affordances of their proprietary digital platforms (sites, applications etc.). Therefore, in this context they make decisions regarding the opportunities and constraints for the forms of participation that is to be inscribed into their digital user interfaces (i.e. technological actors). Comparing with social media platforms, legacy news media have obviously refrained from designing participatory affordances into their proprietary digital platforms.
- Proposition 3: Participatory journalism extends to social media platforms: While taking a reserved position towards enabling participation at their own digital platforms, the news media have allowed social media platforms (non-proprietary to themselves) to let users easily share and

interact with their news material. It has essentially resulted in discussions about how the news has become increasingly dislocated from the original domain of news media, and to social media. Thus, the news media have taken diverging approaches towards enabling vis-a-vis restricting participation in journalism, depending on whether the digital platforms are proprietary or non-proprietary ones.

- Proposition 4: Legacy news journalism benefits from approaches of “entrepreneurialism” and “mediatized engagement”: Recent analysis of interactions and relations between media, journalists and individuals is commonly based on the notion of “mediatization”. Meanwhile, research in journalism and media studies, political studies as well as business studies has explored mediatization as prevailing transformation influencing communication activities of individuals as well as organizations. Processes of “mediatization” seem to be constitutional in the same ways in which news journalists are embedded in the processes of audience engagement and whereby digital media shape and frame the processes and conversation of communication among users, journalists and news media organizations.

Propositions Discussed

In this section, we discuss four key propositions in more detail.

Proposition 1: Legacy news media have adopted a conservative position to participation

Research on participatory journalism has predominantly focused on legacy news media and their proprietary platforms (i.e.

websites and news applications). Participatory journalism concerns news organizations letting citizens influence and take part in the processes of news production. By yielding professional control over some aspects of news production and circulation (Lewis, 2012), participatory journalism could potentially mean that news media and the journalists open their gates and define news journalism in new ways. It not only means letting go of power and control, but it also requires journalists to learn new skills and make changes to their work processes and professional routines. Unsurprisingly, many studies have found journalists to be unwilling to relinquish their professional control in such ways. Formative research has shown that citizens mostly take part in providing source material for journalists, or later in reacting to news stories via comments, but rarely are they allowed to participate in the core aspects of news-making (see Singer, Domingo, Heinonen, Hermida, Paulussen, Quandt, Reich & Vujnovic, 2011). Thus, citizens seemingly have limited possibilities to participate in news production (Steensen, 2011), especially when compared to the plethora of possibilities for participation that currently exist (Lewis & Westlund, 2015)there is a need for better conceptualizing the changing nature of human actors, nonhuman technological actants, and diverse representations of audiences—and the activities of news production, distribution, and interpretation through which actors, actants, and audiences are inter-related. This article explicates each of these elements—the Four A’s—in the context of cross-media news work, a perspective that lends equal emphasis to editorial, business, and technology as key sites for studying the organizational influences shaping journalism. We argue for developing a sociotechnical emphasis for the study of institutional news production: a holistic framework through which to make sense of and conduct research about the full range of actors, actants, and audiences engaged in cross-media news work activities. This

emphasis addresses two shortcomings in the journalism studies literature: a relative neglect about (1. It is worth noting that studies also report on approaches geared towards facilitating participation, such as data journalism in Latin America, journalist-audience interactions over WhatsApp in Israel (Kligler-Vilenchik & Teneinbom, 2019).

News publishers are held accountable for content published on their sites in a significantly different way than platform companies, defining themselves as only offering platforms that host content.

While many have voiced the potential advantages of participatory journalism for democracy and for citizens at large (Borger, van Hoof, Costera Meijer, & Sanders, 2013), it does not mean that it is “rational” for a news organization from both the editorial and commercial viewpoints. Legacy news media cannot simply turn to participatory journalism just because technology now makes it possible. Several scholars have normatively classified legacy news media as slow or incompetent for not having implemented specific participation affordances, assuming this is “the correct way” to do things, as, for example, in the case of mobile news (Westlund, 2013). However, one must also take into an account the business perspective to understand the managerial rationale. The driving forces of the news media are frequently economic rather than democratic. It has been suggested that news media try to encourage citizens to contribute relevant and free, or cheap, content, and that journalists then ultimately decide which content will be used and exposed (Borger et al., 2013). Meanwhile, “free content” can require lots of resources from publishers to manage and thus result

in these prioritizing not to allow user-generated content on their proprietary sites and apps (Westlund, 2011). Importantly, news publishers are held accountable for content published on their sites in a significantly different way than platform companies, defining themselves as only offering platforms that host content. It reduces the pressures on content moderation, yet they are required to have such in place for terrorism, child pornography etc., and also try to maintain community standards. In all, news organizations have adopted strategically different ways for including or excluding citizens with regards to their news production processes (Bechmann, 2012, Lewis & Westlund, 2015; Westlund & Ekström, 2019).

Legacy news media have long owned and controlled their media and platforms for which they publish news. Accordingly, one actor (the legacy news media) sets up the conditions for what another actor (the citizens/audiences) is able to do. The news media are also in control of the ways in which various potential citizen contributions are curated and made visible on their platforms. Let us turn to Sweden to illustrate this. It is a country in which legacy news media are generally relatively successful and innovative but have taken a reserved position towards participatory journalism on their proprietary platforms. Alongside with encouraging citizens to act as sources providing tips, photos and videos, Swedish legacy news media have typically focused on enabling commenting, thus allowing participation in the first and final stage of the news production process (Singer, Domingo, Heinonen, Hermida, Paulussen, Quandt, Reich, & Vujnovic, 2011; Lehtisaari, Villi, Grönlund, Lindén, Mierzejewska, Picard, & Roepnack, 2018).

