

When Homo Academicus meets Homo Journalisticus

An inter-field study of collaboration and conflict in the communication of scientific research

Hartley, Jannie Møller

Published in:
Journalism

DOI:
[10.1177/1464884915608817](https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884915608817)

Publication date:
2017

Document Version
Early version, also known as pre-print

Citation for published version (APA):
Hartley, J. M. (2017). When Homo Academicus meets Homo Journalisticus: An inter-field study of collaboration and conflict in the communication of scientific research. *Journalism*, 18(2), 211-225.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884915608817>

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.

When Homo Academicus meets Homo Journalisticus

- An inter-field study of collaboration and conflict in communication of science

Jannie Møller Hartley, RUC

Abstract:

The long known tension between journalists and academics is explored by analysing data from a qualitative interview survey of 25 journalists and scientist in the framework of Pierre Bourdieu's Field Theory. The article shows empirically how the two fields, journalism and science, are both constructed around the opposition between knowledge (content) and communication (form), and on the basis of the analysis of the narratives of the communication processes between the two occupational groups the article shows that scientists and journalist take different positions according to the existing ideals in the two fields, revealing different science-communication habitus'. The paper present a typology of proximity and distance towards mass media and science as two interrelated fields – making the communication either easier or more difficult, a consequence of the fact that both try to protect their historic professional identities.

KEYWORDS: Science-communication, Science-journalism, Field Theory, Journalism, Science.

Introduction

In 2003 a new University Law was implemented in Denmark, which for the first time put emphasis not only on the research conducted in universities, but also the communication of this research. Thereby media professionals and scientists received an open invitation to make sure that much more science is communicated to the public through the Danish press. Despite these new demands for more communication of science the relationships between journalist and scientists are still described as problematic, both in Denmark and abroad. Much of the literature deals with the how journalists are using academics (Arnoldi 2005; Wien 2013; Albæk 2011) and how journalists and scientists have different agendas and goals in the communication process. For example Reed (2001) shows how competing time frames and organizational and technological demands combine with incomplete understanding of power relations to exacerbate tensions. She argues, that the continuing conflicts and tensions are located in historically constructed occupational identities, and the aim of this paper is to analyse

this conflicted relationship in a field perspective which suggest that in order to understand the conflicts between to related fields, we should also look at the *internal* field-positioning strategies of the agents in each of the fields. In other words, how academics chose to communicate their research might have less to do with the journalists and the logic of practice in the field of journalism than it has to do with what is recognised internally in the field of science as legitimate ways of communicating science.

Scientists and journalists' collaboration is often described in the media literature as a journalist-source relationship. A number of theorists have described the relationship between journalists and sources as: a tango, a relationship of trading, a mutual dependency or a bargaining game (Tuchman 1978; Gans 1979; Ericson, R., Baranek, P. M. & Cahn 1989; Eide 1992; Kramhøft 2000). A recent study of science journalism in Denmark show that researchers from the soft disciplines mainly contribute to hard news or background items, where their role is to comment on daily events as public experts. They do this because they consider it career enhancing (Wien 2013). This indicates, that communication is, at least in some part of the field of science, a form of capital, which can increase and better ones position in the field. The journalists who use them as sources are often inexperienced journalists. However, the young journalists manage to set the agenda. Both parties perceive the cooperation positively although researchers tend to be more reserved than the journalists (Wien 2013), echoing previous studies (Arnoldi 2005; Reed 2001; Peters 1995; Møller Hartley & Hansen 2008).

Common for all these is the assumption that journalists and sources are in relationship in which one party (the source or researcher) has control over some information that the other party (the journalist) want. The advantage of sources is that the news media needs to fill the “day of news” and use the experts as “commentators of news events (Albæk 2011), and the advantage of the media is that academics as sources have a desire and need to put themselves or their message on the agenda. This suggests a mutual dependency between scientists and journalists. Analysing the role of the experts in a field perspective Jacob Arnoldi argues that the media has become more dependent on the symbolic value in having scientists as authoritative sources in their news stories (Arnoldi 2005: 35) and Wien argues similarly that academics are often used to support an already chosen angle on a news story (Wien 2013). So when the Danish government emphasises on a political level the need to communicate science, this might re-enforce already existing mechanisms in a field and the possible changing of internal logics of a field over time.

The aim of this article is to develop field theory to analyse interfield relations between journalists and scientists (both hard sciences and humanities) and thus to examine the struggles to formulate the implicit rules governing “how to communicate science in the Press”. This article thus offers a typology of distance vs. proximity positioning within the two fields in question, the field of journalism and the field of science and the article thus empiri-

cally explores the degrees of variation in such intra-field relations, which has not previously been fully acknowledged or developed by Bourdieu. Following this the term “communicative capital” is introduced, as a specific form of capital, which seems to be of increasing importance for the struggle for power within the field of science in Denmark.

