

Craft and Conservation: Features of Danish Journalism Culture

Using Field Theory as a framework for a sociology of journalism culture

Willig, Ida

Publication date:
2008

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Citation for published version (APA):

Schultz, I. (2008). Craft and Conservation: Features of Danish Journalism Culture: Using Field Theory as a framework for a sociology of journalism culture. Paper presented at International Communication Association Conference, San Fransisco, United States.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact rucforsk@ruc.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

ICA - International Communication Association conference

Panel: Political Culture and Journalism Culture: Theoretical Approaches

Section: Political Communication

San Francisco, 28 May 2007

Craft and Conservation: Features of Danish Journalism Culture Using Field Theory as framework for a Sociology of Journalism Culture

Ida Schultz

Assistant Professor, PhD

Journalism | CBIT | Roskilde University | Denmark

Email: ischultz@ruc.dk

Craft and Conservation: Features of Danish Journalism Culture

Using Field Theory as framework for a Sociology of Journalism Culture

Abstract

This paper presents the field theory of Pierre Bourdieu, discusses how the framework can be used for studying journalism culture, and illustrates the use in a case study of journalism education in Denmark. The first section makes a first attempt to define Journalism Culture as a logic of practice. The second section, Journalism Culture: Field and Capitals, discuss Journalism Culture in light of cultural production, power and social differentiation and the methodological implications for research. The third section presents the empirical case study of Danish journalism education using the concepts of field, capital and habitus to identify craft as a strong capital in the field and conservation as a dominant logic.

Journalism Culture: A Logic of Practice

Journalism culture is a familiar figure in media and journalism studies yet rarely explicated or theoretically conceptualised. This paper presents and discusses the field perspective inspired by the work of Pierre Bourdieu on media and journalism (Bourdieu 1998 [1996], Bourdieu 2005) but not least developed from the earlier studies of social practice, power and cultural production (Bourdieu 1981, 1988 [1984], 1989, 1990 [1980], 1993, 1996, 1998, Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992, Bourdieu et.al. 1999 [1993]) but also on selected works from). Also, the presentation of field theory draws inspiration from studies by other researchers investigating journalism and media using the framework of field theory (for instance Benson 1998, Benson & Neveu 2005, Champagne 1993, Couldry 2003, Hesmondhalgh 2006, Hovden 2001, Marchetti 2005, Neveu 2007). Finally, the paper and not least the empirical case of journalism education are based on an ethnographic field study of Danish news values (Schultz 2005, 2006, 2007).

Journalistic practice

A relevant point of departure for developing a Sociology of Journalism Culture is the writings on journalistic practices, studies about what journalists do and what they think, professional norms and ideals of journalism are and what characterises journalists as a professional group: In short, the literature of newsroom studies, news ethnographies or more broadly speaking, studies which belong to the family of news production sociology (Schudson 1989, Cottle 2000, Tuchman 2002).

From one of the earliest studies of news selection which lay forward the criteria for choosing or not choosing to print a wire story using the methodology of observing the anonymous editor Mr. Gates for a week (White 1950) sociologists, ethnographers and journalists has centred around the topic of journalism culture closing in on it from different theoretical angles and methodological approaches. David Manning White was interested in the gatekeeping function of the press and contributed to our understanding of journalistic culture by highlighting the question of subjectivity and bias in journalism. After White put attention to the role of the individual gatekeeper research started to ask questions such as "Are journalists objective", "How subjective are the decisions made by newspapers", "Are journalists biased" etc. Even though this classical study did not explicitly discuss the concept of journalism culture, the empirical data and in-depth studies of journalistic practice has been a key source for understanding the professional culture of journalists or simply journalism culture. The same can be said of the newsroom

studies that followed in the footsteps of White. Warren Breed studied the “Social Control in the Newsroom” documenting how professional norms and newspaper policies guiding news work are “in the walls” of the newsroom and will be taken in by new staffers by osmosis (Breed 1955). The study documents an important feature of journalistic culture of American newsrooms in the middle of the 50ies, that policies are maintained although editors rarely tells the journalists what to write or how to write it. This might even be a valid thesis for journalism culture still and also outside of the States (Joseph 2001, Schultz 2007).

Journalism culture has also been analysed and discussed in many news ethnographies of the 70's more, and many of the concepts still seem relevant for describing today's journalistic practices in many countries. Think for instance of Jeremy Tunstall's concept of *competitor-colleagues* (Tunstall 1971) in light contemporary journalists working for the same news company but in different news outlets, or in relation to the challenges of content sharing when the same story is to be used on different media platforms. Think for instance of Philip Schlesinger's concept of *Stop watch culture* (Schlesinger 1987) in light of the increased push for timely news in the digital media and the never-ever-always deadline of the internet. Think of Gaye Tuchman's concept of the *News Net* in light of the historically recent developments within digitalisation, global media corporations, civilian eye witnesses recording live videos for news media, etc. (Tuchman 1978). These few examples (see also Gans 1979, Golding & Elliot 1979, Gitlin 1980) show how the news production studies have contributed immensely to our theoretical and empirical understanding of journalism cultures. Yet, the studies have not come up with a consistent or sufficient theoretical framework in which to conceptualise the notion of Journalistic Culture and there are certain inference problems with the methodologies: Studies of news production often lack a historical perspective (Schudson 1989) as a consequence of the ethnographic methods used. The studies rarely have a contextual framework which considers they specific national, cultural or social history of the journalism in question (Chalaby 1996). Also, most studies of news production are conducted on an organisational level, which does not take into account the political-economic, cultural or social structures, and does not have a sufficient link between structure and agency (Benson 1998, Cottle 2000). And many studies of news production often treats the political-economical, the cultural and the textual aspects of journalism as separate research questions in stead of seeing news production in light of all three (Tuchman 2002). The methodology of using documents, observations, interviews and hanging-around newsrooms allows for a unique snapshot of the journalistic culture studied – but a snapshot at a specific point in time and without the context of for

instance the economic, political, cultural and social structures influencing the practices in the newsroom. For all its advantages, the ethnographic methodology does not have the empirical tools for investigating history or structural contexts.

Departing from the tradition of newsroom ethnography which has contributed important insights to the empirical and theoretical study of the professional culture of journalists, we should ask three things of a Sociology of Journalism Culture.

- A historical perspective
- A contextual perspective
- A link between agency-structure

These methodological questions have to a certain extent been addressed in studies using a political-economy perspective on media emphasizing the structural and contextual aspects of journalism.