For example, some Swedish news publishers had opened their news production process to citizens, but such initiatives were later terminated. Some news me-

dia, especially the publicly funded broadcasters, have made possible for citizens to participate in specific programs. In some countries and for several years there was a strong increase in the enabling of participatory functionalities such as comment functions, but then it shifted, and many news media have shut down their commenting fields (Karlsson, Bergström, Clerwall & Fast, 2015), while some still maintain them under moderation (Boberg, Schatto-Eckrodt, Frischlich, & Quandt, 2018). Disallowing or limiting user comments has often been motivated by the difficulties in managing the inflow and spread of Net-based hate. The negative experiential organizational learning yielded from news sites has been applied to how journalists, businesspeople and technologists make sense of and negotiate their approaches to participation via mobile media (Westlund, 2012b; and 2011). At the same time, there are many examples of good participation, such as how the Guardian's reporting on a UN climate meeting engaged highly competent citizens whose contributions in comment fields were actively supervised and moderated (Graham & Wright, 2015).

Proposition 2: Legacy news media control affordances of participation

Throughout the 2000s, there has been an ongoing development of social web architectures, giving rise to different forms of networked participation through social media platforms. As opposed to legacy news media that were originally formed with an intent to inform, contemporary social media companies have emerged with a vision of developing platforms that carry affordances for participation and networked communication. These platforms provide such opportunities "for free" by using a revenue model that builds on sophisticated collection and analysis of data that enables them to sell personalized targeted advertising. Platform companies such as Facebook have more than a billion regular

users, engaging in billions and billions of interactions, hence, it goes without saying that social media are successful in enabling citizens to actively engage and participate in different ways. Social media companies have developed a social architecture that enables broad civic participation (O'Reilly, 2007).

The digital design of affordances that enable media participation comprises a key distinguishing factor of social media. The news media and social media companies offer distinct affordances functionalities and values such as mediation of information, community and/or entertainment via text, sounds, images and video as well as functions that allow users to produce and disseminate content on their own. The affordances provided enable – perhaps even encourage – a specific use, but does not mean that citizens will automatically choose to take advantage of these offerings (Graves, 2007). If specific affordances such as the distinct forms of media participation are missing, then people simply cannot use them for such purposes. The core of this discussion concerns which types of affordances the media and platform companies provide and which types they don't provide, and how citizens act based on that (Hutchby, 2001). The design of digital platforms establishes the organizational frameworks for both content production – such as the journalistic news process – and of citizens' opportunities to participate in that process.

In practice, digital design involves developing and offering good user interfaces requires that a user experience (UX) design is thoroughly elaborated. UX design is concerned with improving the users' experience and satisfaction through availability, user friendliness and utility by paying attention to esthetic qualities and designing for interaction between humans and machines in a way that fits into the greater organizational context (Jacko, 2012)The Human-Comput-

The usefulness and user-friendliness of the digital design may both promote and hinder different kinds of behaviors, and thus harmonize to the line of arguments connected to affordances.

er Interaction Handbook: Fundamentals, Evolving Technologies, and Emerging Applications raises the bar for handbooks in this field. It is the largest, most complete compilation of HCI theories, principles, advances, case studies, and more that exist within a single volume. The book captures the current and emerging sub-disciplines within HCI related to research, development, and practice that continue to advance at an astonishing rate. It features cutting-edge advances to the scientific knowledge base as well as visionary perspectives and developments that fundamentally transform the way in which researchers and practitioners view the discipline. New and Expanded Topics in the Third Edition: HCI and global sustainability; HCI in health care; Social networks and social media; Enterprise social computing; Role of HCI in e-Government; Role of creativity and cognition in HCI; Naturalistic approach to evaluation, persuasion, and globalization. The chapter authors include experts from academia, industry, and government agencies from across the globe -- all among the very best and most respected in their fields. The more than 80 tables, 400 figures, nearly 7,000 references, and four-page color insert combine to provide the single most comprehensive depiction of this field. Broad in scope, the book pays equal attention to

the human side, the computer side, and the interaction of the two. This balanced, application-focused design coverage makes the book not only an excellent research guide but also an authoritative handbook for the practice of HCI and for education and training in HCI. "Without a doubt this is the largest and heaviest book this reviewer has ever reviewed, weighing in at 7.5 pounds. Coordinating and editing the contributions of more than 140 authors, Jacko (Univ. of Minnesota. UX design also comprises how the actual content is presented, the service design and the business models as well as the creation of interactions on and adjacent to platforms. The usefulness and user-friendliness of the digital design may both promote and hinder different kinds of behaviors, and thus harmonize to the line of arguments connected to affordances.

Platform companies such as Google and Facebook employ a great number of hi-tech specialists developing the digital platform design. Also some legacy news media employ digital designers, collaborating with the businesspeople and the journalists (Belair-Gagnon & Holton, 2018; Holton & Belair-Gagnon, 2018; Lewis & Usher, 2014; Nielsen, 2012; Westlund, 2011; 2012b) I examine how 'old' media organizations develop 'new' media technologies by analyzing processes of technological innovation in two Danish newspaper companies that integrated blogs into their websites in very different ways in 2007. Drawing on concepts from science and technology studies and sociology and building on previous research on blogging by news media organizations, I analyze how the three different communities involved in the development process -- journalists and managers, but also the often-overlooked community of technologists -- articulated different versions of what blogging ought to be in each organization and tried to shape the technology and pull the development work in different directions. On the basis of interviews with key participants, I show how the two newspaper organizations (equally

'old' media. Earlier studies have found that technologists are much more interested in digital innovation compared to the journalists and the businesspeople (Westlund & Krumsvik, 2014). To continue, some other media rely on paying third parties to develop and maintain those functions on their behalf. Therefore, it may well be that it is external actors that establish the basic conditions for digital participation for legacy news media. In addition to that, let us use an empirical example to clarify the significance of digital design for participation in news media, in combination with other factors. In negotiating the digital design for a mobile news application, and its potential affordances for participation, the editorial representatives teamed up with the technologists to develop (limited) forms of participation. The outcome involved offering its users to upload multimedia messages (MMS) to an almost invisible subsection of the mobile news application, clearly marked as an amateur content. The digital design for this so-called producer-centric approach was in stark contrast to the participation-centric approach proposed by the businesspeople (Westlund, 2012b). Under such circumstances, it is not surprising that it resulted in relatively low participation rates. Following a call for socio-technical research giving more focus on technology per se, opens for research into how social actors provide technological actors with opportunities for participation (Lewis & Westlund, 2015). In their study of news commenting systems, Morlandstø and Mathisen (2017) found that as digital technology empowered citizens to participate in discussions, the journalists experienced a loss of control.