In “Homo Academicus” (Bourdieu, 1990) Bourdieu documents the battles in the French field of academia and the struggles for dominance and to classify what it means to “be scientific” and although he did not specifically relate the field to the field of mass media, it is likely – also given his public lectures on television later in his career – that he was acutely aware of the importance and lack of recognition of mass mediated communication of science. In the following I will take a closer look at exactly how field theory can be useful in the context of communication of science via the mass media.

Inter-field relations in a field perspective

Much of the existing literature has seen academics and journalists as two separate groups, but has rarely looked at the differences within these groups, but has instead tried to explain the conflicts by focusing on the differences between journalist as one occupational/professional group and academics/scientists as another. In a field perspective journalists and academics are regarded as a part of two separate fields, a scientific and journalistic field which equally struggle *within their respective fields* to define “good journalism” and “good research”. Thus they are both subfields (e.g. related to the art field) within a more general field, which Pierre Bourdieu calls the Field of Cultural Production. The cultural production Field is characterized by producing symbolic items such as Art, Science and Journalism (Bourdieu 1993: 115). When Bourdieu writes that 'goods', such as a journalistic article or a scientific report is symbolic, it means that they have a symbolic value, or symbolic representations of certain values (Schultz 2006: 103). On the same time, the fields are characterized by fight among themselves about what is recognized and valued as legitimate categorizations of the social (Schultz 2006: 104). The struggle is between dominant forces, who wish to preserve the status quo while challenging forces will try to change the structure in the field, for example by getting new forms of capital recognized widely in the field (Bourdieu 1986: 255).

Bourdieu himself expressed a critical view of the journalistic field in his however somewhat criticized publication *On television* (Bourdieu 1998). He concluded that it was structured by flightiness, shallow entertainment ideals and competition for audience acknowledgement. The constant hunt for scoops supersedes originality and diversity, which according to Bourdieu, has had devastating consequences. But Bourdieu never provided any empirical analysis to support his conclusions on the power of the media. What also seems to be lacking is analysis of how capital obtained in one field can be used in the struggle to get exactly this form of capital recognised in another field, when for example two field like the science field

and the field of journalism are part of the same field of cultural production, both concerned with the production and dissemination of knowledge, both with the power to interpret reality to specific audiences.

Despite the struggles for power within a field, almost all activity tends to reproduce the field structure, unless or until it becomes subject to pressure from other fields (Benson, R. & Neveu 2005, p.6). These external pressures can, for example, be political, such as when the Danish universities politically becomes subject increasing pressure to communicate in a certain way, or when the media by way of example, public-service requirements are imposed on them via certain criteria for what to produce and how. The aim in this paper is however not to analyse how these pressures might come into effect, but rather how different forms of capital come into play in the interrelations between to field who are both part of same the same overall field of cultural production and to analyse how different positions internally in a field influence how scientists and journalists are collaborating.

When making use of the concept of field, it becomes clear that researchers at no way represent a total let alone homogenous group (Bourdieu, 2005: 80) This does not mean that there is always constant conflict in the scientific field, for academics as a social group find many things in common that don't just makes them a group, e.i. make them part of the same field, but that also create a number of internal inconsistencies with a resulting fraction formation (Bourdieu 2005: 81), where different scientists constantly struggle to formulate the rules of the game: which are the valid theories, in which journals should one publish, and how one should deal with the media - and thus, the communication via mass media can add symbolic capital in the scientific field (Wilken 2006, p.100).

Bourdieu points out in his book "On TV - and journalism and power" that journalism relations are governed by the economic field and thus more dependent on the external forces than the other fields of cultural production field (Bourdieu 1998, p.62) and thus less autonomous than the scientific field. The economic field has its affect on all fields - through journalism - equally the field of science (Ibid.). The reason is that the journalistic field's power is not just a categorizing power (like science) which sets the principles of vision and division (what we see and what value we attach to it), but also a exalting power, which not only provides space for certain values, stories, agents, institutions etc., but also attribute them a special kind of symbolic and sanctifying power (Bourdieu, 1998; Couldry, 2003). In view of Bourdieu's theory of symbolic capital Couldry argues that the media today possess a meta-capital of other fields that both emerges as a dominance of what is recognized in various fields, but also in legitimizing some symbolic systems over others (Couldry 2003). Following this argument the act of communication science can thus attribute symbolic power to the communicating scientists, however the analytical question becomes whether this is recognized within the field of science, if it is seen as an ideal, by whom and how this exists side by side with existing and

dominant ideals of the two opposing fields?