Journalistic context

An example of the tradition of political-economical media research can be found in the empirical studies of for instance The Glasgow University Media Group (1976), or in the theories addressing the structural features of news production drawing on critical theory such as the propaganda theory (Herman & Chomsky 1988). These studies highlighted notions such as hegemony and ideology which are still very relevant and important questions today (think for instance on the news coverage of topic such as global heating and war). However, the abstraction level of the critical, political-economy framework can be difficult to put to empirical work just as there can be inference problems when broad questions such as the influence of capitalism and the degree of propaganda are linked to everyday practices. Furthermore, as especially evident for contemporary news researchers outside the Anglo-American world, most studies of journalism practice and news production sociology – also the studies from a structural or political-economic perspective - were conducted in the 1970s and were conducted in the US and in the UK.

Looking at new theoretical approaches for studying Journalism Culture, many of the problems mentioned above are being addressed in the promising concept of *Media Systems* especially relevant (Hallin & Mancini 2004). From a theoretical framework which has much affinity with field theory, Hallin & Mancini theorises that there are three overall *Media Systems* in the western world (Hallin & Mancini 2004). The North Atlantic or Liberal Model, The Mediterranean or Polarized Pluralist Model and The North/Central European or Democratic-Corporatist Model. The three models are based on studies of the specific historical developments in the political, economic, social and cultural structures of each country hand in hand with the analysis of the media picture and journalist

profession of the different countries. Journalism culture is not isolated in an explicit discussion or defined and analysed as an independent research questions, yet *Comparing Media Systems* is a great theoretical and empirical source for the development of a Sociology of Journalism Culture. The Media Systems theory has its strength in living up to two of the three demands for the sociology of journalism culture – the historical perspective and the contextual perspective. With the concept of media system at hand, the researcher is demanded to investigate the specific history of not only the media, but also of the journalistic profession and of the media policies and economic developments influencing journalism. One of the strengths of the media system approach is that encompasses the overall contextual structures of news production, but the broad conceptualising is also a weakness in regard to studying journalism culture as it is less clear how to understand the specific practices of each country or the internal differentiation of journalistic fields: As for the third component needed to conceptualise journalism culture, the link between agency and structure, this is not an incorporated element of the media system theory, why we must look for a theory which also addresses the notions of social action and social practice.

Field theory – practice and context

Until now, it has been argued that three epistemological components are needed for developing a sociology of journalism culture overcoming the inference problems of earlier newsroom studies, a historical perspective, a contextual perspective and a link between agency and structure. It has also been argued that the political-economy approaches and the media systems theory contributes with a historical and contextual perspective lacking in the news production sociology, yet does not address the question of agency and structure. The overall argument in this paper is that the three components of history, context and a link between agency and structure are all to be found in the framework of field theory. This might be illustrated with a quote from Bourdieu's essay "Political, Social Science, and Journalistic Fields" (Bourdieu 2005).

"(...) to understand what happens in journalism, it is not sufficient to know who finances the publications, who the advertisers are, who pays for the advertising, where the subsidies come from, and so on. Part of what is produced in the world of journalism cannot be understood unless one conceptualizes this microcosm as such and endeavours to understand the effects that the people engaged in this microcosm exert on one another" (Bourdieu 2005: 33)

The concept of field or embraces or combines both the interest in journalistic practice (news production ethnography) and the interest in the structures that structure the practice (political-economy, media systems). "(...) the field is a critical mediation between the practices of those who partake of it and the surrounding social and economic conditions". (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992:105).

Bourdieu has no narrow concept of culture but a very sociological and broad understanding of cultural production which includes journalism, science and arts (Bourdieu 1993, Bourdieu 1996 [1992], Hesmondhalg 2006). Therefore a first attempt to define journalism culture might simply be to define it as the culture of the journalistic field. The key concepts in reflexive sociology – and for studying journalistic practice and the contextual structures that enable and constrain it - are Field, Doxa/illusio, Habitus, and Capital (Bourdieu 1998). As a simple introduction to the field perspective it might be useful to use a simple game metaphor for the key concepts (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992) which can be used to explore journalism and journalism culture (Schultz 2007):

The journalistic field is where the journalistic games are being played out or rather the journalistic *is* the journalistic game. Looking at journalism as a *field* means understanding journalism as a semi-autonomous field with its own logics of practice as an ongoing game or struggle of defining what is journalism, what is good journalism, etc. *The Journalistic Doxa/Illusio* is the necessary belief in the game, the unquestionable conviction that the journalistic game is worth playing.

News Habitus is a specific way of playing the news game, the certain dispositions which the player (or rather, agent) has for positioning himself in the game, or more simply the embodied 'feel for the game'.

Newsroom capital is the resources which the agent (media or journalist) has to put into the game, resources that are recognized in the field and by the other agents in the field.

This short introduction to the key concepts exemplify how journalism is at the same time an individual performance and a structured practice. The first attempt to define journalism culture as the culture of the journalistic field, can in this way be understood as the particular game played in the journalistic field, or more precisely: *Journalism Culture is the logic of practice of the journalistic field.*

Journalism Culture: Field and Capitals

Pierre Bourdieu does not have a simple theoretical model for society which fit into boxes which we can intuitively understand. The quote below makes the point that field theory is more a research strategy or analytical tool than it is a packaged, predetermined set of practical hypothesis about the social world. Field theory might be a rarely consistent, and very comprehensive theoretical framework but it is first and foremost a methodology aimed at empirical research (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992).

“The concept of field is a research tool, the main function of which is to enable the scientific construction of social objects.” (Bourdieu 2005:30)

This section will discuss the concept of field and the implications of investigating journalism as a field.

Field

The concept of field runs as an undercurrent in most of Bourdieus work and although he is known to be hesitant towards too many theoretical definitions, the concept of field are discussed various places in the vast authorship.

“A field is a field of forces and a field of struggles in which the stake is the power to transform the field of forces. “ (Bourdieu 2005:44)

“There is no other criterion of membership of a field than the objective fact of producing effects within it” (Bourdieu 1993:42)