Proposition 3: Participatory journalism extends to social media platforms

Parallel to legacy news media experimenting – enabling and restricting – participatory journalism, a disruption of the social media platforms has been taking place. Citizen

sharing and interacting around news via social media such as Facebook and Twitter have gained substantial traction throughout the 2010's. There are two key aspects of this development. First, the social actors in news media organizations have appropriated social media for their news production processes, and for publishing news (Dodds, 2019; Lewis & Molyneux, 2018; Ekström & Westlund, 2019). Second, social media platforms have worked towards becoming interlinked with the digital platforms of news media and providing rich affordances for citizens to engage in active participation.

Next, we elaborate further on these two key aspects. Starting with the first aspect, newsrooms and journalists have turned to social media platforms to identify and interact with new networks of sources, as part of incorporating social media into their news production processes (Hermida, 2013). Journalists have been both enthusiastic and skeptical about using social media for work. Some researchers have evidenced how some journalists turn to Twitter to access, observe, and also act upon the opinions of more diverse actors engaged in public discussion (Hermida, Lewis, & Zamith, 2014). Meanwhile, other researchers have found that some legacy news media are keen to maintain established routines and networks of sources even when using social media such as Twitter (Belair-Gagnon, 2015, see also van Leuven, Kruijkemeier, Lecheler, & Hermans, 2018).

Turning to the second aspect, news publishers and social media platforms have become increasingly dependent on each other. Thus, they can be viewed as "frenemies" rather than friends or enemies. Legacy media news sites' traffic mostly took the form of direct traffic (i.e. bookmarks), but there has been a gradual displacement of direct traffic. First search engine (i.e. Google) become increasingly common, then social media platforms (especially Facebook) have become very significant (Nel &

Westlund, 2013). Social media has helped news media to reach wider audiences that can share and redistribute the news within their personal networks, thus enabling their acquaintances to “discover” and “stumble upon” the news (incidental news consumption). Legacy news media have allowed their news content to be easily shared and commented on via social media, in conjunction to the other forms of content, from personal posts and participatory journalism, to entertaining videos and advertising. Facebook and other providers of social media platforms clearly welcome the steady streams of news content coming into their platform, as it catches attention and stimulates participation, which in turn produces useful data analytics and advertising revenues. Ultimately, the relationship between news media and platform companies is very complex and tense. Nielsen & Ganter (2018) discussed that news media are facing difficulties in deciding how to deal with the operational opportunities that social media offer in the short-term on the one hand, and long-term concerns about developing an unfavorable dependence. The news media have transferred more and more of their interaction with citizens to non-proprietary platforms controlled by others, thus enabling a dislocation of media participation and revenue (Ekström & Westlund, 2019). In extension of this, news publishers have strategically begun engaging in so-called platform counterbalancing to reduce their dependency on such non-proprietary platforms (Chua & Westlund, 2019).

Proposition 4: Legacy news journalism benefits from “entrepreneurialism” and “mediatized” engagement

The emergence of digital entrepreneurship raises many questions and challenges that affect all areas of news journalism. In the digital media realm, there are at least two more striking research issues. The first one is to explore the factors of news journalists

as they take a mediating role of communicators that promote “mediatized engagement” of users and how this kind of journalistic entrepreneurialism advocates new knowledge and practices that further trigger social change and democratic well-being in the context of participatory journalism in favor of legacy news.

The emergence of digital entrepreneurship raises many questions and challenges that affect all areas of news journalism.

Noticeably, digital media infrastructures create new opportunities for the production and dissemination of public knowledge, as is the case of the relationship between news publishers and digital intermediaries (Dodds, 2019; Nielsen & Ganter, 2018; Ekström & Westlund, 2019; Sehl, Cornia & Nielsen, 2018). Although the decline in civic participation in established democratic societies has been widely lamented (Putnam, 2000), researchers (Dahlgren, 2009) have also pointed to the growth of new online communities and the growth in quantity and diversity in communication platforms outside of the traditional civic participation platforms, where citizens can exchange information and participate in political debate without an “outside” government influence and control. In fact, “individualization” of civic cultures has emerged in tandem with the growth of mediatized communication processes where individuals use new technologies with a tendency towards personalization in the public domain (Alvarez & Dahlgren, 2016; Bennett & Segerberg, 2013). Evidently, social media platforms, podcasts, blogs, open-source software and wikis have paved the way for an “increasingly individualized civic environment” (Gerodimos, 2012, p. 188), with engagement in the public domain which is “subjectively experienced more as a personal rather than a collective question” (Dahlgren, 2013, p. 52). Here, mediatization research

comes as another reminder that political communication and, in its entourage, civic engagement are both currently changing.

the concept of “mediatization” has evolved to focus not only on media effects but also on the interrelation between the changes in media communication on the one hand and in sociocultural changes on the other, as part of our everyday communication practices and our communicative and social construction of reality

Whenseenas a “meta-process” (Krotz, 2011) alongside various other “mega-trends” of change in political communication such as digitization of communication technologies, hybridization of communication forms, globalization of communication spaces, or individualization of communication repertoires, mediatization comes as another important driver of change to affect individuals in their motivation to engage politically (Vowe & Henn, 2016). In theory, mediatization investigates the interrelation between change in media repertoires and usage as drivers for communicative and socio-cultural change, understood as a long-term process of change. Naturally, however, (digital) media do not necessarily cause these transformations, but they have become co-constitutive for the articulation of politics, economics, education, religion, etc. (Hepp, Hjarvard, & Lundby, 2015; Hjarvard, 2013; Couldry & Hepp, 2016).