As for the editors and journalists who were the research object of the classical newsroom studies, the sociology of Pierre Bourdieu speaks of *agents*. This shift of analytical frame means that theoretically we can assume that the “newsroom” or “academia” is a hierarchical social space, a micro-cosmos reflecting positions in the journalistic and the academic field, in the fields of cultural production and social power, within the overall social space. In reflexive sociology, what is individual is always social, or to put it another way, that which might be experienced as subjective will always correspond to a relational position in a field, and at the same time to a somewhat objectified position. This is expressed in the concept of habitus, which works as a “structuring structure” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992: 126).

Journalists and researchers take up a position in relation to one another in social space, in which their placement is dependent on the amount of economic, cultural and the specific capital of the field, in this contexts thus journalistic or scientific capital, that they command. The more capital they have in common within their respective fields, the closer they are to one another and the questions in this article is what happens in the relations between the fields and by using and developing the concept of *communicative capital* this article aim to show how journalists and academics positioning themselves accordingly and I analyse how they as a consequence of their positions in social space have distinct self-perceptions that guide them in their work; what Bourdieu also describes as 'practical sense'.

Bourdieu has not himself analysed the relations between the field of science and journalism, and thus this article contributes to this development. The analytical concept of capital offers a tool for understanding why the social space is differentiated as it is, but, more importantly, the concept of capitals highlights internal status hierarchies in a given field, and what principles of recognition are dominant in a field. Empirical investigations of capitals are most often statistical (e.g. Bourdieu, 1984[1979]), but just as a quantitative approach can be used for studying journalistic forms of capitals (e.g. Hovden, 2008) it is also possible to use the concepts of capital and habitus as a qualitative research tool (Schultz 2006; Møller Hartley & Hansen 2008; Møller Hartley 2013) and this is the aim of this article.

Methodology

The data for this article consists of qualitative in-depth interviews with 12 journalists and 13 scientists, each interview lasting from 60 to 90 minutes. The respondents were located via an article search via Infomedia¹, and consisted of a review of a total of 161 articles in which scientists appeared in the press in May and June 2007. The interviewees were selected on the basis of the articles where they are either a scientists who is quoted or a journalistic

¹ A database of all Danish news content, www.infomedia.dk.

author. The word “science” (in Danish “forsk*”) was used to obtain articles both presenting hard science results and news articles where scientists are used as experts and commentators. In the Danish context it is important to emphasise that science, scientist and science communication covers both hard science, social sciences and humanities, and because all types of scientists are interviewed, this article will also analyse the differences between what we can label subfields of the science field, and how the different type of scientists position themselves within the overall field.

To the extent that it has been possible both author and source of the same story were interviewed, but it has not been an explicit criteria. This also means that the study is limited exclusively to written media, and more specifically to articles in the Danish Press and the interviewed journalists are all working within major establish Danish news organisations geographically spread out over the country. The article search includes all news articles, only excluding journals, magazines or weeklies. The scientists were from all major universities in Denmark and both from natural science, social science and humanities. I used the articles as a starting point for the interview, but quickly learned that it was difficult for the scientists in the interview situation to distinguish between experience created in the meeting with a journalist for the production of a specific written article and any other mediated appearances, for example on television and radio. The conclusions of this study can therefore not be generalized to all other media platforms, but aim to point towards some broader and explorative analytical points regarding the relations between two fields and the positioning of different types of journalists and researchers within these fields.

Using a relational-theoretical approach means looking at the distinctions the informants make when talking about their experiences with mass-mediated science communication, e.i. how the scientists describe the concrete experiences with being in the media and how the journalist describe the experience of negotiating with the scientist in the interview-situation. Thus the qualitative interviews followed a similar guideline with open-ended questions related to the participation in a concrete piece of mediated communication of science and from there moving on to more general questions of the communication process and the negotiations between scientists and journalists. The research questions that lie behind the interview guide follows 4 themes: 1) How does journalists and scientists describe each other? 2) How do they describe their role in the communication process? 3) What are they describing as important and what do they value in that process and 4) How do the two professional groups try to maintain control?

The interviews have been fully transcribed and coded and index cards were used to assist in an exhaustive qualitative data analysis. The analysis is based on dominant and recurring themes with emphasis on meanings and interpretation using respondents’ own language where possible.