Field theory is a relational, critical theory (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992, Bourdieu 2000 [1997]). Society – but also differentiated social spaces such as ‘politics’, ‘journalism’, ‘economy’ - is seen as a hierarchical social space, where each position in the space is defined by its relation to other positions in the space. As an example, journalism is not powerful in itself, but powerful in relation to the economic or political structure of the social space in question. In the same way, a newspaper is never autonomous or left-wing or commercial in itself but autonomous/left-wing/commercial according to the relation it has to other newspapers and their relative positions in the social space constituting journalism. This was the relational aspect of the field theory. The other characteristic of field theory is that it is a critical theory. For Bourdieu there is nothing ‘natural’ about the

social space or about journalism. On the contrary it is an important task for the social sciences to investigate, describe and objectify the seemingly 'objective' and naturalised categories of the social. We can use a study of Danish news values as an example (Schultz 2005, 2006). From an investigation of the journalistic ideals mentioned in the reasons for awarding the prestigious Danish Journalism prize, the Cavling-prize (the Danish equivalent to the Pulitzer prize) it is evident that for the past twenty years, *exposure* has been a dominant ideal (or symbolic capital) in the Danish journalistic field. In this period, most awards were given to a journalism exposing individual cases or issues for instance political or economic scandals. Now, this might not come as a surprise as we recognize a dominant value of journalism today. But using a historical methodology put this seemingly 'natural', 'self-evident', 'normal' journalistic ideal of exposure in another perspective. From 1965 to 1984, the dominant journalistic ideal in the Danish journalism field was *agendasetting*, which recognized a journalism which strived to put new issues on the public agenda (for instance gender) and addressed long-term structural problems in stead of individual cases and issues. And before that, from 1945 to 1965 the ideal was *information*. In this way, the field perspective urges the researcher not to take seemingly 'natural' categories for granted but to look for visible orthodoxies and the less visible doxa/illusion of the field (Schultz 2007)

Field theory on cultural production – and thus on (western) journalism - builds upon three theoretical assumptions which are the result of Bourdieu empirical studies (Bourdieu 1993, Bourdieu 1996 [1992], Hesmondhalgh 2006):

- Journalism is defined by its relation to the social space, i.e. 'national' field
=> Journalism is a semi-autonomous field with its own logic of practice
- Journalism is defined in relation to the field of power
=> Journalism has a discursive, consecrating power
- Journalism is defined in relation to the field of cultural production
=> Journalism produce principles of vision and division

The first assumption is that the journalistic field is always defined in relation the overall social space. "Journalism is a microcosm with its own laws, defined both by its position in the world at large and by the attractions and repulsions to which it is subject from other such microcosms" (Bourdieu 1998 [1996]:39)". As fields are research tools, the social space might be understood as a 'national' field, as a specific 'media system' (Hallin & Mancini 2004) or even as a 'transnational field' depending on the research object and the research question. Journalism is seen as a semi-autonomous field with its own logic of practice, a fairly self governing space guided by its own rationales but at the same time a product of the social space and determined by the structures surrounding it. Using the

study of the Danish journalistic field as an illustration of the methodological assumption, this means that we can assume that the symbolic capital of *exposure* is at the same time a logic of practice in the Danish journalistic field and a capital mediated and defined by structures of the social space (for instance Danish media polices, media competition, journalism education, etc.). The second assumption is that the journalistic field is always defined in relation to the overall field of power of the social space. "Journalists – one should say the journalistic field – owe their importance in the social world to the fact that they are the owners of a de-facto monopoly on the tools for mass production and mass diffusion of information (...)! Bourdieu 1998 [1996]:42). The quote addresses the specific power of journalism and the journalistic field – a discursive, consecrating power (Coudry 2003). The case of the Danish Cavling award illustrates how some values are being consecrated in the field (lately this has been the symbolic capital of *exposure*) thus exercising a discursive power over other values (lately this has been the case for *agendasetting* and *information*). The third assumption is that the journalistic field is always defined in relation to its position in the field of cultural production which deals with the production of the *principles of vision and division* (Bourdieu 1993).

Those who deal professionally in making things explicit and producing discourses - sociologists, historians, politicians, journalists, etc. – have two things in common. On the one hand, they strive to set out explicitly practical principles of vision and division. On the other hand, they struggle, each in their own universe, to impose these principles of vision and division, and to have them recognized as legitimate categories of construction of the social world. (Bourdieu 2005: 37).

Cultural production and power

In the sociology of Bourdieu, journalism is by definition part of the larger field of cultural production, which is a field producing symbolic goods such as art, science and journalism (Bourdieu 1993, Bourdieu 1996[1992], Bourdieu 1998 [1996], Hesmondhalgh 2006, Neveu 2007). That the goods are symbolic means that there are not only material (i.e. a painting, a newspaper, an article etc.) but that its value to a high degree is symbolic. The prize of a painting is not same prize as the price of the canvas and the paint but a symbolic value. The field of cultural production is divided into small scale production, typically art, and large scale or mass production, typically journalism. The art field, the science field and the journalistic field share a common goal of creating cultural products, i.e. art, science and journalist, which are symbolic goods that defines and discursivates the social space. In this way, the fields of cultural production are fields which are constantly constructing, creating, making the different social categories, for instance the

notion of 'young'. A 'young' person or being 'young' might seem a completely banal and natural social category which we can intuitively understand. Yet, for most of the human history there was only 'child' and 'adult' and the category 'young' is historically new cultural product.

The field of cultural production is in other words a field, where the ongoing game defines the right to produce legitimate, symbolic descriptions of reality. More precisely Bourdieu speaks of the field of cultural production as "(...) the site of the struggles for the monopoly of the power to consecrate (...)" (Bourdieu 1993:78). The ongoing battles in the field of cultural production are in other words battles of *symbolic power*, about the right to recognise and acknowledge certain themes, institutions and agents (Bourdieu 1989, Bourdieu i Thompson 1991 og Bourdieu 1996 [1994]).

On the one hand, the discursive power is something that all the fields of cultural production have in common. To use the same example, the category 'young' is constantly given symbolic value and content in the practices of the art field (art on 'young'), in the science field (science about 'young') and in the journalistic field (journalism about 'young'). In this way, cultural production is not only a tool for identification (so that we know 'young' from 'old') but always and at the same time a tool for recognition (by attaching another value to 'young' than to 'old'). This is what is meant, when Bourdieu speak of cultural production as a process of explicating the "principles of vision and division" (Bourdieu 2005:37). On the other hand, the fields of cultural production are driven by their own principles for vision and division. 'Young' might be something completely different in the art world, than in the perspective of science or journalism, as the three different fields will see the phenomena through their own logic. In this way, the fields of cultural production are at the same time in an ongoing battle about recognised and legitimate categorisations of the social space. But how is the social space structured?


Principles of hierarchisations

The field of cultural production is the product of – and the forum for – an ongoing process of differentiation (or rather hierarchisation) in the field as a result of the ongoing battles. The quote below addresses this characteristic of cultural production using art and literature as an example:

"The literary field or artistic field is at all times the site of a struggle between the two principles of hierarchisation: the heteronomous principle, favourable to those who dominate the field economically and politically (e.g.