The current transformations arising from mediatization in its full dimensionality evoke a nexus of new research dimensions on the level of individual citizens. However, if we emphasize that individuals interact with their environments in ways that their interests are voiced through political cultures and commonalities by means of their own individual motivations

(rather than as a contest of higher principles related to the common good), then the models that used to support traditional governmental technologies of e-participation appear not to work any longer (Murschetz, 2018). Addressing this void raises the fundamental question of how individuals are doing politics today and how they see new mediated forms of e-participation as a valuable alternative to traditional participation platforms and means of creating political public spheres. Essentially, however, understanding individuals engaging in politics and their ways of using digital media technologies within e-participation remains elusive. Nonetheless, as observed above, it is about individuals’ solicitations and comments about public policies that inspire understanding of how civic engagement emerges from individual engagement, and may eventually fertilize into collective structures of commonality, whereby rather private cognitive models of perception and thinking are transformed into communal and political ways of evaluating (political) arguments.

Second, we are well-advised to leave behind various traditional perspectives and rhetoric on civic engagement and instead widen its canvas towards a sociological theory of engagement and political action in the digital age as it is discussed in the works of Laurent Thévenot and his “liberal” notion of “individuals doing politics” (Thévenot, 2007, and 2014), or what Thévenot himself called “the grammar of the individual in a liberal public”. Moreover, if one looks at individuals and their ambitions to engage politically, then the research on mediatization advances our thinking about their opportunities for action in the new civic e-participation spaces or the new social “spaces for change” (Cornwall & Coelho, 2007). These spaces establish themselves next to the state and the market and allow for unconventional forms of participation in a way that they enrich existing digital public spheres and create new ones. These

are the attributes of civic engagement that predict it on the individual level: reciprocity of participants (Wasko & Faraj, 2000), exchange of (symbolic) messages (Rafaeli & Sudweeks, 1997), active user control (Rice & Williams, 1984), immediacy of feedback (Dennis & Kinney, 1998), and trust (van der Meer, 2017). Computer-mediated-communication (CMC) theories stress the way by which the communicators process social identity and relational cues (i.e., the capability to convey meanings through cues like body language, voice, tones, that is basically social information) using different media (Fulk, Schmitz, & Steinfield, 1990).

And third, mediatized engagement is viewed to have more anthropomorphic assets (Quiring, 2009). Here, interactivity refers to the concept of action in the social sciences, whereby action is supposed to depend on an active human subject intentionally acting upon an object or another subject. Interaction with objects and the creators of these objects modify their actions and reactions due to the actions by their interaction partner(s). Seen this way, mediated engagement is understood as a subjective mode of perception and cognition and, as interpreted from a communication theory perspective, focuses on how a receiver actively interprets and uses mass and new media messages. In the CMC literature, two more key themes have emerged under this rubric: individual experiential processes of interactivity, and perceptions of individual control over both presentation and content. Self-awareness (i.e., the psychological factor that impacts on social interaction as mediated by CMC (Matheson & Zanna, 1998)), responsiveness (i.e., the degree to which a user perceives a system as reacting quickly and iteratively to user input (Rafaeli & Sudweeks, 1997)), a sense of presence (a virtual experience made by humans when they interact with media (Lee, 2004)), involvement (defined as perceived sensory and cognitive affiliation with media (Franz & Robey, 1986), and perceived user control

are the additional constituent psychological activities on this level of discussion (Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1998). Furthermore, human agents are not only calculative and rational, nor are they only bound by structures. They are also guided by non-binding habits that leave room for new engagements and new ways of actions.

Theoretically, the concept of "mediatization" has evolved to focus not only on media effects but also on the interrelation between the changes in media communication on the one hand and in sociocultural changes on the other, as part of our everyday communication practices and our communicative and social construction of reality. Mediatization research investigates the interrelation between media communication change and sociocultural change, understood as a meta-concept labeling the long-term processes of change). Media do not necessarily 'cause' the socio-cultural transformations, but they have become co-constitutive for the articulation of politics, economics, education, religion, etc. Hence, this study should also start an interdisciplinary dialogue and articulate a set of key transformations brought by ICTs, the media and individuals as social and political actors (Bakardjieva, Svensson, & Skoric, 2012).

These include the realities of "hyper-connectivity" and "mediatization" facilitated by ICTs, online, social and mobile media and how the research on these facilitating technologies provides insights into barriers and perceived affordances for e-participation as well as the necessary conditions for increased adoption for citizen-led participation.

Ultimately, the issue of participatory journalism blends with the research on entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship can be more broadly defined as a "context-dependent social process through which individuals and teams create wealth by bringing togeth-

er unique packages of resources to exploit marketplace opportunities" (Ireland, Hitt, Camp, & Sexton, 2001, p. 51). As a consequence, "media management practice and entrepreneurship are drawing closer and are more connected – in short, the practice of media management is becoming [more] entrepreneurial" (Will, Brüntje, & Gossel, 2016, p. 189). What this means is that earlier studies in media entrepreneurship focused more on traditional media industries and left out the Internet as a medium. This is consequential for one's understanding of media entrepreneurship, as our concepts of entrepreneurship within the media are lacking behind the current digital realities of social media. It provides new opportunities to connect with audiences, receive feedback and input for producing products and services, and allow creating fundamentally new business models and logics (Vukanovic, 2016).

Conclusion

This study discussed selected key literatures on the emergent perspectives of participatory journalism and mediatized engagement in the field of digital journalism and discussed some key propositions on the role of these two emergent perspectives on legacy news media and journalism studies in the digital era.