The relations between agents in the two fields

There is agreement from the interviews with scientists, science journalists and news journalists that science reporting and writing would benefit from more emphasis on *accuracy, accessibility and attention to audience(s)*. These apparent agreements, however, are nuanced and contain some major tensions and often contradictions. Accuracy is seen to come from clarification of purpose, concepts and the level of journalists' understanding. Accuracy in the sense of 'reality' rather than 'truth' exists in tension with the journalists' need to engage the audience – to find an 'angle' or 'hook' for the news item, feature article or broadcast material. Journalists describe how they cannot describe the "whole truth" and scientists how the fact that the journalists are oriented too much towards the audience means that it is sometimes "untrue", what the article says. As for example illustrated by the following quotes:

Sometimes the [corrections] might be minor changes and sometimes it's the whole point, which is left out, because the journalist think it sounded better like this. But she cannot see that - she looks only at the news triangle, etc., "what I think the reader will find interesting about this" - but nevertheless, it is wrong, what she has written! (Interview scientist 1:157).

Sometimes you will find out soon enough that it could be really good if you used it [a point] in the headline too - and the academic cannot understand. This makes me think that the researcher finds himself a little too self-important, because it is not wrong, what you write - it is just angled a little bit different" (Interview journalists 19:139).

Accessibility is understood particularly, but not only by news journalists as part of a process of making complex and arcane knowledge available to non-specialists. The journalists' talk of making the abstract concrete, while the scientists opposes the concrete and prefers to talk in general terms. For journalists accessibility is the act of making things understandable to the general public, and the position themselves in opposition to the non-accessible language of the field of science. *Accessibility* is thus linked to the conflicts evolving around *accuracy* and it thus often becomes a struggle to use certain words, as illustrated in this example:

So, for example, the word poison - one editor will immensely like to use the word poison, but I have been told countless times that it is wrong, there is often talk about pollution instead, but it's just too long a word [...] poison is a short word that's pretty loaded, but the environmental scientist will not agree to this, there's even one who has said that if it was not changed to "pollution" he would not contribute" (Interview journalist 9:191).

The use of words is often by journalists justified with reference to the needs of the *Audience*, in the sense of demographic groups targeted by media organizations, generates

both the potential for differences in approach and the opportunity for misunderstanding, particularly surrounding distortion and over-simplification of science. Journalists in this study describe how the scientists do not understand the audience, and scientists on the other hand say that journalists are over-simplifying. In the following quote we see how the journalist is positioning the scientist as someone “geeky”, who are in fact not able to communicate, and thus have a need for the journalist to do this task:

They are not used to thinking in readers, they are more accustomed to thinking in theory, curriculum and such-things [...]. Some of them are really geeks who live in their own little world. And maybe they have just acknowledged that they have to live their lives in a laboratory, and then they maybe dropped the whole communicative aspects in elementary school (Interview journalist 20:157).

Journalists and scientists work with different and sometimes oppositional conceptions of knowledge, imagined audiences and frameworks of meaning while using the same words and expressions to the extent that both groups participate in practices and strategies which lead them to depart from their professional disciplines and exacerbate rather than bridge the distance between journalism and science as will be seen later in this article.

The above indicates the two fields are structured around two main forms of capital, namely the *production of knowledge* and thus a for the scientific field specific capital, namely *scientific* capital, and for the journalistic field a specific *journalistic* capital. Both fields are also concerned with the dissemination of knowledge in the form of what we can label a *communicative capital* and their conflicts seems better understood by looking at their different positions in the field of cultural production and autonomy vs. heteronomy of the economic field.

However, in the empirical material we see that when scientists and journalists position themselves differently in relation to especially the communicative capital in the science communication process, thus in relation to what earlier studies show –not *all* scientists find communication with journalists easy and unproblematic and how they differentiate themselves and position themselves in relation to the process of mass-mediated communication of science can tell us how this is a part of a larger battle for power and authority within the scientific field. The advantage of using field theory is that when thinking in terms of a field or a space of differences it allows for multi-dimensions, thus scientific capital and communicative capital are not only opposed and it is indeed possible to possess and strive for both forms of capital, which would indicate a strong position within the field. Although we cannot generalise of the whole field of science and journalism the analysis does uncover some different positioning-strategies and thus different science communication habitus’ and these will be explored in the following two sections.

The struggle for recognition of communicative capital in the field of science

The interviewed scientists agree that they have to communicate. They realise that it is part of the academic professional culture to publish research in the form of articles in journals or books. Hence what scientists disagree on is how and to which audience they have to communicate to. From the empirical material we see how scientists differ in their self-understanding in terms of 1) how they describe their own role and 2) their relations to journalists, and 3) the view of other scientists and science. We shall see that these three analytical points are inter-connected and that 3 overall positioning strategies and hence different self-understandings in relation the mass-mediated communication of science can be observed – *three forms of habitus*.