'bourgeois art') and the autonomous principle (e.g. 'art for arts sake') (...). The state of the power relations in this struggle depends on the overall degree of autonomy possessed by the field". (Bourdieu 1993:40)

First, the social space is structured around a basic opposition between the dominant (i.e. dominant institutions, agents, values, etc.) and the dominated. The social space is a hierarchical social space, where certain positions are more prestigious and have more power than other positions. As an example, we intuitively place for instance oil painting and classical music in a different – and more powerful - place in the social space than finger painting and death metal. In field theory methodology this translates to a question of heteronomous differentiation (Bourdieu 1993). Second, the social space is structured around a basic opposition between cultural and economic capital (Bourdieu 1993, Bourdieu 1998, Bourdieu 1996 [1992]). This opposition is so fundamental that cultural production is seen at the antagonism to material, or economic production. In fact, Bourdieu has described the field of cultural production – and thus the logics of art, science and journalism – as "The economic world reversed" (Bourdieu 1993). As an example, we intuitively place the starving poet and the independent blogger in a different – and more autonomous – place than the rich romance novelist and the well paid journalist at a commercial media. In field theory methodology this translates to a question of autonomous differentiation. Below is a principle sketch of the two principles of differentiation in fields of cultural production, in this case journalism (see other principal sketches of fields of cultural production in Bourdieu 1993, Benson 1998).



The field of cultural production can be understood as the result of this ongoing battle between cultural and economic logics or rather as the constant battle between cultural and economic principles of recognition. The same is characteristic for the journalistic field, which is characterised by an ongoing battle between cultural and economic logics in the field. The two structuring principles can be illustrated as two different poles or axis in cross (see principle sketch). An horizontal axe illustrating the autonomous differentiation with an autonomous/intellectual pole (left) and an heteronomous/commercial axe (right) and a vertical axe illustrating the heteronomous differentiation with a dominant pole (top) and a dominated pole (bottom) (Bourdieu 1998). Heteronomous differentiation results in a hierarchy of overall power and success, for the journalistic field this could for instance be measured by newspaper circulation, journalism awards, etc., i.e. the sum of different capitals, mainly cultural and economical. Autonomous differentiation on the contrary is a question of the specific logic of recognition within a field, and for the journalistic field this could for instance be measured by prestigious journalism awards, professional skills etc. (Schultz). We must assume to find fields and positions of small scale production to be placed near the autonomy pole and the fields and positions of large scale production to be placed near the heteronomy or market pole.

As mentioned, fields are research tools and empirical questions. As an example of practical application, in his analysis of the literary field Bourdieu explains the positions near the poles in terms of 'poor' (autonomy) and 'rich' (heteronomy-market), 'old, high degree of consecration' (dominant) and 'young, low degree of consecration' (dominated) (Bourdieu 1993:48f). The horizontal axe structuring the journalistic field implicates positions that are more or less dependent on the market or more or less dependent on the internal principles of recognition in the journalistic field (e.g. 'journalism for journalism's sake'). To the left we find the positions which are autonomous in the sense that they correspond to the specific values (or cultural capital) of the field. To the right we must expect to find the positions which correspond to the market values (or economic capitals). It is possible to imagine a position to the left in the journalistic field which has a high internal status among journalists, while a position far to the right does not enjoy the same kind of journalistic recognitions though being a commercial success. The vertical axe structuring the journalistic field is the result of the total amount of capital. At the top of the axe we find the positions which has the biggest total amount of capital (both economic and cultural) – that is the dominant positions – and further down the axe we find the positions which has less total capital – that is the dominated positions. We can also understand the top and bottom of the principle sketch as the home for the

conservating and the transforming forces of the field. In the top of the field we find the conservating forces: The dominant positions per definition interested in holding on to their dominant positions. This could for instance correspond to empirical positions such as powerfull media, strong journalists union, etc. In the bottom of the field we find the transforming forces: the dominated forces per definition interested in getting more powerful positions. This could for instance be new generations.

Fields are dynamic and will change over time. In a historical perspective it is very likely, that the journalistic field will move between the autonomous and the heteronomous pole of the field of cultural production. This could be the case of changes in other fields which the journalism is defined in relation to, for instance changes in the economic field (i.e. the affect of fluctuation of the market on the media market) or changes in the political field (i.e. new media policies for instance state subsidies on media or laws on ownership of media). The other cause of change has to do with the changes within the field. Education of journalists is one of the key questions in this regard and the next section will present the case of Denmark. Before that, it is due to resume.

Research questions and methodological implications

After the introduction to the key concepts of field theory in the first part of this paper, a first attempt was made to define Journalism as the logic of practice of the journalistic field. After this second part, where the concept of field, cultural production and symbolic power has been presented, a second – and more precise – attempt can be made towards a theoretical definition:

Journalism culture is the logic of practice of the journalistic field, with certain principles of vision and division according to the internal differentiation of the field and according to the fields relation to the other fields

There are three steps of field analysis (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992: 104f) which are also key components for studying the journalistic field and thus journalism culture. First, the researcher must investigate the position of field in relation to the field of power. This could for instance be translated to questions of dominance of journalism in relation to other fields of cultural production, the economic field, the political field, etc. Second, the researcher must investigate the principles of differentiation of the field, the dominant forms of capital and how they structure the field. Third, the researcher must investigate the habitus of agents, the dispositions and position-takings of the field.

The last part of this paper will try to illustrate the research strategy by looking at the case of Danish journalism education.

Craft and conservation: Features of a Danish Journalism Culture

As the last section suggested, there are three research questions which should be asked in the case of Danish journalism education: How is the Danish journalistic field positioned in the relation to the field of power? What are the dominant capitals and principles of differentiation in the field? What are the habitus of the agents? This small case study will not be able to answer all three questions, or one of them in detail, but will illustrate both questions of the relative dominance of the journalistic field (for instance a strong union and strong trade associations dominating the recruitment to the journalistic field), questions of symbolic capital (illustrated by the identification of craft as a dominant capital) and the question of the habitus of the agents (discussed generally in terms of conservation as a strong dynamic of the field).

Symbolic capital and recruitment to the field

In the section on field theory, the concept of symbolic capital was illustrated by using the example of *exposure*, *agendasetting* and *information* in the Danish journalistic field. The study investigated a Danish journalism award in the Danish journalistic field, yet the capitals probably resonates journalistic values of many other western countries. Hallin & Mancini suggests that there are signs of a global journalism culture not least made possible through technological and commercial developments: "All of this tends to promote common conceptions of the journalist's role – the influence of Watergate mythology on journalism worldwide is a perfect example – and common styles of news representation" (Hallin & Mancini 2004:259). Both *agendasetting* and *exposure* might be partly explained by technical and economical influences (for instance as the globalisation of journalistic fields, increased heteronomy within the Danish journalistic field, etc.). But another explanation might be found in the influence of American models of journalism education in the Danish journalistic field:

"There is not a lot of systematic research, particularly of a comparative nature, on journalism education. But it does seem likely that American models of journalistic education have played an important role in changing cultures of journalism worldwide." (Hallin & Mancini 2004:257)

This part of the paper presents the case study of Danish journalism education to illustrate and discuss journalism culture in a field perspective. The first part of the paper identified three elements which guides the case study: A historical perspective on Danish

journalism education from the turn of the century. A contextual perspective by comparing the Danish educational history to that of the US and UK, and to the other Nordic countries. A linkage between structure and agency which can be found in the identification of craft as a dominant capital and conservation as the strong dynamic of the field.