It has been found that although there are disciplinary differences in observing, defining, and interpreting these perspectives, which obviously makes comparisons of different studies difficult, we insist on analyzing them from these multiple sources in order to provide pointers for fruitful discussion. Alas, the literature has yet to treat the concepts more systematically. The problems are manifold but the biggest seems to be the nature of the concepts themselves, which remains multi-faceted and difficult to operationalize.

In all, we can draw the following conclusions: Regarding proposition 1, it has been found that the social actors involved in the legacy news media ecosystem have adopted a cautious if not conservative position to enabling audience participation via their proprietary digital platforms, but, conversely, allowed for partnerships with non-proprietary social media to happen. Hence, we can confirm that while news journalism and other editorially facing social actors have largely sought to maintain their professional control, acting cautiously when it comes to enabling citizens to participate in news production processes via their proprietary platforms. Scholarly research should comprehend not only the journalistic but also business and technological rationales for the organizations' turning towards participation. We can thus verify this proposition. This means that "legacy" news media need to focus on efforts to better understand how and what kind of processes and practices of organizations, managers and creative workers are helping them to drive their new ideas and strategies forward (Horst & Murschetz, 2019).

As for proposition 2, it was claimed that legacy news media are in charge of the affordances of their proprietary digital platforms (sites, applications etc.). In this context they make decisions regarding the opportunities and constraints for the forms of participation that are to be inscribed into their digital user interfaces (i.e. technological actors). Compared with the social media platforms, legacy news media have obviously refrained from designing participatory affordances into their proprietary digital platforms. We can confirm that this and several other key factors have worked against participatory journalism rather than in its favor.

Regarding proposition 3, we assumed that while legacy news media adopted a cautious position to enabling participation at their own digital platforms, they have

nonetheless allowed for non-proprietary social media platforms to act as new engagement tools where users can easily share and interact with the news material. It has essentially resulted in discussions on how the news has become increasingly disrupted from the original domain of news media and transferred to the social media universe. In fact, legacy news media have taken different approaches towards enabling vis-a-vis restricting participation in journalism, depending on whether the digital platforms are proprietary or non-proprietary ones.

As for proposition 4, a review of literature on the relationship between participatory journalism and the mediatization concept revealed an exciting new field with huge research potential for the field of digital media entrepreneurship. We conclude that proposition 4 can serve as a conceptual node in developing future research approaches, and empirical investigations of different kinds. Nevertheless, we admit that at the current stage, mediatization research is in need for reflecting more closely and intensively on its assumptions and approaches for building more substantial and reflexive theories of a participatory journalism that are not bound to proprietary platforms. The role of trustworthy, anti-partisan quality journalism and news media in a democratic society is clearly important, providing a forum for the public dialogue, and enabling social inclusion, political participation and responsible action of the public.

As for future research, starting from the notion that participatory journalism, civic engagement and the challenges arising through mediatization is a contingent, dynamic, and complex social process, some of the paradigms that seem to dominate more traditional research perspectives on entrepreneurship need to be refreshed. Planned extensions and future research of this paper shall include improving the validity of analysis by generating more insight-

ful and testable theoretical propositions to be examined against empirical evidence. Ultimately, if journalists become more entrepreneurial in ways that they facilitate the sharing of insights and expertise that support creativity, learning and knowledge creation and sharing for responsible journalism in mediated environments for and by the public, then normative goals for achieving a participatory journalism serving society and democracy can be met.

References

- Achtenhagen, L. (2017). Media Entrepreneurship—Taking Stock and Moving Forward. *International Journal on Media Management*, 19(1), 1–10. doi: 10.1080/14241277.2017.1298941
- Almgren, S. M., & Olsson, T. (2015). 'Let's Get Them Involved' . . . to Some Extent: Analyzing Online News Participation. *Social Media + Society*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305115621934>
- Alvarez, C., & Dahlgren, P. (2016). Populism, extremism and media: Mapping an uncertain terrain. *European Journal of Communication*, 31(1), 46–57.
- Anderson, C. W., & Reever, M. (2018). From counter-power to counter-Pepe: The vagaries of participatory epistemology in a digital age. *Media and Communication*, 6(4), X–X. DOI: 10.17645/mac.v6i4.1492.
- Bacigalupo, M., Kampylis, P., Punie, Y., & Van den Brande, G. (2016). *EntreComp: The Entrepreneurship Competence Framework*. Luxembourg: Publication Office of the European Union.
- Baines, D., & Kennedy, C. (2010). An Education for Independence? Should Entrepreneurial Skills Be an Essential Part of the Journalist's Toolbox? *Journalism Practice*, 4(1), 97–113.
- Bakardjieva, M., Svensson, J., & Skoric, M. M. (2012). Digital citizenship and activism: questions of power and participation online. *eJournal eDemocracy Open Gov*, 4(1), i–iv.
- Bechmann, A. (2012). Towards Cross-Platform Value Creation. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(6), 888–908. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2012.680483>
- Belair-Gagnon, V. (2015). *Social media at BBC news: the re-making of crisis reporting*. New York: Routledge.
- Bennett, W. L., & Segerberg, A. (2013). *The logic of connective action: digital media and the Personalization of contentious politics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