The first positioning strategy belongs to scientists that describe it as a “duty” to communicate their own research and they position themselves in opposition to researchers who do not find it important to communicate science via the mass media. As illustrated in this quote:

There is a, pardon the expression, a bloody arrogant attitude in the academic environment; we do the research here, it is at a level that not everyone can understand (...) but the point is to deliver something everyone can understand, if you can not explain what you are researching, you should be paid to do research (Interview scientist 21:67).

In the following we will name her the *media-positive scientist*. The quote above equally shows that this type of scientist is aware that mass mediated communication is looked down upon by his colleagues, and the empirical analysis indicates, that communication as a capital is not widely recognised in the field. This type of scientist understand communication as an integral part of research, but they equally realise that they are a minority and that they might have to take a “beating for it” from their academic colleagues. This is also illustrated by the fact that scientists realise that it might compromise their scientific authority (capital), if they are *too much* in the media. As illustrated in this quote:

Sometime people feel it is almost prostitution and that it is pop and tabloid, and that you should not do it, but I have always ignored those people - and I was also very satisfied when it was written into the University Law as an obligation, for now I can say to all those who thinks its too much, "yes, but you people also have an obligation, so just get on with it! (Interview 21:62).

What is interesting is that the struggle to get the *communicative capital* recognised as a legitimate value in the field seems to be influenced by the external pressure from the field of politics. Empirically we see that the media-positive scientists is often from social sciences and humanities, often participating in the news agenda as experts and they seem to have an interest in getting the type of media participation they do recognised, especially since it is some-

thing they already do and that they do well. It follows that this type of scientist is often in the media.

If I have turned off my phone, and there are about 3-4 messages and one of them is from a journalist, I will answer that one first. They have a deadline, and it's urgent, so I think they deserve a good service. (Interview scientist 21:30).

The media-positive scientist will generally describe her relationship with journalists as "good" and is so used to being in the media, that she finds no need to see, what they journalist wants to use her for in the specific journalistic production, and it seems that the amount of communicative capital means that she understands how the journalist work and accept this as a condition, if she wants to be a public media figure, which she, as explained before, feels is her duty. She lets the journalist maintain control and sees it as a small price to pay for the value in getting the message out there. If we look at this in a field perspective it is useful to distinguish between the specific and internally recognised value of a field, in this case scientific capital, and forms of capital that are achieved externally via for example participating in mass-mediated communication and it seems equally fruitful to draw in the concept of *autonomy*. The positioning of the researchers that we have seen above can thus be seen as a position closer to the external pole in the field, as they emphasise the importance of linking their research to a wider mass-audience and they find it important to move beyond the field of specialised knowledge and towards dissemination of this knowledge to a larger public. As a consequence we can understand their position-taking as an opposition between both on one hand autonomy and heteronomy and between the dominant and the dominated forces of logic in the Field of Science.

Thus in opposition to the above we see another type of scientist who generally oppose to mass-mediated communication, we can label him the media-distanced scientist. They are much less frequent in the media and this suits them well. The empirical material indicates that this is often scientists from hard sciences, although there are exceptions. The media-distanced scientist see the media's use of scientists as experts as a form of "prostitution" and the fact that several of the scientists uses this word indicates strong feelings about the fact that some scientists are a lot in the media. Exemplified by the following quote:

Sometimes we're all used to get some basic point across, where you ask a scientist, but you might as well ask someone on the street and get the same answer, but the journalist wants someone with authority and status. I am certainly not going to prostitute myself, in order to get attention, as if to create awareness of my research [...] They are not interested in what the researcher has done, they just need a statement because it fits in the set up. (Interview scientist 7:170).

The media-distanced scientist is not used to being in the media and thus has no interest in recognising as a value in others. Interestingly it seems that it is this form of science journalism that is most widely rejected, whereas communicating ones research results is not looked

down upon in the same way. They are aware of the media logics of the hierarchies of sources – that scientists seem to have the function of supporting the news-angle, and giving the news item an authority, which the journalist themselves do not have, a point also shown by Charlotte Wien in her quantitative studies of how experts are used in the media (Wien 2013). In their rejecting mass mediated communication of science the position themselves towards the autonomous pole in the field of science, where ones interests are projected towards fellow academics. We can say that they are more “inward” looking and they achieve authority from internal logics of the field, rather than from the external participation in another fields’ logic – the field of journalism. Communication via the mass media becomes an obligation, and something that one should only do once in a while. As exemplified by this quote:

Of course, I try to fulfil my obligation to communicate, but I'm not so mass media orientated. I look at it this way, if all researchers tried to get in the media, then it would be a farce (Interview scientist 3:76).