Education of journalists – newsroom, school or university?


In developing the tradition of Danish journalism education, Denmark has looked in two directions for inspiration, towards the US and towards the Nordic countries (Schultz 2005, 2006). The inspiration from the US is for instance apparent in the close institutional relations between the Danish School of Journalism and American journalism schools but also in the fact that the US is where most Danish reporters, editors and editors-in-chief go for conferences and courses. The inspiration from the Nordic countries are also visible in institutional relations such as the Nordic association of journalism teachers.

As noticed by Hallin & Mancini there are not much comparative research on the education of journalists all though it is possible to find literature which describes journalism education or discuss theoretical and practical issues (i.e. Desmond 1949, Just 1954, Nordenstreng 1990, Wale 1990, Zelizer 2000, Fröhlich & Holtz-Bacha 2003, de Burgh (ed.) 2005). One of the rare examples of comparing education systems internationally is *Making the Newsmakers. International handbook on journalism training* (Gaunt 1992).

According to Gaunt there are three overall models of educating journalists defined by the place where the student spends most of their time during the education, whether it is in the newsroom, on a journalism school or at the university (Gaunt 1992). The distinction is primarily analytical as most countries have educational models which combine the three, but the distinction also points back to the fact that most countries have had (and still have) discussions about who should have the overall responsibility of educating journalist – the media business, the state or the university sector. According to Gaunt, there is an overall difference in the educational traditions of the US and Europe. The US has the longest and most widespread tradition for university education of journalists while Europe has had a tradition for educating journalist in different kinds of trade school. To this overall picture, it should be added that there are different kinds of educational models within the US just as journalism education varies from one European country to another and journalism education was changing many places in Europe in the beginning of the 1990s (Gaunt 1992). Nevertheless, Gaunt finds that on a general level one of the biggest differences between the US and Europe is that the US has a stronger

tradition for journalism education (journalism studies) in the university system. European journalism educations are to be found on a continuum between “on-the-job-skill-training” and “communication-oriented-university-based-media-studies”.

From Gaunt it is possible to deduct a model of ideal types of journalism education based on the relationship between theory and practice illustrated in the model below (Schultz 2006):



In the left side of the continuum journalists are primarily being educated in the university without any form of practical training and in the right side of the continuum, journalists are primarily being educated in the newsroom without formal theoretical training. According to Gaunt, the ideal type of journalism education in the US will be placed to the left on the continuum, whereas the ideal type of journalism education in Europe will be placed on the right hand side of the continuum. It can be assumed, that most trajectories of the individual journalist will often be based in between the poles of the position. Journalists with an academic degree will have some sort of internship or practical training before they are employed in their first journalistic job, just as most journalists trained and educated in the newsroom will have some sort of theoretical knowledge. Even so, the continuum illustrates the point that journalism education will always involve a certain mix of theory and practice. (Schultz 2005, 2006)

Anglo-American models

The US was the first country in the world to have a journalism education which has roots back to 1873 where Kansas State University offered a course on “printing” (Gaunt 1992). In 1908 the first independent school of journalism opened at the University of Missouri and many followed in the years to come. The schools were independent institutions but often supported financially by the media organisations. Pulitzer of The New York Daily donated 2 million dollars to Columbia University, the publisher of the Minneapolis Tribune, Murphy, and the owners of Chicago Tribune established the journalism education at North Western University. Since the beginning of the 20th century the number of journalism educations at college level in the US has risen significantly: From 4 in 1910, to 54 (almost 14 times as many) in 1927 to 462 journalism programmes in 2000 (Weaver 2001). Many of the programmes has been developed with the help from press organisations and until the 50’s most of the teaching was conducted by former journalists and editors (Gaunt 1992).

Contrary to the traditions of many European countries, the US has had close bonds between the commercial media, especially newspapers, and university based education. In this way the influence from journalists union as well as from the state has been minimal (Weaver 2001). It is an open question whether it is appropriate to speak of an American model of journalism in the singular as there is a plurality of different schools and programmes and ideals (Adam 2001, Schultz 2002). However, it is a characteristic of the US that journalism education is based on supply, in the sense that journalists are produced without looking at the demand of the media market. Furthermore, the US has a tradition for journalism studies in the universities, and not broader media- or communication programmes with journalism on the curriculum.

Journalism education in the UK has until recently been dominated by a strong institutional focus on on-the-job-training (Esser 2003). There was no formal journalism education in the UK until 1962 apart from a diploma course on Kings College from 1922 to 1939 and the way to a career in journalism went through the local media. In 1952 the National Advisory for Training and Education of Junior Journalists (NCTJ) was established and served as pillar of the British journalism education until the end of the 80s (op.cit).

The NCTJ programme became a strong organisation, build upon the idea of journalism as a craft. The organisation had close relations with the journalists union (NUJ) and held a stronghold on both journalism education and recruitment to the profession until the middle of the 1980s where the collective bargaining between publishers and unions broke down and the result was more individual agreements (Esser 2003). Today, journalism education in the UK are still inspired by the two models from NCTJ. The first model involves one year of fulltime studies and then an internship lasting between 6 and 24 months, though usually 18 months. In the other model, which is the most predominant, the students are employed at the newspapers directly out of school and are trained on the job while taking intensive courses at approved colleges. NCTJs teaching methods has been criticised for being old fashioned, and the media organisations has been discontent with the fact that the education has been used for attracting members to the union, but according to Esser, things were changing. Journalism has become a popular university course to a degree where there was more than a 1000 journalism courses (with over 10 participants) in the UK in 2003 (op.cit). Contrary to the US where the education is controlled by supply, the UK has traditionally leaned towards a demand model producing the number of journalist which are in demand in the journalistic employment market (Gaunt 1992). This however looks as it might have changed, as Essers critical valuation of the educational situation is, that there are too many places of journalism education and too little control (Esser 2003).