- Boberg, S., Schatto-Eckrodt, M., Frischlich, L., & Quandt, T. (2018). The moral gatekeeper? Moderation and deletion of user-generated content in a leading news forum. *Media and Communication*, 6(4), 58–69.
- Borger, M., van Hoof, A., Costera Meijer, I., & Sanders, J. (2013). Constructing Participatory Journalism As a Scholarly Object. *Digital Journalism*, 1(1), 117–134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2012.740267>.
- Braun, J. A., & Eklund, J. L. (2019). "Fake News, Real Money: Ad Tech Platforms, Profit-Driven Hoaxes, and the Business of Journalism," *Digital Journalism*, 7(1), 1–21.
- Bruns, A. (2012). Reconciling Community and Commerce? *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(6), 815–835. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2012.680482>
- Chua, S., & Westlund, O. (2019). Audience-Centric Engagement, Collaboration Culture and Platform Counterbalancing: A Longitudinal Study of Ongoing Sensemaking of Emerging Technologies. *Media and Communication*, 7(1), 153–165.
- Cornwall, A., & Coelho, V. S. (2007). *Spaces for change? the politics of citizen participation in new democratic arenas*. Zed Books, London.
- Dennis, A. R., & Kinney, S. (1998). Testing media richness theory in the new media: the effects of cues, feedback, and task equivocality. *Information Systems Research*, 9(3), 256–274.
- Deuze, M., Bruns, A., & Neuberger, C. (2007). Preparing for an Age of Participatory News. *Journalism Practice*, 1, 322–338.
- Dodds, T. (2019). Reporting with WhatsApp: Mobile Chat Applications Impact on Journalistic Practices. *Digital Journalism*, DOI: 10.1080/21670811.2019.1592693
- Duffy, A., Ling, R., & Westlund, O. (2017). Cold comfort: Lessons for the 21st-century newspaper industry from the 20th-century ice industry. *Media Industries Journal*, 4(2), 22–43.
- European Journalism Centre (2019). *The Engaged Journalism Accelerator. Report: Stronger journalism through shared power*. <https://engagedjournalism.com/resources/report-stronger-journalism-through-shared-power-engaged-journalism-accelerator-community-media> (July 19, 2019).
- Ekström, M., & Westlund, O. (2019). The Dislocation of News Journalism: A Conceptual Framework for the Study of Epistemologies of Digital Journalism. *Media and Communication*, 7(1), 259–270.
- Eldridge, S. II, Hess, K., Tandoc, E. C., Jr., & Westlund, O. (2019). Navigating the scholarly terrain: Introducing the digital journalism compass. *Digital Journalism*, 7(3), 386–403.
- Ferrer-Conill, R. & Tandoc, E. (2018). The Audience-Oriented Editor. *Digital Journalism*, 6(4), 436–453.
- Franklin, B. (2014). The future of journalism: In an age of digital media and economic uncertainty. *Journalism Studies*, 15(5), 481–499.
- Franz, C. R., & Robey, D. (1986). Organizational context, user involvement, and the usefulness of information systems. *Decision Sciences*, 17(4), 329–356.
- Fulk, J., Schmitz, J., & Steinfield, C. W. (1990). A social influence model of technology use. In J. Fulk, & C. Steinfield (Eds.), *Organizations and communication technology* (pp. 117–140). Sage, Newbury Park.
- Gerodimos, R. (2012). Online youth attitudes and the limits of civic consumerism: The emerging challenge to the Internet's democratic potential. In B. Loader, & D. Mercea (Eds.), *Social media and democracy: innovations in participatory politics* (pp. 166–189). Routledge, London.
- Graham, T., & Wright, S. (2015). A Tale of Two Stories from "Below the Line" Comment Fields at the Guardian. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 20(3), 317–338. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1940161215581926>
- Graves, L. (2007). The Affordances of Blogging: A Case Study in Culture and Technological Effects. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 31(4), 331–346. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0196859907305446>
- Heft, A., & Dogruel, L. (2019). Searching for Autonomy in Digital News Entrepreneurism Projects. *Digital Journalism*. doi: 10.1080/21670811.2019.1581070
- Hepp, A., & Couldry, N. (2013). Conceptualizing mediatization special issue: mediatization. *Journal of Communication Theory*, 23(3), 191–315.
- Hepp, A., Hjarvard, S., & Lundby, K. (2015). Mediatization: theorizing the interplay between media, culture and society. *Media, Culture & Society*, 37(2), 314–322.
- Hermida, A. (2013). #Journalism. Reconfiguring journalism research about Twitter, one tweet at a time. *Digital Journalism*, 1(3), 295–313. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2013.808456>
- Hermida, A., Lewis, S. C., & Zamith, R. (2014). Sourcing the Arab Spring: A Case Study of Andy Carvin's Sources on Twitter During the Tunisian and Egyptian Revolutions. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 19(3), 479–499. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12074>
- Holton, H., & Belair-Gagnon, V. (2018). Strangers to the Game: Interloper, Intralooper and Shifting News Production. *Media and Communication*, 6(4), 70–78.
- Horst, S.-O., Murschetz, P. C., Brennan, D., & Friedrichsen, M. (2018). TV Film Financing in the Era of "Connected TV". How do "Legacy" Broadcasters