In between the two we have the *media-pragmatic scientist*. This scientist fears his loss of control and talks of journalists who distort and sensationalizes and he shares with the media-frustrated a feeling of being extremely uncomfortable having to comply to the logics of the field of journalism. Interestingly this was often the younger scientists who recognise the need to communicate, but nevertheless felt awkward doing it, possibly as a consequence of their relative “low” amount of scientific capital as younger researchers. The media-distanced scientist and the media-pragmatic scientist will often ask to have see though the article and will often enter a discussion over choice of words. Both will equally often abstain from participating if it is not exactly his area of expertise. The media-pragmatic scientist finds it difficult, not because he finds it silly, but he feels a sort of responsibility for the article, and is worried about how he is perceived, which is very different from the strategy of the media-positive scientist of leaving it up to the journalist. The media-pragmatic scientist worry how the article might turn out, and then finds it easier not to do it at all, or at least only if one is very familiar with the area, as illustrated in the following quote:

As someone said to me, if you are playing with fire, be careful not to burn your fingers. The problem with all this attention is if it goes wrong. So I prefer not to get any attention at all. Personally, I do not like it. But it was interesting to try it - a completely different world, and certainly not something I'm used to (Interview scientist 8:70).

In the following we will look at the field of journalism and the internal differences in the positioning strategies towards the field of science.

Dominant forces of login in the field of Journalism

In our empirical data, we first and foremost see a journalist type who typically work, and in

particular understands herself as a news reporter. Hence we see a connection between job functions and the articulated positioning-strategies, the journalist takes in the narratives of the qualities she recognizes from colleagues and researchers. This of course applies to all journalists pattern (and researchers for that matter) that their working conditions have an influence on how they relate to writing about science and research, but the reason is also to be found in the journalistic training they have had, and we see an opposition between the trade educated journalists and journalists who often also have some sort of university degree. The interesting thing is, this work-related impact on the stories of research, is especially being articulated and highlighted by a type of journalist who find collaborating with scientists problematic. From the interviews we see that *the science distanced journalist* who most often use researchers and scientists as commentators or experts on current events (see also Arnoldi 2005). This is illustrated in quotes like: "we love the experts" (interview journalist 5:48). She thus uses scientists as experts and otherwise only writes about research when there is something new that is important to tell readers about which can become a part of the general news agenda, i.e. make a shorter news story. Research is just one of the many topics that this journalists can write about and she will typically not be employed as a science journalist, but as a news journalist.

I want to write about research, but not just because it's research. It has to be within, the so-called normal news criteria, so it should be interesting to the readers [...] otherwise it must be up to the trade journals and not the mainstream news media to write the story [...] so it is not a plus that it's research. It might as well be anything else. It is the story that lies in research... (Interview journalist 5:18).

The quote is also drawn in to illustrate that the science-distanced journalist sees herself as a representative of the mainstream media, unlike the narrow and specialized, and thus she as generalist can write about everything unlike the more specialized colleagues in the field (see Marchetti's division of the journalist field of specialists and generalists, (Marchetti 2005)).

I also think science journalism gets more space than it should, if you look at how it is written, I have the impression that many places the authors are not journalists, but people with academic backgrounds and education, who write these stories. The drama and the essence that is in the story is not lined up properly - you can read a large story that shows the newspaper prioritize it, but its not coming through, because it's kind of semi-dull (Interview journalist 4: 123).

In a field theory perspective it becomes clearly to see how, in this quotation the journalist constructs two contradictory positions; 'journalists' and other 'people with academic education'. According to this reporter, being academic almost the opposite of being a journalist, and the journalist is thereby distancing herself in this interview sequence from working as a science journalist. The quality she appreciates in journalism is associated with the craft of journalism and this is opposed to the so-called 'semi-dull' science journalism, which science jour-

nalism stands for. The science-distanced journalist talks of scientists, who are “nutty”, scientists who “live in their own little worlds” and who “wants to have everything checked before publication”. She insists that it is her job to boil things down to the essential, but that this is often difficult for the scientist to understand.

In opposition to the above positioning strategy we find the *science-positive* journalist. What becomes clear from the interviews is that he enjoys the privilege of being specialised in writing about science; he feels however that this subject is inferior to other subjects, such as politics. In the way the journalists refer to science journalism it reveals the hierarchies of production logics in the field of journalism, where the ideal is the critical watchdog.