The Nordic context

As early as 1925 Finland had its first journalism course in the scope of the university and before that the majority of Finnish journalists had no formal education entering the profession (Nordenstreng 1990, Gaunt 1992). Journalism studies became a part of the university programme at the University of Tampere before the second world war, when a permanent position as associate professor was established in 1943 and a professor chair was created in 1947. Since then, students at Tampere have been able to combine journalism with other academic courses as part of a degree in the social sciences. From 1960 the University at Tampere has had two journalism programmes, a professional program leading to an undergraduate degree and an academic programme leading to a masters degree, with relatively high degree of theoretical academic teaching though still equipping the students with a basic practical journalism skills and the opportunity of specialising. Sweden also has a tradition of educating journalists at the university, but there are many ways of becoming a journalist in Sweden and different journalism courses at so-called high schools and journalism schools (Gaunt 1992). The university of Goeteborg offered journalism courses together with the local newspapers from 1945, and the university of the capital of Sweden offered similar courses from 1946 in cooperation with the leading trade organisations and unions. Come 1950 the two universities offer 6-8 weeks courses for untrained journalists and a specialised course for experienced reporters. Norway's history of journalism education also begins shortly after the second world war, when the media started sponsoring courses for young journalists but quickly realised that a more structured programme was needed (Just 1954). Thus in 1951 the Editors Association, the Journalists union and the association of media owners founded Oslo Journalism school which offered a 10 week journalism course (Gaunt 1992). Today, journalism education in the Finland, Norway and Sweden are still characterised by the fact, that there are many ways to become a professional journalists, both through university, through trade schools, through different journalism schools (Bjørnsen, Hovden, Ottelsen, Schultz, Zilliacus-Tikkanen 2007).

Danish journalism education: From trade school monopoly to university

The history of Danish journalism education falls in three periods (Schultz 2005, 2006)

1900-1961: Apprenticeship, professional associations and broad recruitment

1961-1998: Trade school monopoly, strong journalistic union and narrow recruitment

1998- : Institutional plurality – monoculture?

Around the turn of the century, Danish journalists had no other formal education than the practical on-the-job training they had in the newsroom (Graa 1971). Sometimes the journalist was lucky enough to come under the supervision of an editor who allocated time and resources on teaching the journalists the tricks of the trade, but at most newspapers around the country, the education was arbitrary or missing altogether. At the time, the situation was different for the big newspapers in the Danish capital, Copenhagen which did not take on young journalists as apprentices but recruited them from the local and regional press or hired academics to write about specialised topics, such as historians writing about foreign politics and economists writing about economy (Graa 1971:6). The apprentices that came to work for the local newspapers usually came with a background of 7 years of school but some –more and more – had 9 or 10 years of school. Some were printers and some had a course from a highschool¹ before they came to work as journalists. All in all, the education of Danish journalists around the turn of the century was informal and varied from newspaper to newspaper and from countryside to town.

The idea of creating a course for journalists associated to the University of Aarhus appears around the year of 1938. In an interview with the newspaper, *The Democrat*, one of the advocates of the journalism course express the idea that the courses should be organised as other university courses, only they should not be too theoretical, and that there should be no exam or grading, just a certificate of participation (Graa 1971: 8f). The participants should be “young promising people of the press, selected to participate by their organisation, but also voluntary participation should be allowed” (op.cit). The thought was to educate the apprentices and journalists already working in the press. In an international review of the “specialist education of journalists” from 1957 the background and reasons for creating journalists courses in Denmark and Norway for people already in the newspaper business are explained in terms of the expected employment situation:

“In order for there not to rise a journalistic proletariat - that is a vast number of young women and men who run around in vain from newsroom to newsroom with diplomas in their handbags or pockets - the professional training of journalists in both Denmark and Norway was reserved to young people who had already obtained an affiliation with a paper and had worked as a journalist in one or more years” (Just 1954:77)

¹ The Danish highschool system cannot be compared to the American system. Since the middle of the 19th century Danes from all walks of life have had a strong tradition of participating in weekly or monthly courses on *peoples Highschool* on topics ranging from healthy living to music and the work of Kierkegaard.

Creating journalists courses was discussed in the late 30s but not everyone thought it was a good idea. There was no union of journalists in Denmark at this point in time but the idea was discussed in the different journalists associations². The association of journalists from the local regions, and the association of social democratic journalists were positive towards the idea of creating courses for journalists, whereas many journalists from Copenhagen were sceptical as to the value of a formal education. The Copenhagen association of journalists did not turn up to the preliminary meetings, and the negotiations about the course didn't take on. Shortly after, the Second World War broke out and the idea was left in abeyance although not forgotten. Even though Denmark was occupied, a prominent newspaper persona suggested a parallel idea in 1941, that there should be a press research institute at the University of Aarhus or at the business school of Copenhagen (Graa 1971). During the war the idea was matured in political circles and the journalist courses at University of Aarhus began in December 1946 (Fink, Reske-Nielsen & Hansen 1958).

In 1961 the journalist courses at University of Aarhus was reformed and this process led to the establishment of an independent institution: The Danish School of Journalism (DSJ) in 1962 in the provincial town of Aarhus on the peninsula of Jutland in the northwestern part of Denmark (Kjær 2000). From 1963 there is a permanent staff at the DSJ and it becomes obligatory for all journalists – not only from Aarhus but from all over the country including Copenhagen on the Island Sealand in the south eastern part of Denmark - to participate in a 6 months stay at DJS in Aarhus as part of a new three year education. It is decided that the journalist education should not be governed by the Ministry of Education as all other educations in Denmark. In stead the school is governed by the organisations and associations of the press, yet with a comprehensive subsidy from the government and under the overall supervision of the Ministry of State Affairs (i.e. the State Department of the US). During the 60s the education at DSJ becomes more and more academic not least through the relations between the school and the Institute for Press Research at the University of Aarhus. At the same time, the "ability of the journalism education to accommodate the modern and complicated society's demands" is increasingly discussed as problematic (Kjær 2000:108). In 1970 a new law is passed about the Danish Journalism School: The obligatory stay at the school is prolonged from 3 to 18 months. Also, the economic and political ties change. The DSJ now becomes fully financed by the state, although the governing boards of the school is

² Denmark had a four-party press system (until the 50s or 60s) also mirrored in the journalists association such as the Social Democratic journalist association, but there was also associations based on geography such as association of journalist from rural parts of Denmark.

still dominated by the strong interest organisations of the press. The era of the apprentice model of journalism education is over and the trade school monopoly of the DSJ is a fact.

From 1974 the supervision of the school goes from the Ministry of State Affairs to the Ministry of Education, but this does not mean that the press loses influence on the governing of the school. In 1979 the parties of the journalistic labour market comes to an agreement that one week of in-service training³ paid by the employer is a right for all journalist. The new need for courses aimed at educated journalist who wants to update their professional skills and knowledge results in the creation of a Center for Journalistic In-Service Training [CFJE in Danish] and later, the DSJ adds a journalistic diploma course for academics to their education programme.

In 1992 Philip Gaunt highlights three characteristics of the Danish journalism education model (Gaunt 1992):

- 1) One institution, the Danish Journalism School, holds a de facto monopoly
- 2) There is an institutionalised tradition for in-service training of working journalists
- 3) The education system is the result of interaction between state authorities, a strong journalists union and a powerful media employer organisation.

