New technologies have changed our entire lives. They have also influenced the work of journalists. Today there are questions about the border of journalism. Who can be called a journalist? Moreover, there is the increasing suggestion that in the age of social media, in which everyone can be the sender of a message, and artificial intelligence can generate texts—journalists are no longer needed. That is why the question about the role of journalism in the modern world is justified.

Patrick Ferrucci, Scott A. Eldridge, and other authors in this volume try to answer this question. Their book is a collection of essays showing examples of changes that have occurred in journalism, such as those due to: the implementation of new technologies; the increase in the amount of information generated by non-journalists; and the financial problems of the media outlets. Authors of the chapters show the shifting not only of journalism’s boundaries but also the actors and institutions that traditionally were affiliated to, or cooperated with, the media. As the editors write on page iii:

Bringing together original contributions from a worldwide group of scholars, this book critically explores the changing role and influence of institutions in the production of news. Drawing from a diverse set of disciplinary and theoretical backgrounds, research paradigms and perspectives, and methodologies, each chapter explores different institutions currently impacting journalism, including government bodies, businesses, technological platforms, and civic organizations. Together they outline how cracks in the autonomy of the journalism industry have allowed for other types of organizations to exert influence over the manner in which journalism is produced, funded, experienced and even conceptualized.

The authors give an interesting look at new actors in journalism, showing the pros and cons of such a situation. However, the subtitle of ‘Barbarians Inside the Gate’ could suggest that the emphasis of the change is negative. The advantage of the book is that many examples allow a better understanding of the complex
social phenomena and processes. It is probably also due to the editors whose research focus on the topic. Patrick Ferrucci (PhD, University of Missouri) examines organization-level variables’ impact on message construction and Scott A. Eldridge (PhD, University of Sheffield) researches digital journalism and how non-traditional actors challenge the boundaries of the journalistic field.

The book is divided into three parts. The first, entitled “The historical influencers”, contains four essays. Karoline Andrea Ihlebæk and Tine Ustad Figenschou look at inclusion and exclusion mechanisms in the Norwegian press self-regulation system. They analyze cases of refusal to accept controversial right-wing alternative news sites Document.no and Resett.no to the Association of Editors and the Association of the Media Industries. The reason for this decision was, among others, the current practices (e.g., portals challenging to boycott other information media), publication of anti-system content, and violation of ethical principles enshrined in journalism’s codes of conduct. A discussion about the limits of journalism which indicates that journalists could criticize the practices of other editors but not call for a boycott because this undermines the idea of the freedom of speech. In the second essay, You Li shows how advertising affects journalism by analyzing the example of native advertising. Li on page 31 emphasizes that:

> The tension between the transparency and deception of the news-advertising boundary illustrates the power asymmetries between the editorial side and the business side. The preservation of the editorial-business boundary depends on the execution of native advertising, whether the production, integration, and presentation of native advertising adhere to an ethical and clear disclosure.

Thus follows the dissipation of the editorial-business boundary, considering that many publishers have started producing ads through either their own design studios or editorial teams. Making native advertising similar to journalistic texts may expose recipients to manipulation and discourage using such messages. In the third essay, Jonathan Peters shows the tension between freedom of speech enshrined in the American First Amendment to the Constitution, the right to information and the right to privacy, and the protection of one’s image and defamation. It is crucial in the era of digital media, spreading misinformation, and political and social polarization. In the fourth text, Alfred Hermida, Lisa Varano, and Mary Lynn Young write about the role and impact of academic circles on journalism, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic, on the example of Canadian digital media platform The Conversation. At that time, the importance of The Conversation’s journalism model, under which articles were written by academics and edited by professional journalists, was burgeoning. The model could irritate journalists from traditional media who were in a difficult financial
situation due to the pandemic. The Hermida, Varano, and Young summarize on page 68:

The Conversation model has demonstrated one way that the higher education sector can intervene in the media and help counter the market failure of commercial news, capitalizing on the unique position of universities as trusted generators of expert information.

The second part is entitled “The new funds and organizers”. In the first essay, Sandra Banjac indicates how digital technologies have changed the relationship between journalists and recipients. The latter has gained the opportunity to express their needs, preferences, and reluctance to publish messages or journalistic practices. In the next chapter, Magda Konieczna describes the foundations’ impact on journalism (using the example of the USA), e.g., by financing journalistic schools. On the one hand, foundations have been beneficial for the development of journalism, financially supporting editors, partly making them independent of advertising. On the other hand, some of the foundations secretly pursue political goals. In another essay, Stefan Baack, David Cheruiyot, and Raul Ferrer-Conill research how non-journalistic actors perform practices central to data journalism and how journalism shapes peripheral actors. In the following text, Andreas Hepp and Wiebke Loosen describe the concept of pioneering journalism, which consists of the fact that journalists experimenting with new forms due to technology development are embedded in practice communities. They also act as trainers or consultants and manage and write blogs. In this way, the authors show journalism’s re-figuration, which means an expansion of the constellation of actors; a transformation in the character of journalism’s organizational figurations; and a change in work practices and processes (p. 129).

The third part is entitled “The technological institutions”. In the first essay, Jacob L. Nelson and Andrea Wenzel present engaged journalism on the examples of City Bureau, Resolve Philly, and Free. They analyze the impact on journalism of actors outside the traditional journalistic field. Another essay by Valérie Bélair-Gagnon is the story of the role of web analytics (e.g., number of page views, unique users) in journalism and the dangers resulting from excessive management of indicators. As a consequence, it is the recipients themselves who decide what to publish by clicking, and journalists themselves become addicted to external actors. In the next essay, Frank M. Russell and Tim P. Vos describe the impact of social media platforms, i.e., Facebook, Google, Apple, and Twitter, for journalistic practice, analyzing available literature. The authors examined the interaction of journalism with Silicon Valley platforms from three scientific perspectives: new institutionalism, field theory, and assemblage theory. They state on page 75 that:
All three theories see journalism’s relationship with Silicon Valley platforms as a social relationship among agentic actors. Multiple articles showed journalists adopted social media values when they did not conflict with traditional journalistic values such as objectivity (...). However, audiences embraced Silicon Valley platforms to engage with news and other information, requiring news media to interact with platforms, regardless of whether journalists are willing participants.

These essays show how journalism changes and the ways many new institutions and actors become content producers. They are called peripheral actors—barbarians. After all, they are not professional journalists and they query journalistic standards, but still, they change journalism. The editors, in the introduction on page 2, compare journalism to a ship, which has undergone many changes, and ask whether we are still dealing with the same ship or another one:

Through this analogy, we can approach journalism as a ship defined on the one hand by the historically imbued value and purpose it has long benefited from, and by the continuous transformations that it has endured on the other.

Thus, the limits of journalism are constantly negotiated, and the fear of the status of this profession is due, today, to changes taking place much faster than before. Journalism is not a state or an unchanging institution, but a process, as editors explain on page 9. That is the reason that studying journalism in many aspects is crucial as both an institution with clearly defined functions and principles and as a field constantly changing due to the impact of various external phenomena and processes. Getting to know and understand them will facilitate the assessment of this profession and make us not treat change as a threat but instead as a challenge. That is why it is worth reading this book.
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