My role is to monitor what is happening and get it disseminated to the larger public. It is rare that this kind of journalism has the consequence of a government having to step down, but the goal is to make something which is interesting to many told to many and not just to a small group of researchers (Interview journalist 5: 320).

The quotes illustrate how the journalists who cover science feel inferior because of the dominant logics of hard news in the field. When this type of journalist equally position himself against ‘science as fascination’ content, it indicates a lower status of entertaining content in the field. The journalists speak critically of ‘stories of science as a breathing-gap between all the serious content in the newspaper’ and an opposition between ‘light’ and ‘heavy’ subject areas rises in the empirical material.

We're a little sad that we are always the stuff at the end, and we think that people are not referring enough to the work we are doing. It is not taken seriously enough. It becomes a bit of entertainment in the end, even though it is just as relevant for the omnibus readers, as much of the other content (Interview journalist 25:97).

From day to day I could wish that it (science journalism, ed.) would get more space, but it can be hard sometimes, unless you have some ‘breaker’ from Science (a journal, ed.), which really has very high relevance - then it's hard to compete with the daily political news and what is going on at societal level (Interview journalist 15:26).

The struggle in the field is equally about space in the paper, who gets the front pages, who is referred to the back page and so on. Thus the struggle for recognition of this specialised form of journalism is all about getting science journalism recognised as *something else* than entertainment, as something serious, relevant and important to many people, and hence the science positive journalist talks of the ‘critical role’ that they strive towards as a an ideal, exemplified in the following;

I sit here and say that we should be critical, but in reality it is not very much, I have done it... I just think there are just many of those ‘new research shows’ stories [...] but

at least people should be aware that they should check around with other sources, but maybe people are just not doing it enough (Interview journalist 2: 259).

The type appears also in the positioning in relation to the use scientists as experts or commentators where journalists do not treat the scientific content in a critical way. She sees herself as someone who uses the 'real scientists' and writes about 'the heavy science'. But the critical role towards science remains an ideal, as they often do not need to act in a very critical way when communicating science, so being critical becomes often about making sure that there is more than one source and to validate to academic value of the research, the method etc.

This is often justified by the fact that she has academic training in addition to the practical journalistic craft education ('has gone to university in addition to having been an intern or have worked in the field of journalism for many years), which also indicates that this type holds more scientific capital than journalists who understand themselves as science-distanced. The science-positive type has less need of control with the final result.

I always ask them to read what I have written, not necessarily the entire article, but at least the section where what they have said is being used. I think it's incredibly important that it is correct when it is published, since I am not an expert at all, I think it's really nice to be sure that there is not anything that has been misunderstood (Interview journalist 19:84).

In between the two opposed strategies of positioning in the field of journalism we find a *science-pragmatic* type of journalist. The description of this type of journalists is less apparent in the material and it holds certain elements from the two other more extreme positioning strategies in the field. This positioning strategy as pragmatic is most evident in several journalists' stories about how they work as magazine journalists and how they see themselves as specialized, not in science journalism in particular, but in a special subject area that they have followed for several years, for example health or schools. They are thus specialized in a area rather than the genre science journalism. For this reason these journalists, get many of the stories from being in constant contact with, for example, scientists, but also other professionals such as people from the trade union movement or from other organizations. The research pragmatic journalist see themselves as the kind of journalist a researcher can agree with, if she wants her research published in the mass media after publication in a journal. The articulated position also appears when we in the interviews see that some journalists recognize that the researcher is conceited to his results, but on the same time he does not emphasise the need to be critical towards the research, as done by the science positive journalist.

Concluding discussion – the alliance of the dominated

It is increasingly expected that researchers appears in the media, and we see that more and

more do (especially social science, see (Albæk, E., Christiansen, P.M. & Togeby 2002; Wien 2013) but that commentator role paradoxically, (or maybe because of it?) seems to be poorly recognized amongst the respondents in this study. The analysis above shows that researchers who prioritize relations with the media and also accepts commentator role are not recognized for their ability to communicate. They barely recognize it as a great achievement themselves – i.e. referring to it as “prostitution”. However presenting new research via the mass media seems to be more accepted and this study indicates that the struggles between journalists and scientists must also be seen in the light of the internal struggles between hard science and humanities and social sciences. In the future it would be useful to further study how this rejection take place and whether differences between agents in the field of science can support this hypothesis on a more general level.

On the other hand the scientists who don't mind the commentating role in the news media are valued and appreciated by journalists for their ability to communicate. The researchers who position themselves as media distanced seem to struggle against the fact that mass mediated communication of science becomes widely recognized as a form of capital across the field, and equally that the commentator role gets accepted as science communication, and they oppose this because that would mean less power, as they do not possess this form of capital. However more research needs to be carried out in order to explore how the power relations between the agents of a specific field is influenced by relations to other fields – in such an analysis field theory has proven a good starting point as an analytical lens.