But during the 1990s there are significant developments. Communication and media studies with journalism on the curriculum become increasingly popular at universities, and the Minister of Education begins addressing the lack of competition regarding journalism education and the monopoly of the trade school DJS. In 1998/1999 journalism is introduced as a university course in Denmark at the two universities of Odense (BA) and Roskilde (MA). The monopoly of DJS is broken and for the first time it is possible for Danish university students to get an academic degree in journalism.

As for the other two characteristics they are still valid as an overall description of the Danish model of journalism education. There is still a large market for in-service training of journalists as this is in the journalistic contracts of the about 10.000⁴ people working on contracts from the journalists union. And the educational model is still the result of interaction between the state, the strong journalists union and the powerful media organisations – also at the public, state financed universities of Odense and Roskilde.

³ Courses aimed at educated journalists who wants to update or expand their skills.

⁴ The Danish Journalists Union has 13.000 members but recruits broadly, both journalists, press photographers, PR employed and various technical professionals such as hospital photographers (Schultz 2006).

Danish journalism education: Craft and conservation

The move from an educational model of apprenticeship to trade school to the introduction of journalism at the university is described by Kjær as a double move of tying the journalism education closer to the state through public funding, and of making the journalism education more academic (Kjær 2000:108). From an institutional perspective this interpretation of the history of Danish journalism education as a process of 'academification' is a solid observation. However, from a field perspective journalism education is not necessarily becoming more academic just because journalism studies is being offered as a university course – this question is strictly speaking a matter of differentiation, capitals and habitus.

Craft

In a field perspective, the most important conclusion from the reading of the history of the Danish journalism education is the fact that Denmark has educated journalists from a single school, and that this school has been a trade school. The first students began studying journalism at a university in 1998, which in comparison is 90 years later than the US and 73 years later than Finland. Practically speaking this means that only very few of the Danish journalists working in media are *not* educated at the DSJ. In a field perspective the history of the trade school monopoly can be interpreted as a journalist field with very little competition about what journalism is, as a stable reproduction of dominant values with no challenge from opposing understandings of journalism (Schultz 2006, 2007). Most Danish journalist come from the same school, where they have been taught by the same teachers, using the same text books and curriculum, using the same teaching methods. Compared to the differentiation of journalism education models in the US, in the UK and in the other Nordic countries the case of Denmark point towards strong reproduction of exisiting values in the field. For the journalists educated in the era of the trade school the ideals, methods and myths is a result of the formal education. For the journalists from the era of apprenticeship it is also true that they are all from the same school, using the same books, taught by the same teachers, event though the course was only three months. Theoretically speaking this would still lead to a diagnosis of field orthodoxy. An experienced news editor describes himself and his colleagues in these words:

“We have been trained in the same journalistic environment and we have worked with each other on different newspapers. Everybody has the same

story as mine: 3 or 4 places of employment are pretty normal with 25 years of experience. We have criss-crossed around the same places so that's why our training is social and environmental" (Danish News Editor, late 50s, 2004)

The Danish journalistic field can be characterised in terms of craft being a dominant symbolic capital because of the specific institutional history of the apprenticeship tradition and the trade school monopoly. The question is how the new academic journalism courses at the universities will affect the field.

Conservation

At the moment the future points towards conservation of the orthodoxy in the field. The reason for this is the structure of the two new educations at Odense and Roskilde University which to a high degree is modelled in the shape of the DJS model. This means that the current model of journalism education in Denmark is very difficult to place on Gaunts continuum of "on-the-job-skill-training" and "communication-oriented-university-based-media-studies". This has got to do with the fact, that the Danish university degrees in journalism have two characteristics which are rarely seen in the university model of journalism education.

- More time is spent on practical skill-training (researching, news writing etc.) than on academic work (theory lectures, academic writing, etc.)
- University students of journalism has 12-18 months of internship

Compared to the Nordic countries, the weight on practical skill training is much heavier than university degrees in Sweden and Norway. Compared to other Nordic countries it is also unique to have such a long period of compulsory internship in relation to a university degree (more than three months of internship is very rare in for instance Norway). Even though the degrees at Odense and Roskilde University are thought as an alternative to DJS (Danmarks evalueringsinstitut 2004:9) both university degrees are based upon extensive practical skill-training and 12-18 months of internship – on top of the academic demands, so to speak. As such, the Danish model of journalism education is neither directly comparable to the tradition for theoretical, academic journalism education which we see in the US. Even though the Danish model has extensive practical on-the-job-training it does not compare to the British apprenticeship/trade school model either.

What does the education of journalist mean for the journalism culture. In the quote below a news reporter in the beginning of his 40s talks about his colleagues:

We all think the same way and we are all trained in the same environment. For my generation – most of us here have some years of experience – they are all educated at the DSJ because the new educations wasn't a choice. Not that I think it makes any difference with the other educations. We have all been educated in the same place, we hang around the same social circles, the same people and we are recruited from the same places

The quote illustrates the two important features of the Danish journalistic field, that is characterised by a strong conservation and that craft is an important capital structuring the field. In order to work as a journalist in Denmark it is necessary with at least one year of practical on-the-job training on a journalistic media. Besides two years of education at a trade school or three to five years at university of which at least one year is devoted to a practical curriculum.

Discussion

This final section of the paper has studied the history of Danish journalism education from a historical, contextual perspective linking structure and agency. The recent history of Danish journalism education might be that of a broken trade school monopoly and thus a new institutional plurality, but at the same time the educational models points towards a monoculture where craft is a dominant symbolic capital and the general habitus of the field points towards conservation (and not transformation).

The case is illustrative for the use of Bourdieus field theory in relation to developing a framework for studying Journalism Culture yet it is important to stress that it is not a fulfilling field analysis. Neither is it a conclusive case regarding the important question of recruitment to the field which also would also need an analysis of the labour market for journalists and the employment situation as I have done elsewhere (Schultz 2005, 2006).

Conclusion

This paper has presented the field theory of Pierre Bourdieu and discussed how the framework can be used for studying journalism culture, illustrated in a case study of journalism education in Denmark.

The first section argued that the concept of field conceptualises at the same time the notion of journalism practice studied from the perspective of news production ethnography, and the structures that structure this practice studied from the perspective of political-economy and media systems). In this way, field theory meets three important elements of a sociology of journalism culture: A historical perspective, a contextual perspective and a link between agency and structure. A first attempt was made towards a definition: *Journalism Culture is the logic of practice of the journalistic field.*

The second section – Journalism: Field and Capitals – presented field theory as a critical, relational theory and discussed Journalism Culture in light of cultural production, power and social differentiation and the methodological implications for research. This led to a second attempt of a theoretical assessment: *Journalism culture is the logic of practice of the journalistic field, with certain principles of vision and division according to the internal differentiation of the field and according to the field's relation to the other fields*

The third section presented the empirical case study of Danish journalism education using the concepts of field, capital and habitus to identify craft as a strong capital in the field and conservation as a dominant logic.