- Respond to Market Changes? In P. C. Murschetz, R. Teichmann, & M. Karmasin (Eds.), *The Handbook of State Aid for Film. Finance, Industries, Regulation* (pp. 615–635). Heidelberg/Berlin–Germany: Springer International Publishing.
- Horst, S.-O., & Murschetz, P. C. (2019). Strategic Media Entrepreneurship: Theory Development and Problematicization. *Journal of Media Management and Entrepreneurship*, 1(1), DOI: 10.4018/JMME.2019010101
- Hutchby, I. (2001). Technologies, Texts and Affordances. *Sociology*, 35(2), 441–456. <https://doi.org/10.1177/S0038038501000219>
- Ireland, R. D., Hitt, M. A., Camp, S. M., & Sexton, D. L. (2001). Integrating entrepreneurship and strategic management actions to create firm wealth. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 15(1), 49–63. DOI: 10.5465/ame.2001.4251393
- Jacko, J. A. (2012). *The human-computer interaction handbook: fundamentals, evolving technologies, and emerging applications*. CRC Press.
- Karlsson, M., Bergström, A., Clerwall, C., & Fast, K. (2015). Participatory journalism – the (r)evolution that wasn't. Content and user behavior in Sweden 2007–2013. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 20(3), 295–311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12115>
- Karlsson, M., Clerwall, C., & Nord, L. (2017). The public doesn't miss the public. Views from the people: Why news by the people? *Journalism*, 146488491769439. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884917694399>
- Kligler-Vilenchik, N., & Tenenboim, O. (2019). Sustained Journalist–Audience Reciprocity in a Meso-Newspace: The Case of a Journalistic WhatsApp Group. *New Media and Society* (forthcoming)
- Komarkova, I., Gagliardi, D., Conrads, J., & Collado, A. (2015). Entrepreneurship Competence: An Overview of Existing Concepts, Policies and Initiatives. Final Report. In M. Bacigalupo, P. Kampylis & Y. Punie (Eds.), *JRC Science and Policy Reports*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Krotz, F. (2011). Mediatisierung als Metaprozess. In J. Hagenah & H. Meulemann (Eds.), *Mediatisierung der Gesellschaft?* (pp. 19–41). LIT-Verlag, Münster.
- Küng, L. (2013). Innovations, technology, and Organizational Change. Legacy Media's Big Challenges. An Introduction. In T. Størsul, & A. H. Krumsvik (Eds.), *Media Innovations. A Multidisciplinary Study of Change* (pp. 9–13). Göteborg: Nordicom.
- Küng, L. (2017). Reflections on the ascendancy of technology in the media and its implications for organizations and their leaders. *The Journal of Media Innovations*, 4(1), 76–81. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5617/jmi.v4i1.3171>
- Lee, K. M. (2004). Presence, explicated. *Communication Theory*, 14, 27–50.
- Lehtisaari, K., Villi, M., Grönlund, M., Lindén, C.-G., Mierzejewska, B. I., Picard, R. G., & Roepnack, A. (2018) Comparing Innovation and Social Media Strategies in Scandinavian and US Newspapers. *Digital Journalism*, 6(8), 1029–1040.
- Lewis, S. C. (2012). The Tension Between Professional Control and Open Participation. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(6), 836–866. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2012.674150>
- Lewis, S. C., & Westlund, O. (2015). Actors, Actants, Audiences, and Activities in Cross-Media News Work. *Digital Journalism*, 3(1), 19–37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2014.927986>
- Lewis, S. C., & Molyneux, L. (2018). A decade of research on social media and journalism: Assumptions, blind 598 spots, and a way forward. *Media and Communication*, 6(4), 11–23.
- Lewis, S., & Usher, N. (2014). Code, Collaboration, And the Future of Journalism. *Digital Journalism*, 2(3), 383–393.
- Matheson, K., & Zanna, M. P. (1998). The impact of computer-mediated communication on self-awareness. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 4(3), 221–233.
- Morlandstø, L., & Mathisen, B. R. (2017). Participation and Control. *Digital Journalism*, 5(6), 791–808.
- Murschetz, P. C. (2018). Exploring the Role of Individuals for Civic Engagement in the Digital Age. A Critical Reflection on the Sociology of Engagement under the Impact of Mediatization. In J. Servaes (Ed.), *The Handbook of Communication for and Development Social Change*. Singapore: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-7035-8_85-1
- Murschetz, P. C., & Friedrichsen, M. (2014). Social Media, Alternatives to Commercial. In K. Harvey, & J. G. Golson (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Social Media and Politics* (pp. 1155–1157). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Nel, F., & Westlund, O. (2013). Managing New(s) Conversations: The Role of Social Media in News Provision and Participation. In M. Friedrichsen, & W. Mühl-Benninghaus (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Media Management* (pp. 179–200). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-28897-5_11
- Newman, N., Fletcher, R., Kalogeropoulos, A., & Nielsen, R. K. (2019). *Reuters Institute Digital News Report 2019*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Nielsen, R. K. (2012). How newspapers began to blog: Recognizing the role of technologists in old media organizations' development of new media technologies. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(6), 959–978. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2012.694898>