Opposite we have seen a *transformational pole* of researchers who challenge the traditional perception of science communication and this can be seen as a sign of transformation of the area, which obviously represents an opportunity for the future of research communication. However the interviews carried out in this study suggest that scientists on the large-scale reject role as commentator or expert, which can be seen as a sign of *preservative* tendencies. This we have seen signs of, as some scientists are referred to as 'worn out' and 'used too much'. Scientists must therefore be careful not to fall into either populism or overexposure.

As a consequence of this some journalists can be argued to be closer positioned towards the field of science, while on the same time some scientists are positioning themselves closer to the journalistic field. Interestingly, the journalists with more scientific capital seem to prefer scientists with less communicative capital, while journalists with less scientific capital prefer scientists with more communicative capital. The dominant and the dominated in each field seem to have formed an alliance. By this I mean that the media-distanced scientist prefers the science-positive journalists, who are marginal in the field of journalism by being few and very specialised. On the other hand the media-positive scientist forms an alliance with the science-distanced journalist – thus participation in the field of journalism enables the scientist to increase his or her communicative capital in the struggle to get this form of capital

recognised in the field of science.

References

- Albæk, E., 2011. The interaction between experts and news journalists. *Media, Culture & Society*, 17(31), pp.31–48.
- Albæk, E., Christiansen, P.M. & Togeby, L., 2002. *Eksperter i medierne –dagspressens brug af forskere 1961 -2001*, Magtudredningen, Århus.
- Arnoldi, J., 2005. *Den offentlige ekspert*, Frederiksberg: Forlaget samfundslitteratur.
- Benson, R. & Neveu, E., 2005. *Bourdieu and the journalistic field*, Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P., 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, London: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P., 1990. *Homo Academicus*, Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P., 1998. *Om Tv- og journalistikkens magt*, Tiderne skifter.
- Bourdieu, P., 1993. *The field of cultural production, Essays on art and Literature*, P. Press, ed.,
- Bourdieu, P., 1986. The forms of capital. In I. J. R. (Ed.), ed. *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. (New York, Greenwood., pp. 241–258.
- Bourdieu, P., 2005. The Political Field, the Social Science Field, and Journalistic Field. In R. og E. N. Benson, ed. *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, pp. 29–47.
- Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L.J.D., 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, The University of Chicago Press.
- Couldry, N., 2003. Media meta-capital: Extending the range of Bourdieu's field theory. *Theory and Society*, 32, pp.653–677.
- Eide, M., 1992. *Nyhetens interesse : nyhetsjournalistikk mellom tekst og kontekst*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Ericson, R., Baranek, P. M. & Cahn, J.B.L., 1989. *Negotiating control*, Open University Press.
- Gans, H., 1979. *Deciding What's News – a study of CBS evening Nightly News, Newsweek and Time*, Northwestern University Press.
- Kramhøft, P., 2000. *Journalistik med omtanke: arbejdsmetoder i udredende og analytisk journalistik*, Århus: Ajour.

- Marchetti, D., 2005. Subfields of specialized Journalism. In E. Benson, N. og Neveu, ed. *Bourdieu and The Journali-stic Field*. Polity Press.
- Møller Hartley, J., 2013. The online journalist between ideals and practices: Towards a (more) audience-driven and source-detached journalism? *Journalism Practice*, 7(5), pp.572–587. Available at:
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17512786.2012.755386>.
- Møller Hartley, J. & Hansen, B., 2008. *Kampen om virkeligheden*. Roskilde University.
- Peters, H.P., 1995. The Interaction of Journalist and Scientific Experts: Cooperation and conflict between two Professional Cultures. *Media, Culture and Society*, 17.
- Reed, R., 2001. (Un-)Professional discourse?: Journalists' and scientists' stories about science in the media. *Journalism*, 2(3), pp.279–298. Available at:
<http://jou.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/146488490100200310> [Accessed October 15, 2014].
- Schultz, I., 2006. *Bag om nyhederne*, Frederiksberg: Forlaget Samfundslitteratur.
- Tuchman, G., 1978. *Making news: a study in the construction of Reality*, New York: The Free Press.
- Wien, C., 2013. Commentators on daily news or communicators of scholarly achievements? The role of researchers in Danish news media. *Journalism*, 15(4), pp.427–445.
- Wilken, L., 2006. *Pierre Bourdieu*, Frederiksberg C: Roskilde Universitetsforlag.