In sum, the paper has tried to show how field theory is a promising framework for developing a sociology of journalism culture.

Literature

- Benson, Rodney. 1998. "Field Theory in a Comparative Context: A new Paradigm for Media Studies." *Theory and Society* 28:463-498.
- Benson, Rodney and Erik Neveu. 2005. "Introduction: Field Theory as a Work in Progress." Pp. 1-25 in *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field*, edited by R. Benson and E. Neveu. Cambridge CB2 1UR, UK: Polity Press.
- Berkowitz, Dan. 1997. *Social Meanings of News. A Text-Reader*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Bjørnsen, Hovden, Ottelsen, Schultz, Zilliacus-Tikkanen. 2007. "The Nordic Journalism Student: A Cross-national study". Conference paper. ICA. May 2007
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1989. "Social Space and Symbolic Power." *Sociological Theory* 7:14-25.
- . 1993b. *The Field of Cultural Production. Essays on Art and Literature*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- . 1996 [1992]. *The Rules of Art. Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. Stanford California: Stanford University Press.
- . 1998. *Practical Reason. On the Theory of Action*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- . 1998 [1996]. *On Television*. New York: The New Free Press.
- . 1999. "The Space of Points of View." "Understanding".in *The Weight of the World*, edited by B. et.al. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- . 2000 [1997]. *Pascalian Meditations*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- . 2002 [1977]. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2003. "Participant Objectivation." *Journal of Anthropological Institute* 9:281-294.
- . 2003 [1979]. *Distinction. A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London: Routledge.
- . 2005b. "The Political Field, the Social Science Field, and Journalistic Field." Pp. 29-47 in *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field*, edited by R. Benson and E. Neveu. Cambridge CB2 1UR, UK: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre et. al. 1999 [1993]. *The Weight of the World. Social Suffering in Contemporary Society*. Translated by P. P. Ferguson, S. Emanuel, J. Johnson, and S. T. Waryn. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Loïc J. D. Wacquant. 1992a. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Breed, Warren. 1955. "Social Control i the Newsroom: A Functional Analysis." *Social Forces* 33:326-335.
- Chalaby, Jean K. 1996. "Journalism as an Anglo-American Invention." *European Journal of Communication* 11:303-326.
- Champagne, Patrick. 1993. "The View from the Media." in *The Weight of the World*, edited by P. B. e. al. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Cottle, Simon. 2000. "New(s) Times: Towards a 'Second Wave' of News Ethnography." *The European Journal of Communication Research* 25:19-41.
- . 2003. "Media organisation and production: mapping the field." in *Media organisation and production*, edited by S. Cottle. London: SAGE Publications.
- Couldry, Nick. 2003. "Media meta-capital: Extending the range of Bourdieu's field theory." *Theory and Society* 32:653-677.
- Curran, James and Michael Gurevitch. 1996. "Mass Media and Society." Pp. 378. New York: Arnold.

- Esser, Frank. 1998. "Editorial Structures and Work Principles in British and German Newsrooms." *European Journal of Communication* 13:375-405.
- Gans, Herbert J. 1979. *Deciding What's News. A Study of CBS Evening News, NBC Nightly News, Newsweek & Time*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Gitlin, Todd. 1980. *The Whole World Is Watching. Mass Media in the Making & Unmaking of the New Left*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press.
- Golding, Peter and Philip Elliot. 1979. *Making the news*. London, New York: Longman.
- Glasgow University Media Group, Peter Beharrell, Howard Davis, John Eldridge, John Hewitt, Jean Oddie, Greg Philo, Paul Walton, and Brian Winston. 1976. "Bad News." London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- GUMG, The Glasgow University Media Group. 1976. "Bad News." *Theory and Society* 3:339-363.
- Hallin, Daniel C. and Paolo Mancini. 2004. *Comparing Media Systems. Three Models of Media and Politics*.
- Hesmondhalgh, Desmon (2006): "Bourdieu, the media and cultural production". *Media, Culture & Society*. 28/2:211-231. Sage.
- Hovden, Jan Frederik. 2001. "'The Norwegian Journalistic Field. Issues and problems in an ongoing research project'-. " in *15th Nordic Conference on Media and Communication Research*. Reykjavik, 11-13 august 2001: Jan Fredrik Hovden. Department of Media and Journalism. Volda University College. Norway.
- Marchetti, Dominique. 2005. "Subfields of Specialized Journalism." Pp. 19 in *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field*, edited by R. Benson and E. Neveu. UK: Polity Press.
- Neveu, Erik. 2007. "Pierre Bourdieu. Sociologist of media, or sociologist for media scholars?". *Journalism Studies*. Vol.8/2.
- Schlesinger, Philip. 1978. *Putting 'reality' together. BBC news*, Edited by J. Tunnstall. London: Constable.
- Schudson, Michael. 1989. "The Sociology of News Production." *Media, Culture & Society* 11:263-282.
- . 2003. *The Sociology of News*, Edited by J. C. Alexander. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Schultz, Ida. 2005. "[Title translated: Positioning the News. An ethnographic field analysis of News Values in Journalistic Practice.] Bag nyhedsværdierne. En etnografisk feltanalyse af nyhedsværdier I journalistisk praksis." PhD Dissertation. Department of Journalism, Roskilde: Roskilde University, Denmark
- Schultz, Ida. 2006. [Title translated: *Positioning the News. Values, Ideals, Practice*] *Bag Nyhederne. Værdier, idealer og praksis*. Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur.
- Schultz, Ida, 2007. "The Journalistic Gut Feeling. Journalistic Doxa, News Values and Orthodox News Values." *Journalism Practice*. Vol. 1. /1.
- Tuchman, Gaye. 1978. *Making News. A Study in the Construction of Reality*. New York: The Free Press.
- . 2002. "The Production of News." In *A Handbook of Media and Communication Research. Qualitative and Quantitative Methodologies*. (Ed, Jensen, K. B.) Routledge, London.
- Tunnstall, Jeremy. 1971. *Journalists at Work. Specialist correspondents: their news organizations, news sources, and competitor-colleges*, Edited by J. Tunnstall. London: Constable.
- White, David Manning. 1950. "The "Gate Keeper" A Case Study in the Selection of News." *Journalism Quarterly* 27:383-396.
- Zelizer, Barbie. 2000. "What is Journalism Studies." *Journalism* 1:9-12.
- . 2004. *Taking Journalism Seriously. News and the Academy*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.