- Nielsen, R. K., & Ganter, S. A. (2018). Dealing with digital intermediaries: A case study of the relations between publishers and platforms. *New Media & Society*, 20(4), 1600–1617.
- O'Reilly, T. (2007). What is Web 2.0: Design Patterns and Business Models for the Next Generation of Software. *Communications & Strategies*, 1, 17–37. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1008839>
- Olleros, F. X., & Zhegu, M. (2016). Digital Transformations: An Introduction. In F. X. Olleros, & M. Zhegu (Eds.), *Research Handbook on Digital Transformations* (pp. 1–19). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2716710>
- Picard, R. G. (2014) Twilight or New Dawn of Journalism? *Digital Journalism*, 2(3), 273–283.
- Rafaeli, S., & Sudweeks, F. (1997). Networked interactivity. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, 2(4). <http://jcmc.huji.ac.il/vol2/issue4/rafaeli.sudweeks.html>.
- Rice, R. E., & Williams, F. (1984). Theories old and new: the study of new media. In R. E. Rice (Ed.), *The new media* (pp. 55–80). Sage Beverly Hills,
- Robinson, S., & Wang, Y. (2018). Networked News Participation: Future Pathways. *Media and Communication*, 6(4), 91–102. <https://doi.org/10.17645/mac.v6i4.1674>
- Rosen, J. (2008). A most useful definition of citizen journalism. *PressThink: Ghost of Democracy in the Media Machine*. July 14. http://journalism.nyu.edu/pubzone/weblogs/pressthink/2008/07/14/a_most_useful_d.html
- Ruotsalainen, J., & Villi, M. (2018). Hybrid engagement: Discourses and scenarios of entrepreneurial journalism. *Media and Communication*, 6(4), 79–90.
- Schulte-Holthaus, S. (2018). Entrepreneurship in the Creative Industries. A Literature Review and Research Agenda. In E. Innerhofer, H. Pechlaner, & E. Borin (Eds.), *Entrepreneurship in Culture and Creative Industries. Perspectives from Companies and Regions* (pp. 99–154). Clam: Springer International Publishing.
- Sehl, A., Cornia, A. & Nielsen, R. K. (2018). *Public Service News and Social Media*. Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, University of Oxford.
- Singer, J. B. (2014). User-generated visibility: Secondary gatekeeping in a shared media space. *New Media & Society*, 16(1), 55–73. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444813477833>
- Singer, J. B. (2015). Out of Bounds: Professional Norms as Boundary Markers. In M. Carlson & S. C. Lewis (Eds.), *Boundaries of Journalism: Professionalism, Practices and Participation* (pp. 21–36). New York: Routledge.
- Singer, J. B. (2016a). The Journalist as Entrepreneur. In C. Peters, & M. Broersma (Eds), *Rethinking Journalism Vol. II: The Societal Role and Relevance of Journalism in a Digital Age* (pp. 1–16). Abingdon, UK: Taylor & Francis.
- Singer, J. B. (2016b). Journalism as an Entrepreneurial Enterprise: Normative Boundaries, Economic Imperatives, and Journalistic Roles. In C. W. Anderson, & P. J. Boczkowski. (Eds.), *Remaking the News* (pp. 195–210). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Singer, J. B. (2018a). Entrepreneurial Journalism. In T. P. Vos (Ed.), *Handbooks of Communication Science: Journalism* (pp. 349–366). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Singer, J. B. (2018b). Fact-Checkers as Entrepreneurs: Scalability and Sustainability for a New Form of Watchdog Journalism. *Journalism Practice*, 12(8), 1070–1080. DOI: 10.1080/17512786.2018.1493946
- Singer, J. B. (2018c). Theorizing Digital Journalism: The Limits of Linearity and the Rise of Relationships. In S. Eldridge II, & B. Franklin (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Developments in Digital Journalism Studies* (pp. 487–501). New York: Routledge. ISBN 978-1-138-28305-3.
- Singer, J. B., Domingo, D., Heinonen, A., Hermida, A., Paulussen, S., Quandt, T., Reich, Z., & Vujnovic, M. (2011). *Participatory journalism: guarding open gates at online newspapers*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Steensen, S. (2011). Online journalism and the promises of new technology. *Journalism Studies*, 12(3), 311–327. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2010.501151>.
- Steensen, S., Larsen, A. M, Hågvar, Y., & Fonn, B. (2019). What Does Digital Journalism Studies Look Like? *Digital Journalism*, 7(3), 320–342.
- Swart, J., Peters, C., & Broersma, M. (2019) Sharing and Discussing News in Private Social Media Groups. *Digital Journalism*, 7(2), 187–205.
- Thévenot, L. (2007). The plurality of cognitive formats and engagements. Moving between the familiar and the public. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 10(3), 413–427.
- Thévenot, L. (2014). Voicing concern and difference: from public spaces to common-places. *European Journal of Cultural and Political Sociology*, 1(1), 7–34.
- Vos, T. P., & Singer, J. B. (2016). Media discourse about entrepreneurial journalism: Implications for journalistic capital. *Journalism Practice*, 10(2), 143–159.
- Vukanovic, Z. (2016). Converging Technologies and Diverging Market Trends of Internet/Web and Traditional Media. In A. Lugmayr & C. Dal Zotto (Eds.), *Media Convergence Handbook - Vol. 2: Firms and User Perspectives* (pp. 69–93). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Wahl-Jorgensen, K., Williams, A., Sambrook, R., Harris, J., Garcia-Blanco, I., Dencik, L., Cushion, S.,

- Carter, C., & Allan, S. (2016). The Future of Journalism. *Journalism Studies*, 17(7), 801–807. DOI: 10.1080/1461670X.2016.1199486.
- van der Meer, TWG (2017). Political trust and the “crisis of democracy”. Oxford research encyclopedia of politics. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.77>
- Van Leuven, S., Kruikemeier, S., Lecheler, S., & Hermans, L. (2018). Online And Newsworthy. *Digital Journalism*, 6(7), 798–806.
- Wasko, M., & Faraj, S. (2000). “It is what one does”: why people participate and help others in electronic communities of practice. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 9(2–3), 155–173.
- Westlund, O. (2011). Cross-Media News work Sensemaking of the Mobile Media (R)evolution. Doctoral Dissertation, Dept. of Journalism, Media and Communication. Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg, https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/28118/1/gupea_2077_28118_1.pdf
- Westlund, O. (2012a). Guest editorial - Transforming tensions: legacy media towards participation and collaboration. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(6), 789–795.
- Westlund, O. (2012b). Producer-centric versus participation-centric: On the shaping of mobile media. *Northern Lights*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1386/nl.10.107-1>
- Westlund, O. (2013). Mobile News. A review and model of journalism in an age of mobile media. *Digital Journalism*, 1(1), 6–26.
- Westlund, O., & Ekström, M. (2018). News and Participation through and beyond Proprietary Platforms in an Age of Social Media. *Media and Communication*, 6(4) 1–10.
- Westlund, O., & Ekström, M. (2019). News organizations and routines. In K. Wahl-Jorgensen, & T. Hanitzsch (Eds.), *Handbook of Journalism Studies*, London: Routledge.
- Westlund, O., & Krumsvik, A. H. (2014). Perceptions of Intra-Organizational Collaboration and Media Workers’ Interests in Media Innovations, *The Journal of Media Innovations*, 1(2), 52–74. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5617/jmi.v1i2.858>
- Westlund, O., & Lewis, S. C. (2014). Agents of Media Innovations: Actors, Actants, and Audiences. *The Journal of Media Innovations*, 2(2014), 10–35. <https://doi.org/10.5617/jmi.v1i2.856>
- Witschge, T., Deuze, M., & Willemsen, S. (2019). Creativity in (Digital) Journalism Studies: Broadening our Perspective on Journalism Practice. *Digital Journalism*. DOI: 10.1080/21670811.2019.1609373.
- Zimmerman, M. A., & Rappaport, J. (1998). Citizen participation, perceived control, and psychological empowerment. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 16(5), 725–750.